

A Letter on Justice and Open Debate



- 1 Our cultural institutions are facing a moment of trial. Powerful protests for racial and social justice are leading to overdue demands for police reform, along with wider calls for greater equality and inclusion across our society, not least in higher education, journalism, philanthropy, and the arts. But this needed reckoning has also intensified a new set of moral attitudes and political commitments that tend to weaken our norms of open debate and toleration of differences in favor of ideological conformity. As we applaud the first development, we also raise our voices against the second. Resistance must not be allowed to harden into its own brand of dogma or coercion. The democratic inclusion we want can be achieved only if we speak out against the intolerant climate that has set in on all sides.
- 2 13, the lifeblood of a liberal society, is daily becoming more constricted. While we have come to expect this on the radical right, censoriousness is also spreading more widely in our culture: an intolerance of opposing views, a vogue for public shaming and ostracism, and the tendency to dissolve complex policy issues in a blinding moral certainty. We uphold the value of robust and even caustic counter-speech from all quarters. But it is now all too common to hear calls for swift and severe retribution in response to perceived transgressions of speech and thought. More troubling still, institutional leaders, in a spirit of panicked damage control, are delivering hasty and disproportionate punishments instead of considered reforms. Editors are fired for running controversial pieces; books are withdrawn for supposed inauthenticity; journalists are barred from writing on certain topics; professors are investigated for quoting works of literature in class; a researcher is fired for circulating a peer-reviewed academic study; and the heads of organizations are ousted for what are sometimes just clumsy mistakes. Whatever the arguments around each particular incident, the result has been to steadily narrow the boundaries of what can be said without the threat of reprisal. We are already paying the price in greater risk aversion among writers, artists,

and journalists who fear for their livelihoods if they depart from the consensus, or even lack sufficient zeal in agreement.

- 3 This stifling atmosphere will ultimately harm the most vital causes of our time. The restriction of debate, whether by a repressive government or an intolerant society, invariably hurts those who lack power and makes everyone less capable of democratic participation. The way to 15 is by exposure, argument, and persuasion, not by trying to silence or wish them away. We refuse any false choice between justice and freedom, which cannot exist without each other. As writers we need a culture that leaves us room for experimentation, risk taking, and even mistakes. We need to preserve the possibility of good-faith disagreement without dire professional consequences. If we won't defend the very thing on which our work depends, we shouldn't expect the public or the state to defend it for us.

This letter was drafted by writers Robert Worth, George Packer, David Greenberg, Mark Lilla and Thomas Chatterton Williams and was signed by 153 people, mostly famous scholars and writers.

harpers.org, 2020

Tekst 5 A Letter on Justice and Open Debate

- 1p 12 What is said in paragraph 1?
- A Eroding fundamental constitutional rights might lead to domestic upheaval.
 - B Repressing divergent opinions on behalf of a righteous cause is reprehensible.
 - C The prevailing academic viewpoints and practices are obsolete and invalid.
 - D Those in public office seem to condone disruptions by political agitators.
- 1p 13 Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 2?
- A The editorial content of papers and magazines
 - B The free exchange of information and ideas
 - C The intolerance towards science and research projects
 - D The unrestricted access to public records and reports
- ‘Editors (...) clumsy mistakes.’ (paragraph 2)
- 1p 14 What is the function of the examples in this sentence?
- A to argue that a stricter control of established institutions is long overdue
 - B to explain why a string of isolated incidents can have such a profound impact
 - C to make clear that the legislation on public misconduct is haphazard
 - D to show that repression of alleged wrongdoers is already common practice
 - E to stress that ill-considered publications are a threat to social stability
- 1p 15 Which of the following fits the gap in paragraph 3?
- A confirm consensus effects
 - B control opposing voices
 - C defeat flawed ideas
 - D impose dubious policies
 - E trigger unwanted responses

Bronvermelding

Een opsomming van de in dit examen gebruikte bronnen, zoals teksten en afbeeldingen, is te vinden in het bij dit examen behorende correctievoorschrift.