

The Guilfordian



Editor-in-Chief Bob Stanger
Managing Editor Warren Mitofsky
Associate Editor Carolyn Newlin
Sports Editors Lee Jacobson
 Claudette Belton
Business Manager Lee Jacobson
Advertising Manager Frazier Smith
Staff Members—Ann Cox, Ken Douglass,
 Beth Eastwood, Dale Embich, Woody
 Finley, Bob Hiatt, Alvin Jaffee, Bar-
 bara Jinnette, Doug Kerr, Craven
 Mackie, Andy McGlamery, Clara
 Montgomery, Carolyn Pipkin
Exchange Editor Carolyn Robertson
Circulation Manager Leona Schmidt
Circulation Staff Louise Beasley
Art Editor Craven Mackie
Photographers—Stan Bass, Bob Johnson
Faculty Advisor Jackson Burgess



EDITORIAL

Welcome Alumni

We of THE GUILFORDIAN would like to extend to our returning Alumni a very cordial welcome. Homecoming Day is recognized by all of us as the day when graduates of Guilford College return to enjoy once more the spirit of our school. It has been our wish to make your visit a rewarding one and hope that you will come and see us again.

EVERYONE A REPORTER

THE GUILFORDIAN would like to extend an invitation to all students to report to us news items. It is sometimes difficult to cover every newsworthy event, especially if we have no knowledge of it. We have attempted to spread our coverage so as to include clubs, seminars, and various campus organizations. However, being fallible it is entirely possible that we may miss an item or two. If such is the case, please call it to our attention. Thank you.—R. S.

Your Rumormate

Remember the saying, "Diamonds are a girl's best friend?" Guilford co-eds seem to think so, too, judging from the abundance of rings that have appeared on campus this fall. Last week, Carolyn Newlin became engaged to Tom Liverman and Judy Winslow received a diamond from "the boy from home." Merle Shelton also has a sparkler from Guilford Grad Jerry Payseur. Best wishes to all three couples!

A Faculty Member's View...

Why Adlai?

By DR. EDWARD BURROWS

The selection of a President of these United States is a serious matter for upon it depends much of our future. Admittedly, there are arguments that can be given in favor of either candidate, but the strongest arguments, as I see it, favor Adlai Stevenson.

From a negative approach, as standard bearer of the Democratic party, Stevenson has an advantage because that party, through its tradition of adjustability, and its inclusion of numerous young, capable figures, offers greater promise than does the Republican party at this time. Further, Eisenhower's record during his four years in office has been disappointing; and he has failed to provide the insight and forceful, responsible leadership that we need. Finally, the present condition of his health offers little hope that such abilities as he does have would be available for his country for another full four, active years.

On the positive side, were neither the state of the Democratic Party nor disappointment with Eisenhower to be considered, I would choose Adlai Stevenson because I am convinced that he would make an excellent president of the United States. His ability, experience and personality all qualify him for the highest honor and responsibility that we can give him.

Adlai Stevenson is a very capable man. He has an agile, well trained mind and knows how to use it. He recognizes the complexity of our national problems, yet is not afraid to face them. He is capable of understanding a wide variety of subjects, yet is obviously willing to learn from others. He can and does put his own thoughts and ideas into effective form to convey them to others, an essential of a strong leader.

Adlai Stevenson is an experienced political leader. This he demonstrated not only as governor of Illinois, but also by his astute conduct during the past four years. Further, his experience is not limited to the United States. He has traveled abroad and has first hand knowledge of many of the subtleties of foreign affairs.

Adlai Stevenson is a strong personality. He blends the strength of confidence in himself and his abilities with a genuine humility that is rare among public figures. He is not afraid to take a stand on a matter of principle; yet he is not insensitive to the deeply rooted

(Continued in last column)

Why Ike?

By DR. PHILLIP FURNASS

I favor Eisenhower, not because he has shown himself a great military leader nor because he is a likeable man who does not put on airs nor hold himself above the common people, but because he stands for what, from the observations of a lifetime, I have come to believe are the more practical, the sounder principles of government.

I have no objections to Stevenson as a man; in fact I have admired his skill and cleverness as a public speaker, and he has dignity. But I disapprove of his ideas on government. I think those ideas are anything but profound and I feel that he lacks the remarkable genius for and training in administration which the army found in Eisenhower and developed by their rigorous system of discipline. At the same time Eisenhower has not proved to be too domineering, as one might have feared a military man would be.

Under Roosevelt and Truman, the power of the states was steadily weakened; labor, which had undoubtedly once been the under dog, was indulged until it became a near tyrant and the whole Federal government expanded into a monstrous organization. The debt of the nation and the yearly expenditures became incomprehensible in magnitude. Where so much money is flowing freely there are always a few greedy and dishonest politicians who succeed in directing some of the flow into their own pockets. The more enormous the funds are, the easier it is for some of them to be misused.

Not only have these things been true, but the government, under the Democrats moved slowly further and further in the direction of socialism. The dignity, prestige, powers and respect accorded the states were correspondingly reduced. These are, as I shall try to show, unwholesome tendencies. Eisenhower has attempted to stem these tendencies and to promote private enterprise, but a common initiative.

Any person of candor, must admit there are abuses and imperfections in the system which favors private enterprise, but a common fallacy is the idea that, because there are imperfections in a given system, you must change to another system. People do not seem to realize that although a new system may correct many of the abuses of the old, it will introduce new abuses which may be as bad or

worse than those of the old. In the present case I believe the Democrats by their changes introduced more imperfections than those they corrected—if any.

I may say that I feel this attitude is not mere prejudice, since I have in the past voted Democratic, but gradually I have corrected (The word is corrected, my good Democratic friends) my thinking and my choice.

I have often thought that a tendency towards the welfare state and socialism ought *theoretically* to be a good thing. For example it seems reasonable that a government should be able to plan ahead for the whole nation and then steadfastly shape the actions of the people to this plan. They do such things in Russia and China. Right now the government might take a very sensible point of view that we should not waste millions of gallons of gas which carry people about on pleasure rides on Sunday and at other times. Walking is perhaps more healthful. Such a use of gasoline might well be forbidden in the interest of economy and conservation. But it is quite possible that under a government that would not flourish and no new discoveries would be made. Under a different system, some person might well invent or discover some new form or source of energy which would completely outmode the use of gasoline. So, after all, we may as well be permitted to say, if we can afford it, "Fill 'er up; we're going for a ride."

Take the matter of farm surpluses. The government under the Democrats was determined to help the farmers. Perhaps the governmental intentions were good, but of course they have been merely expedient. Instead of helping the farmer to help himself, they made a plan. Everything was administered from Washington. The money drawn from all the taxpayers was used to help the one social group. The sorry result was an enormous surplus of food stuffs which grew and grew until, under Eisenhower and Benson, they were, with the greatest difficulty, reduced. As long as the surplus has remained it has depressed farm prices and threatened a depression. The land bank idea of the Republicans may prove, in the long run, to be equally bad, but I honestly doubt whether it will be as bad as the idea of a support for farm prices. Bolstering the price of coffee in Brazil was tried and proved dramatically unsuccessful. This is only one example of the dabbling in economic control that socialistically minded governments drift into.

Not to take an example closer home, the control of rent in Paris,

which sounds like a good idea, has had very unhappy consequences. Rents were established at so low a rate that the landlords could not keep their property in order. Conditions deteriorated and became scandalous because there was no healthy, normal competition on the part of the landlords to secure renters. Controls, controls! This has been the slogan of the Democrats. Experience teaches that free competition and free enterprise constitute the best controls. Admittedly, monopoly and restraint of free trade must be prohibited by the government. Imagine a controlled government which built the automobiles. If conditions were like those in other socialistically minded governments, one would not be able just any day in Boonville, Missouri, to step into a sales room and buy a new Ford. In practice the government, which like that of the Democrats, tries to do all things for all people, in actual practice, works out badly.

Because, then, he wishes to restore to the American people more of that self-respect which goes with doing things for themselves, because he wishes to reduce the controls and the machinery of the central government, because he wishes to restore the dignity and respect of the individual state, and because he is a gifted and highly trained executive who has been successful in practice, I favor Eisenhower for President.

WHY ADLAI?

(Continued from column two)

feelings that may affect the thinking of others. Religion is an integral part of this life, but his faith is not the kind that offers easy soporifics in the business of living.

Of course there are criticisms that can be leveled at Stevenson. It is charged that as governor of Illinois he did not clear up all the imperfections of the political situation in that state. The record shows that he did much, I believe; and no one questions where he stood on the issues involved. He is divorced which is a matter of concern to those who feel that the occupant of the White House should set an example for all to follow. His personal behavior and deportment are above reproach, however. He is an intellectual which is a fault in the eyes of some. But he searches deeply, thinks clearly and does not permit his mental superiority to cut him off from understanding and appreciating those not so gifted as himself.

Frankly, I think it would be a genuine pleasure to be able to call Adlai Stevenson our president. His clear, beautifully wrought and carefully enunciated prose would be a relief after the years of flat, halting addresses we have had from the White House for the past decade. He would bring both dignity and vision to the position of our chief executive at a time when both are needed. Americans of every race class and creed could follow him with pride and assurance that, although he may not work the miracles so glibly promised by others, he would use his God-given talents to lead us toward our ideal of American life, and to steer our nation into the pathway of true and lasting peace.

ARNOLD

