

Faith And Reason

Ed. note: Any individual or group may submit religious editorial copy for publication on Sundays. Copy should be interdenominational in theme, 750 words or less in length, and submitted by noon, Thursday of the week to be published. All such copy is subject to the discretion of the Editor.

The revered homespun fillosofer Will Rogers had a little saying which often makes me feel good when overwhelmed by certain campusites' panurgy in matters intellectionshual (and spiritual): "everyone is ignorant—only on different subjects. . . ." Since they seem sincere in their desire to be informed (literally or actually) I assay the monumental task with Quixotic abandon and fervor.

It seems evident that this paramount infusion of spiritual fog has obliterated our vision most around those two moral reefs—Faith and Reason—and the following chart for navigational purpose through the tricky channel or passage between this spiritual Scylla and rational Charybdis is provided herewith (without charge—they don't even have to attend church on Easter Sunday).

The divorce of faith and reason has been expressed by Pascal as "reasons of the heart" over against "reasons of the head." "The heart has its reasons which reason does not know." In terms of judgment Ritschl declares that in the religious area "judgments of value" obtain in contrast to "judgments of existence" in other realms of experience.

Of course, when we define faith as believing things which we know aren't so and regard reason as a transcendental, a priori capacity of the self, irreverently termed by Carlyle "transcendental moonshine," the two are incompatible. The relationship, however, is not of such sorry status. Faith is a practical working assumption. Biologically speaking, it is a sort of unconscious "will to believe" in the service of the "will to live." As such it suffers no disesteem in comparison with procedures in the sciences. Science makes its unproved assumptions which must undergo the empirical test. That nature is uniform to one of these. It is both unproved and unprovable. To attempt a logical verification of the concept of uniformity is to assume it. However, in the macroscopic world, at least, it meets the pragmatic test. Our conviction is that a wholly faithless reason or an utterly irrational faith is non-existent.

We must neither derationalize faith nor dehumanize reason. Faith is not a slushy emotionalism, nor is reason a distant iceberg jewelled in the sun. All reason is shot through and through with faith just as all faith that is not spurious has rational grounds or justifying elements.

"The only escape from faith," says James, "is mental nullity." Pure untainted reason is a fiction. We are all inerably marked by the accidents and pressures of tradition and environment. Scientific hypotheses are meaningless without faith in their possible validity. The linkage of steps in any mathematical demonstration is possible only through faith in the validity of its assumptions and procedures. Faith is an essential ingredient, a postulate of reason.

Pebble Ernest Barrow

Not Guilty

by Barry Farber

Zagreb, Yugoslavia. . . Greetings from the Federal Peoples' Republic of Yugoslavia.

In a few minutes the fourth session of the Conference for Peace and International Cooperation will get under way here in the Parliament Building at Zagreb, the capital of the province of Croatia. Over two hundred people, Communist, Capitalist, white, black, yellow, and brown, are busy searching for the magic olive branch to bring peace to the planet. We're trying to achieve a meeting of the minds without a knocking of the heads.

I'm going to describe my trip and experiences along with a little local color before I go into Yugoslavian communism. I want to let every little impression sink in before I make any profound political observations.

Last Monday night at 6 o'clock the sleek, silver airplane kissed America goodbye and headed eastward across the Atlantic. I hate planes. Okay, so I'm a sissy. I still hate planes. I chewed my fingernails so much my stomach needed a manicure. Once the pretty hostess smiled and said, "Would you like a cup of tea?"

I screamed! I thought she said, "We're falling into the sea."

Talk about air sickness! For twenty hours the hope of dying was the only thing that kept me alive. I prayed to every Christian, Jewish, and Mohammedan God I'd ever heard of and I was just getting down to Buddah and Zoroaster when we landed safely at Zurich, Switzerland. "Whaddayaknow," I smugly snickered as I bravely tramped down the gangway. "Chapel Hill yesterday, Switzerland today." I felt as cosmopolitan as a comet.

In Zurich I hopped a train for the Yugoslavian border. Just after midnight we passed through an interesting country I'll bet you never heard of. The name of the place is Lichtenstein. It's about half the size of the Y Court and hangs onto Switzerland like a tick on the neck of a hound dog. Rumor has it that a guy named Prince Lichtenstein owned a few acres of land near the Austrian border. One day this chap got tired of obeying Swiss traffic laws so he set up his own government. The chief export of Lichtenstein is false teeth.

by Tommy Sumner CPU Roundtable

President Truman's recent appointment of Gen. Mark Clark as U. S. Ambassador to the Vatican has called forth extravagance of both praise and condemnation. Because of the very present interest in this matter the Carolina Political Union has chosen as its subject for tonight's discussion, "Communism, Democracy, and Catholic Power." The discussion will be held in the Grail Room of Graham Memorial at 8 p.m.

Paul Blanshard, author of the controversial "American Freedom and Catholic Power," has recently written a similar work which gave its title to tonight's discussion. These two books are undoubtedly the best written and documented volumes of the type ever printed in this country, although the second is much poorer than the first.

It is in the light of the statements made by Blanshard that the recent appointment takes on added significance. If as he claims the Catholic hierarchy is aimed at making the U. S. a state subject to the Vatican then the nation is in clear and imminent danger. If, however, there is no such plot afoot then the Vatican would be an invaluable ally against the encroachments of the communist states.

In either case it is a wise move to have an official voice at the Vatican. This neither compromises nor denies the principle of the separation of church and state; it does not establish a church, it merely recognizes its existence.

by Walt Dear Over The Hill

A point of law: "Financial supervision of all student publications financed by authority of the Student Legislature shall be vested in the Publications Board." . . . "The Publications Board shall exercise no control over the Editors-in-Chief of the various publications in the performance of their duties, including the appointment of their staffs, except where matters of finance shall be involved."

Surely the letter and spirit of the Constitution, of which parts of Article V appear above, indicate that the Publications Board will work for the benefit of the newspaper and yearbook, that members of the Publications Board will not use their powers in such a way as to snap off the editor's prerogative to print what he wants to print. The board, not all-powerful, is strictly a body set up by the students who wrote the Constitution to watch the finances—to give a fair amount of funds to each publication.

The phrase, "He who holds the purse strings makes the policy" certainly cannot be applied to the board. The board has no intention of being an autonomous group, heavy with "supreme powers," ready to lower the ax on those that disagree with it.

The board is composed of a business executive, a lawyer, a lawyer-accountant, two members of the Student Legislature, a former sportswriter, a Yack editor, and a reporter.

These people are acting under the Constitution. They are obligated to watch the budget, to

Letters

Madam Editor:

In a future "HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN NORTH CAROLINA," there might be recorded in one small foot-note something like this:

In the year 1951, a strange sect known as Snookites began to breed in Chapel Hill. In the usual historical tradition of heresy, this sect presented God a manifesto which He had to agree to, or they would denounce Him as anti-liberal and intolerant. God, in His infinite Wisdom and with glowing pageantry, dispatched these schismatics to Hell by a gigantic "auto-da-fe" staged at Kenan Stadium.

Yours in Christian Obedience,
John Richard Rison Jones, Jr.

Madam Editor:

Harry Snook is certainly an interesting writer, and in many ways a constructive liberal. I like his articles on religion very much, because I have a feeling that what the Western World needs most of all, is not a reaffirmation of narrow-minded Christian faith. Doctrinal faith leads to persecution of such as think otherwise, and finally to now most wars have been declared and waged in the name of God: "Onward, ye Christian Soldiers!". A strong faith, defined as a blind belief in Christian doctrine, on the part of the Western World today, is just as dangerous to decent, tolerant humanism and the future of our world, as is the blind belief in Joseph Stalin and the Communist Doctrine on the part of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Therefore I find it most encouraging to see Harry Snook write the following sentences in an American students' paper: "What we do want is the kind of understanding that enables each of us to think what he wishes and do what he wants, as long as his fellowmen have their privilege of doing the same."

Harry Snook seems to have felt the need for such a reservation, too, saying: "But no one should be allowed to practice his belief in any manner that works against the best interests of the community at large."

Good. But then he continues: "The polygamist, for example, should be free to believe in polygamy, but not to practice it."

Now, what kind of liberalism is this?

Does Harry Snook mean that if an Arabian came to this country with his six wives, the Arabian should be allowed to believe in polygamy, but not to practice it? Would he have to divorce five of his wives, or would he have to leave five of them behind, before coming to this country? Life is certainly so burdensome to a man with six wives

work with the editors and business managers, and to make contracts.

If the Constitution be wrong, then we should change it. Perhaps, a Publications Board consisting of the editors and business managers of the different publications with the secretary-treasurer of student government acting as chairman, would settle disputes better, and would be a more satisfactory composition of membership.

Perhaps, there should be no publications board. Perhaps, just a faculty advisor who could be a highly paid business manager for all publications.

The need for a Publications Board has been probably be-

that we should not place him in the dilemma of choosing between belief and practice, to say nothing of the poor five women left entirely to themselves!

Or does Harry Snook simply mean the tendency we find in the Western World today (and in America) to handle the duties of monogamistic marriage somewhat leniently? If that is the case, it seems as if Harry Snook is unwilling to acknowledge the unquestionable need in some men and women to have more than one sexual relationship during their life. And if Harry Snook means that the hetaerae system in ancient Greece (the highest civilized community in the world has ever seen), the mistress system in France (whereby they keep the family intact and the children under one roof), or the divorce system in the U. S. A. (whereby the children are scattered and left uncertain) are foul things, how would he propose to reestablish faith in monogamy?

And if he would prevent people who believe in the advantage and happiness of several sex relationships from finding out in practice whether it is true or not, how can he then possibly claim to be a liberal?

And finally: how can he be certain that polygamy (he probably means promiscuity) necessarily would work "against the best interests of the community at large?" Is he certain that this country would have more hatred, frustration, sex crimes, and cases of ulcers under a system of polygamy than under the present system of rigid monogamy.

Agnar Mykle

Madam Editor:

Johnny Long, the left-handed violinist, is truly a magnificent person. In the article in this morning's DTH, it was stated that Mr. Long "was born near Charlotte in 1934 and entered Duke in 1951." It's unbelievable! How can a man enter college three years before his birth? I had to finish high school before the University would permit me to enter. Maybe I should have gone to Duke and skipped high school entirely. As it is, I have to begin my college career at the ripe old age of 17.

I wish you would find out how Mr. Long did such a splendid thing, because I would like for my probable children to have the wonderful chance to begin their college career at an early age. If such a thing can be done, they will be able to finish college before they reach their teens.

Any information about how this can be accomplished will be greatly appreciated.

Bill Garner

The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is published daily at the Colonial Press, Inc., except Monday's examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms. Entered as

second class matter at the Post Office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed \$4.00 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered \$6.00 per year and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor: Glenn Harden
Managing Editor: Bruce Melton
Business Manager: Oliver Watkins
Business Office Manager: Jim Schenck
Society Editor: Mary Nell Boddie

Sports Editor: Billy Peacock
Subscription Manager: Chase Ambler
Associate Editors: Al Perry,
Beverly Baylor
Feature Editor: Walt Dear