

Students Of Freedom

The indictment against those who are sapping the moral strength of America generally heads the list with such public figures as Senator Joseph McCarthy, and works down through the McCarrans, Fergusons, Chambers, Longs, and Clarks to the activities of various organizations who tabulate the loyalty riskiness of individuals.

The indictment, as a result, generally misses the real danger point in regard to civil liberties. The argument that a despot could "put himself" in power through the atmosphere of fear that befalls the countryside today is fallacious. The political organization of this country is yet such that men may achieve power only through popular support. Fear is an individual thing. Only where individuals fear to speak out, and therefore acquiesce, through silence, to fear tactics, can power over individuals be achieved.

Yet men have families, futures, homes and established reputations to consider, and only a few men in any given community will have the innate courage to endanger these things to speak out against the things they fear.

Therefore has the world constantly looked to youth—not for leadership—but for courageous outspokenness; for constant displacement of the old by the new; and for open examination of the orthodox.

The heartiest damnations of America's current crop of young men and women has come in post war years from older leaders who see no vigorous replacements arising for progressive leadership. We are called the "generation of jelly-fish," "silent," and "security-minded."

Where older established leaders cling to the old, the orthodox, the conservative, the situation is normal. Where young men and women—university students—accept passively the status quo, and regard with fear any efforts toward change, the situation justifies alarm.

The men and women on this campus, in their quiescent acceptance of pressure and fear tactics from the outside have exhibited their inadequacy to renew the democratic spirit.

Many examples can be shown. Boys up before ROTC and Naval examining boards for commissions are afraid to answer honestly such political questions as "what do you think of Eisenhower?" being asked by the military officials on those boards. The examining boards are probably correct in asking such questions, for the United States Army should know whether or not its officers can think, and if the men hired to lead other men are cognizant of the issues of today.

But the military students themselves have built up a personal fear of reprisal from some unknown source. In their general acceptance of whatever is current military orthodoxy, they are further strengthening the ability of the military to standardize thought.

They do not seem to realize that military orthodoxy of today may be the heresy of tomorrow, and that the honest way is therefore the only safe way.

Students intimidate faculty members. Only the other day a professor, in explaining a socialist form of government, elaborated to the extent of outlining the conditions under which such a government might expect to prosper. A back-row crossword-puzzle worker walked out of class and announced to a group of students that he was being taught by a communist.

Just such an incident a few years ago resulted in a full-scale investigation of the University of Chicago by the Illinois State Legislature, with a resultant chaos in Chicago's academic freedom.

Students at the present time are accused by John Clark of trying to intimidate the Board of Trustees, and we cannot but admit that such a situation is possible, if it does not exist now.

The Greensboro Daily News commented the other day that "if there is one thing in North Carolina less likely to be intimidated than John Clark, it is a University student."

President Gordon Gray has asserted many times that academic freedom (with the necessary accompanying responsibility) will be maintained for faculty and students on this campus.

We are undoubtedly in a unique position on this campus in our freedom. Efforts to intimidate students are very likely to result in so much protest that the intimidators feel intimidated, as does John Clark.

Yet such a body as the Dialectic Senate found itself in such a state of fear that the group has completely equivocated its earlier stand on segregation, by claiming its irresponsibility for the issue, and by claiming that the vote of the body is on the purely technical basis of debate.

The Senate (which is not commonly recognized as a mere debate squad) issued a statement saying that the group did not feel intimidated, at the same time admitting privately that the roll call vote on the segregation issue would not be included in the minutes which they so bravely offered for public inspection. And the group refused to take any official notice of a defamatory letter which was addressed to the president of the body and circulated widely in mimeographed form.

Gray also commented that "the allegation that students are not allowed to speak on this campus perhaps is made by those who don't see The Daily Tar Heel." We could add that is perhaps made by those who hear only students so seeped in their own fear of the process of thought that they deny for themselves all right to that process.

The blame for failure to speak on controversial issues must lie squarely with the student who fails to speak.

Letters to the Editor

Madam Editor:

It was refreshing to read your editorial, "Faculty for Freedom", of 12 February. I hope its message has not gone unheeded.

What has happened to us here in America? Was I completely naive when in grammar school, words such as "freedom", "democracy", "liberty", seemed to glow with the promise and dreams they represented? One of the stock sentences in our vocabulary then, only a few short years ago, was "It's a free country, ain't it?" But such a sentence was in that case an expression of irresponsibility.

Our vital need today is a sense of responsibility, of individual responsibility to society. The guiding ideals of our revolution must not be allowed to die, if we expect the nation they support to live.

But what do we see upon looking around us? A government which is becoming a dictatorship in its blind efforts to defeat another; a mania for comfort and security to the utter disregard liberty; a society in which people are suspect for the reading of Carl Marx; a situation in which reputations can be assassinated and careers ruined by irresponsible, unproved accusa-

Madam Editor:

I would like to comment on your editorial of Thursday morning and the dangers which it brought to my attention. I would like for this to be considered an open letter to the writer of the editorial. I do not intend for my comments to imply complete disapproval of all of his ideas, but rather let them be considered a discussion of certain thoughts which his most stimulating letter brought to my mind.

For the past few years I have viewed with great alarm a trend toward too liberal thinking that has come to grip the American educational community. This trend finds its roots in fear, greed, insecurity, and false reasoning generated by the nature of certain politicians and frustrated intellectuals. We have allowed ourselves to become the prisoners of a doctrine of liberalistic tolerance of everything, be it right or wrong, which is causing us in many instances to repudiate historic principles proven worthy down through the years, and which we sometimes fight to protect.

Under the guise of tolerance we have allowed communists to infiltrate the government, we have allowed frustrated, confused, would-be intellectuals to corrupt many educational institutions with their revolutionary ideas, we have allowed misinformed Southern liberals to be led into the ways of Yankee politicians seeking to exploit the Negro vote, we have allowed our social and moral life to reach miserable depths. I refer you to the current rates of crime, drunkenness, and divorce. Regarding Chapel Hill, why is it that these so called "great thinkers" who come up with some of these liberal theories are so often seen doing their finest work in any of the several local establishments which specialize in selling beer? Regarding national policy, why is it that so many important decisions are made at Washington cocktail parties?

Today, it is the conservative, thoughtful person who is the

tions; where unpopular opinions are censored from newspapers and learned journals; in short, where most of the symptoms of a neo-fascist (in its corrupted meaning) state are evident.

The situation is critical when things like these go on, when American citizens can be convicted for peacefully advocating a philosophy of government, when the government can arbitrarily designate organizations as subversive, thereby condemning their members, when one group can be set apart from the majority and its rights flagrantly trampled upon and disregarded.

Rapidly the time is approaching when individuals must make the choice: are ideals of liberty, justice and decency valuable enough to be the cause for real sacrifice, or will we go along with the crowd and forget these dreams? Perhaps it would be more pleasant to welcome dictatorship with parades and celebrations, rather than to pretend to believe in these other things while allowing the iron grip to become stronger. But I think not. I am frankly worried deeply about our future. Only fools are not.

Jack W. Hopkins

Reviews

William Whitesides, tenor, sang a well-selected and diversified program in Hill hall on Wednesday evening. It was, perhaps the most stimulating and accomplished musical presentation of this year. Mr. Whitesides combines a delightfully fresh voice with perceptive interpretation usually found only among older artists.

In two tenor arias from Bach's Cantata 78, both Mr. Whitesides and his accompanist, Thomas Nichols, showed their mastery of classical technique. A delicate and sensitive blending of skills made two selections from Don Giovanni effective. A group of Brahms Lieder showed the singer at his very best.

On Wenlock Edge, a setting by Vaughn Williams of poems from A. E. Housman's Shropshire Lad, is a superb impressionistic evocation of the unadorned joy and pathos of the poems. As performed, it was carefully calculated and cumulative in emotional intensity. A group of artfully arranged spirituals concluded the program.

W.B.F. W.M.P.

non-conformist. Just you dare to advocate the barring of Negroes from the University of North Carolina, dare to advocate the dismissal of faculty members communistically inclined; see how much help you get. The desire to conform, against which you so vigorously protest, is merely the desire to continue in the paths which have proven successful by guiding our nation to power. A common malady arising from success is to become blind to the merits of the very factors causing your success, and turning aside to other paths, which often lead to doom. In your blind advocacy of progress, tolerance, and extension

by Rollo Taylor

Rameses

Sound "blue" warning No. 2, boys, the electioneers are on the loose again. In a few weeks the campus will be flooded with literature ranging from the poetic to the obscene and all will plead for your support and votes. Little fists will be worn out from pounding on dormitory doors and little ears will get blistered from foul utterances coming from behind those doors. The professional and the amateur campus politicians are on the march!

For the benefit of the freshmen who have never witnessed a full scale spring election, I would like to say that you are about to hear the most beautifully ambiguous statements of all times. You will hear candidates talk for hours on such rich subjects as the party platforms, the segregation question and what should be done about the student legislature. You, Mr. Frosh, are about to become old buddies and life long friends of various campus big dogs. They will put a fatherly hand on your shoulder, look you straight in the eye and feed you sugar with a spoon.

Awhile back students got so durn mad with so many folks coming around asking for money, the Campus Chest was founded. In that way only one person came to the room and asked for about ten times his usual amount. That ain't bad. Pay it all at once and get it over with is better.

Now if there is some way we could get up a Politician Chest whereby only one candidate would knock once on every door, give all the speel for all the office seekers, 'twould be fine. Think of the yawning you could save. This way we could put all the hardened pros on that job and save the more innocent freshmen officer seekers from being disillusioned at what the average student thinks of the average office seeker. Believe me, brother, it ain't much.

And too, the more productive minds on the campus could really whoop up some good ones when young ladies took a notion to run for something. "Politician's Chest"—that is rather suitable; about as ambiguous as you can get.

Every day in every way
I'm disliking him more—
This Johnny Raye.

of the "good life", you would, in achieving your ends, destroy the things that have made us great. Not to say that progress, tolerance, and the "good life" for all are not desirable elements, they most certainly are, but the factors that you claim to be their necessary components are not conducive to achieving the desired goals.

Those people who are so constantly tolerant are characterized by a marked lack of intestinal fortitude. They use tolerance as a cover behind which to hide their real motives. I refer to certain political leaders in our state whose desire for power keeps them from taking strong, firm, actions such as those of Governor Byrnes of South Carolina. More power to Dave Clark, Nell Battle Lewis, James Byrnes, and anyone else who will refuse to conform with the current mad scramble to see who can be the most liberal.

Charles Edward Bissell