



© FRANKLY SPEAKING Post Office Box 1523 East Lansing, Michigan 48823

# "Age of Candor"

by Karen McCotter

According to numerous self-appointed experts, we are now experiencing a sexual revolution. Actually, only recently have people been willing to discuss what they have been doing for years. In fact it seems that some are too willing for discussion; and thus, the subject has been very effectively over-worked. The amount of verbal and written repartee on SEX, (and I capitalize each and every letter of the word to avoid accusations of reticence or of having a sexual hang-up) is phenomenal. Also it seems to be exerting undue and rather tiresome pressures on some people.

With the publication of so many books on the subject of sex, it would seem that everyone should be an expert by now. I anticipate daily the appearance of *Cliff's Notes on The Sensuous Woman*, *The Sensuous Man*, and *The Sensuous Couple*, for those who desire a shortcut to guaranteed pleasure. These books and their extremely vocal adherents,

usually of the male sex, are partially responsible for the sexual pressures felt by many young people today, especially women. Repeatedly informed of the "new" importance of their sexual role, I expect that more than a few young women are certain that if they cannot emulate J's success every time, they are hopelessly frigid. And if a young woman refuses to have sex, her next stop should be Masters' and Johnson's Clinic. In my opinion the free sex supporters could not, even intentionally, have found a more efficient method of cutting down on the sexual activity in the United States. By demanding perfection, they have instilled fear into the inexperienced, as an "A" for effort no longer can be desired. I think that many people have forgotten that sex is a personal and private matter in which we desperately need to regain our perspective. So therefore I say unto you, put away the Redd-Whip, girls, and remember that sometimes it is the thought that really counts.

# Director Aids Campus Affairs

by Julie Bartan

Randy Williams, Director of Art Exhibits for the Fine Arts Center, is also an instructor for pottery and sculpture for the Winston-Salem Arts and Crafts Council. He considers himself very fortunate to have two jobs involving art: whereas, most art majors either teach art in public school or have a job in a totally unrelated field. Randy graduated from Western Carolina University with a Bachelor of Arts degree after having spent two years in the Army. He especially enjoyed the mountains of Western Carolina, and still enjoys camping and traveling. Having toured the United States during previous summers, Randy plans a trip to Europe for this summer. He finds traveling and meeting people intriguing, and is searching for a place to settle down. New England, Canada, and the Smokey Mountains are his favorite spots. He considers urban areas a place to visit, but wants to live

away from people.

At Western Carolina, Randy took a few music courses, and is now an amateur folksinger and composer. He performs here in Winston-Salem at the coffee house sponsored by Knollwood Baptist Church and Wake Forest University. In Chapel Hill, he has performed at the Student Union, and in Forest City at the Bangladesh Moratorium. Leon Russell, Bob Dylan, and Leonard Cohen are among Randy's favorite professional performers, but he enjoys classical music as well.

Randy's primary artistic interest is sculpture which he does in marble and limestone. His style resembles that of Henry Moore, and his favorites are Turner and Michelangelo. As a teacher in the area of art, Randy is very dedicated and enjoys his position. He states emphatically that he is happy about living and enjoys living each day.

## Is a Liberal Education Relevant?

by Paul A. Freund

(Paul A. Freund is perhaps America's most distinguished legal scholar. Professor Freund, a constitutional lawyer and historian of the United States Supreme Court, is the author of *The Supreme Court of the United States*, and *On Law and Justice*. He is past president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and is presently in his thirty-first year as Professor of Law at Harvard University.)

Education was once defined by John Maynard Keynes as "the inculcation of the incomprehensible into the ignorant by the incompetent"; but we know that this is a gross canard, because students today are far from ignorant. Are they wise as well as knowing? The student generation insists that learning must be pertinent to their immediate personal problems, to their search, in the current phrase, for their self-identity. This attitude, it seems to me, is one of maturity insofar as it rejects the self as the center of the universe. For we learn to know the self by transcending it. We apprehend the immediate in all its fullness through the light of perspective.

To put the issue more concretely, how can we justify our immediate immersion in the arts and the humanities as something more than a taste for the decorative embellishments of life which are as irrelevant and incongruous at this hour as Victorian bustles would be in a crowd of mini skirts? How can a liberal education help to cope, for example, with two of the principle domestic crises of our time - the crises of the power of confrontation and the crisis of the power of technology?

First, consider the power of confrontation as a form of protest, a reflection of the spirit that demands which have not been heard can be made to be felt, that rational discussion is no longer fruitful and the way to achieve ends is by the force of physical coercion. I do not mean to pursue the theme of civil disobedience, beyond observing that direct disobedience of a morally repugnant law on ground of conscience ("I can do no other") is a less complex moral problem, for all its anguish, than a decision to disobey unrelated laws as a form of political pressure, where the prudential aspects of the choice become highly important. Nor need I labor the point that society will not condone lawlessness whether it occurs on the campuses or in the streets.

But there is a deeper question. Although to suppress these movements is not too difficult as a matter of physical force, this by itself is not an exercise of the highest art of government. The role of government is like that of art itself - to impose a measure of order on the disorder of experience while respecting and not utterly suppressing the underlying diversity, spontaneity, and disarray. For civilization itself is

a continuous tension between tradition and change, between heritage and heresy. The best statement I know of this is by Alfred North Whitehead, in his little book on symbolism, where he says "It is the first step in sociological wisdom to recognize that the major advances in civilization are processes which all but wreck the societies in which they occur, like unto an arrow in the hand of a child. The art of free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code, and secondly in fearlessness of revision, to secure that the code serves those purposes which satisfy an enlightened reason. Those societies which cannot combine reverence for their symbols with freedom of revision must ultimately decay from anarchy or from the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows."

To appreciate this truth requires more than intellectual commitment. It requires the understanding that comes with feeling, the capacity to imagine what we know and observe, to respond not out of fear or vengeance or pedantic imitation of the past but out of understanding in the way that a musical performer understands a score - not only cerebrally but kinaesthetically. It is as true today as when Shelley wrote his *Defense of Poetry* that "We want the creative faculty to imagine that which we know. We want the generous impulse to act that which we imagine. We want the poetry of life." Because a liberal education means, or should mean, that we have learned to exercise our imagination in a disciplined way against a resisting medium, whether it be language or numbers or canvas or metal; because it teaches us that true understanding is a tension between the frenzy of an insight and the discipline of an equation, a liberally educated person can best understand with sensitivity, and judge with comprehension, the moral crisis of confrontation.

The second great crisis to which I have referred, the power of technology, is quite different and yet interrelated, for I believe that the disaffection of the student generation is due basically to the great gap between the potentiality and the actuality of technological civilization. A French scientist said some thirty years ago that science had taught us how to become gods before we have learned to be men. Science and technology promise us in the foreseeable future that we shall be able to manipulate genetic inheritance; that we shall be able to control human behavior through chemical substances the implant of electrodes; that we shall be able to prolong human life through the transplantation of organs; and that computers will deliver up at our call a host of stored information, much of which could be of the most intimate and personal sort, for a computer, though it may know all, does not have the capacity to forget

or forgive. Someone, the story goes, fed a tape into a computer with the question "Is there a God?" and after the wheels clicked and whirled, the tape came out with the message, "There is now". But I don't want to be understood as anti-scientific. Quite the contrary.. My point is rather that we suffer from the default of the humanities and the social sciences in preparing us, as the French biologist said, to be men.

Philosophy has too often deteriorated into a branch of mathematics or linguistics. Political science has become quantified so that the questions being asked are those trivial enough to be answered by the capacity of present-day computing machines. Somehow the old questions of the meaning of justice, the legitimacy of authority, the obligation of fidelity to law - these questions if they are considered systematically at all seem to be consigned to the preserve of the law schools, but these are questions far too important to be left to the professionals. The scientists themselves are appealing to the non-professionals to guide them in resolving those moral questions which their own efforts have inescapably raised.

If a liberal education does not address itself to these basic issues of the proper uses of technology, then technology will by default become a frankenstein. We are told by scientists that we are now able to accomplish virtually anything we seek and so the question is necessarily, now and in the future - what *should* we seek? For the first time in history the pressing question before society is not what can be done, but what ought to be done, and so the relevance of the moral teachers of the past is surely not less than ever before. Socrates is as relevant today as Sartre. We will have to live increasingly with moral ambiguities. The often conflicting rights of the living individual and the claims of posterity, the obligation of law observance and the duty of private conscience, are themes that run through the greatest literature from *Antigone* to *Hamlet* to *Billy Budd*. It will not be an easy world in which these moral ambiguities will be pressing, if not for solution at least to be lived with understandingly, and yet they are not different from the problems which the minds of the past have wrestled with save in their urgency and pace. To adapt a phrase of Justice Holmes - "when you take off the lion's skin of jargon, you find the same old jackass of a moral problem underneath". The beckoning task of the liberal arts is to give us a look beneath the skin.

Thanksgiving Observance

6:30p.m. Monday, Nov. 27

Club Dining Room

Sponsored by the Y.W.C.A.



Campus Colloquy INC