

Lay On, Chancellor

Demonstrating that he is one of those who still retains the art of conversation (it has passed away, he lamented, for most of our people) Chancellor House spoke the other day eagerly and clearly for liberal arts.

The place was his office and the occasion was his press conference. The Chancellor obviously was enjoying himself, and for that matter so were the reporters. His prose was closer to poetry as he expounded educational philosophy with the grace of a genteel teacher. It would have seemed appropriate for the Chancellor to end it all with a vigorous harmonica rendition of Brahms' "Academic Festival Overture."

He paused (only for effect), aimed, and demolished the business-humanities quarrel of how much emphasis on which. (This question had prompted the Chancellor's discussion.) Such a quarrel netted nothing, he said. "Without art the sciences are dumb. The scientist has to be an artist to teach effectively." Then the counterbalancer: "The humanist must be a scientist to learn effectively."

Golden, melodious, inspiring.

But we take issue with the good Chancellor. We point out that this fullness of education is difficult to effect in our four years here. For the business major it is impossible. Of the foreign language about which the Chancellor spoke so appreciatively the business student need take but half as much as his arts & sciences contemporary. He must take at least 20 of his 40 collegiate courses in business.

Half of the business student's time here, then, is spent away from that academic side which teaches man to understand himself and others, to live peacefully, beautifully, productively with himself and with others.

How long, Mr. Chancellor, will we let part of our student body miss these advantages of liberal arts? For those who do miss them you said you had "pity." We hope you also have help.

I Dreamed

I Won A Contest . . .

The Miss College Queen of 1954 contest was a total bust.

One of the losing contestants claimed the winner was beating her chest over nothing. Another of the coed entries charged the judges conspired and that the neck-and-neck finish was only part of a pre-pageant plot.

We see national implications in the allegations. With false values besetting us and corrupting our youth it is no wonder that the maidenhood of our country should be tempted to do with cotton what Nature has forgotten.

Senator McCarthy might well hold a seeing—oops, we mean hearing.

From The Corn Cobb (UNC)

Plum Enchanted Boy

There was a boy . . . a plum enchanted boy.

He wandered over hill and dale, down to UNC. And this here boy—this here plum enchanted boy—visited the fraternities and found he wasn't financially able to join. But little did he suspect he was to become a social do-nothing. Little did this here boy,

this here plum enchanted boy realized that if he wasn't loaded that the University didn't supply much of anything for him to do—free. Oh, he knew he had no auditorium—and he knew we had no bowling alleys—not even a decent student center that was good for anything except magazines and card playing. But, you see, this here was really a plum enchanted boy.

He thought the dorms supplied a program of at least minimum activities for those who were only among the proletariat. He thought the University was interested in supplying something. He thought UNC was place where all could enjoy going to school—even if they couldn't afford to go to the Germans.

But, you see—he was really a plum enchanted boy.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday, examination and vacation periods and during the official Summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

The Washington

Go-Round

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — It is now exactly one year since Dwight Eisenhower entered the White House, a year that has been one of great education and has seen great changes. Here is a thumbnail sketch of the Ike of today:

A year ago Eisenhower's economic theories sounded like a National Association of Manufacturers pamphlet. Now he has swung back halfway to the ideas expressed at the F Street Club right after the war which so shocked Republican backers. "If men's lives were conscripted in wartime," Ike said at the F Street Club dinner, "why shouldn't profits be conscripted too?" . . . Ike is more conservative than in those immediate pre-war years, but less so than a year ago. Today he doesn't believe in a complete hands-off policy toward business. Nor does he believe that the doctrine of states' rights, so loudly proclaimed a year ago, constitutes a cure-all for everything.

No longer does the President believe he can balance the budget. Nor does he view government spending with anathema, as he did a year ago. He is willing to put his foot in government-spending water as an offset to recession worries. But he is a long way from taking the big spending plunge. . . . And some of the economists around him recall that it takes a lot of spending to halt a business slide once it starts. . . . Ike has changed his mind about creeping Socialism and the Tennessee Valley, has already set aside \$105,000,000 to start another "Creeping Socialism" project on the St. Lawrence, once the seaway project passes Congress.



PEARSON

swung back halfway to the ideas expressed at the F Street Club right after the war which so shocked Republican backers. "If men's lives were conscripted in wartime," Ike said at the F Street Club dinner, "why shouldn't profits be conscripted too?" . . . Ike is more conservative than in those immediate pre-war years, but less so than a year ago. Today he doesn't believe in a complete hands-off policy toward business. Nor does he believe that the doctrine of states' rights, so loudly proclaimed a year ago, constitutes a cure-all for everything.

'I've Been Waiting At That Other Door For 30 Years'



HERBLOCK
COPY THE WASHINGTON POST

YOU Said It

Humbog, Mr. Meaders

Editor:

I truly felt that I had cheated myself out of a minute's time when I finished reading W. E. Meaders, Jr.'s letter to The Daily Tar Heel, Sunday, January 17, 1954.

I cannot class as communist or "fuzzy-minded liberal" the writer or anyone else who feels as he apparently does about the draft. Indeed, neither communists nor liberals stand for that which Mr. Meaders upholds — they most probably think such an attitude

toward the draft to be utterly stupid.

The French Revolution established the principle of a people's army; and since the time of this revolt against tyranny, the democracies have continually used a "civilian" army in their many struggles against oppressive influences such as those now created by communist Russia.

It would be utterly stupid for me to try to refute Mr. Meaders' argument that religion opposes one's efforts to overcome sup-

pressive influences. To prove what religions say and stand for is similar to proving what infinity multiplied by zero equals—many things can be said for any side of the question without those who are arguing being able to come upon a satisfactory conclusion.

Therefore, since I feel that neither Mr. Meaders nor I would be able to resolve the question of Religion vs. War, I shall now pass my own candid, dogmatic opinion about Mr. Meaders' opinion: humbug. Dan Silvia

Editor:

I read Mr. Meaders' article in Sunday's paper and then was quite sure I had misunderstood its intended message so I repeated my perusal. . . It was still there! I hadn't mistaken his thesis.

Then I couldn't help wondering about his purpose. If he is sincere, then I must respect him, for his is a rare faith. If he is attempting to make a loud noise in an empty room then I'm sure we can classify him with the fatuous individual who screams in the crowded market place: "I am an atheist." Both of them will get a kind of attention.

Along with many other young men in this country, I spent five years of my life in Army service. Most of this time I was with combat divisions as a line officer. I met many fine young men and since war (particularly in combat if you are a member of a combat arm) is mostly a thing of a mad dash and then a long wait, we had ample opportunity for long, soul-searching talks. We all griped about the heat and the insects and the stench and we longingly looked to the time when we could go home.

I guess I was lucky. I wasn't killed even once, but for some of those fine youngsters whose lives were arrested there I'll take exception with any individual who attempts to suggest that they so painfully gave their life's blood in vain! They didn't want to die! None of us do, but they and yes, we, believed in the reasons behind why we were there. That is one thing we didn't gripe about.

Mr. Meaders, would you let the late John Dillinger and others of his ilk rampart over our society just because he believed he was doing right? Would you excuse the mad dog as he chewed up your neighbor, shake you and and say, "He's just a playful puppy and he believes in what he is doing."? I'd like to talk with you Mr. Meaders. Our completely opposite views should stimulate some interesting discourse.

I believe that most of our young men here at the University are interested in delaying their Army service until they can finish their educations. Then, I'm sure they'll accept any of their obligations as Americans; also, in event of war, Mr. Meaders, I'm sure I can agree with you that our young men should "refuse to be drafted." They shouldn't wait to be drafted and I'm sure they won't.

Might I also point out, it will be these men who make the world safe for people like you and I think that's a shame!

Rick Faw

No man is the worse for knowing the worse of himself.—H. G. Bohn

Thales was asked what was most difficult to man; he answered: "To know one's self."—Laertius.

Freedom & Loyalty: By A Noted Citizen

(This article by Archibald MacLeish, Boylston Professor at Harvard, is based upon an address given by him at the opening of the William Pyle Philips Collection of Renaissance Literature at Haverford College. It has a grave meaning for all of us.—Ed)

Two things become increasingly evident as the sickness of our American democracy approaches its inevitable crisis: one is the surpassing genius of the founders of this Republic; the other is the transience of even the greatest of political resolutions. It was the supreme achievement of the generation of the American Revolution that it solved the most difficult of all constitutional problems, the problem of the reconciliation within one society of the conflicting human desires for freedom and for community. It may well be the ultimate shame of our generation that with us that resolution fails.

A free society is, of course, a contradiction in terms. Freedom means individual freedom; above all, freedom of conscience and freedom of mind. Society means community of some sort; not only membership in the community, but loyalty to the community. Only where all men think and believe alike does the contradiction disappear; and such societies, as history has demonstrated over and over again, are not alive but dead. Elsewhere, a resolution must be found not in conformity, but in the very nature of human difference. It was there that the authors of the American Constitution found it. They rejected as unworkable and offensive the notion of an established creed or an official doctrine or a national belief to be held in common by all Americans. Conformity of belief has, from time to time in the history of the world, overrun whole populations like a plague, flinging them into fanatical religious wars upon unbelievers everywhere; but it is not by chills and fevers such as these that nations are established or that nations endure. Nations are created, nations endure, by the men who compose them—the actual men, the individual men. And it was in the individuality of the individual men, in their differences from each other, that the founders of this Republic put their trust.

Our Loyalty Is Defined

Men were to create a community in America not because they were to belong to the same race, not because they were to subscribe to the same political doctrines, not because they were to worship in the same church, but because they were to share a common experience, the experience of being free together. They were to be free to be men and so to share freedom and so to become a community and a nation. Their loyalty was to be a loyalty to the right of each of them, and so of all of them, to be free. It was the conviction of our ancestors—a conviction which they wrote into their Constitution in the form of an explicit limitation on the law-making power of the central government—that loyalty to the liberty of every man to believe what he chooses would outlast loyalty to any formulation of belief whatever. That that conviction was well grounded, the history of the American people down to our own time has conclusively demonstrated.

But though the American resolution has proved itself under varying conditions over a considerable period of time, it has never more than a balancing of conflicting human needs. A shift in either direction—toward a more passionate assertion of the demands of individual freedom, or a more jealous insistence upon the precedence of the community—was always possible and did, of course, from time to time occur. There was always, in consequence, the danger that one emotional need might so overbalance the other that the underlying structure would collapse. What has been happening in the United States over a period of the past five years or more makes it tragically evident that that danger is now both real and present. There has been a massive, almost glacial, shift away from the passion for individual freedom and toward a desire for security of association, of belonging, of conformity.

The change is not a purely American phenomenon. It has been observed elsewhere during recent years and, in some parts of the world, in the most extreme forms. In eastern Europe

and in Asia, a cancerous aggravation of the natural human desire for community and association has sent millions of human beings to march in Red Flag parades and Brown Shirt parades and Fascist triumphs—millions of human beings who have found in the community of shouting voices, the community of hatred for the outsiders, the community of persecution and murder, something their sick hearts required. We have not come to that in this Republic, but it is only too clear that the emotions which move us are emotions capable, if similarly perverted, of similar consequences. The same perplexity and hatred and fear which have formed the Communist herds and the Fascist gangs in other countries have already produced their herds and gangs in the United States; and conformity of opinion and belief, the first demands of the mob everywhere, has been secured by methods which differ only in degree from the methods of the Moscow and Berlin streets. When loyalty is put before freedom, and when loyalty is made to mean loyalty not to the right to be free, but to the demands of the majority, with economic and social destruction as the penalty for dissent, the drums of Moscow and Berlin are near enough to hear.

Of Floating Lumps Of Mentality

What has been happening in American schools and universities in the past few months is plain enough for any eye to read. The explanation of the successful intrusion of government—or of a group of politicians acting in the name of government—into an area from which the American tradition, if not the American Constitution, excludes it, is to be found in the changed attitude of the American people. We Americans have become increasingly convinced that unless we can believe in something in common, the Communists will take us over. To the Russians, we tell ourselves, communism is a faith. How, then, can we hope to confront it with nothing but the freedom of each one of us to believe what he pleases? And how, unless our educational institutions produce like-minded men and women, can we hope to become a like-minded people? And unless we become a like-minded people, how, in this iceberg age of gigantic floating lumps of national mentality, can our nation survive? We can think of no answer either in our own history or elsewhere; and the longing for conformity so overwhelms us that we look on in silence, if not in active approval, while the one freedom which underlies all others—the freedom of the mind—is attacked at the point where its protection is most essential to the Republic, and by methods of hypocrisy and intimidation which shame us all.

It is our silence as a people, far more than the mischievousness of the politicians engaged in this foray, which should give concern to those who truly love the country. There have always been cynical and ambitious politicians, ignorant of the American tradition or contemptuous of its meaning, who would gladly lead the mob against the individual for political advantage. What is new is the encouragement given men of this character by the indifference of the citizens. The eight or ten great newspapers which still maintain their integrity have protested. The leaders of the learned professions and of the American churches and of liberal and labor organizations have condemned the whole campaign of censorship and suppression. But the country is silent when it does not openly applaud. If attacks on individual liberty are conducted in the name of "loyalty," they are justified without more argument. It makes no difference that the "loyalty" asserted is not the loyalty Americans have understood in the past—loyalty to the right of each individual to think and speak as he chooses, loyalty to the ideal of freedom. It makes no difference that the "loyalty" is loyalty to the economic and social and political and military and diplomatic views of the inquisitors. "Loyalty" is in question, and "loyalty" comes before freedom in a time like this.

If "loyalty" continues to come before freedom in the American scale of values, there can be little doubt as to the ultimate outcome. The delicate balance upon which the Republic has maintained itself for almost two hundred years will be destroyed, and the United States will follow Nazi Germany and Communist Russia into that frozen world in which everything coheres and

conforms, and the life of the individual mind and soul is of no more significance than the life of a single drop of frozen water in an ice floe. No one who believes in the vitality of the American people—no one who recalls the passionate indignation with which they have defended their personal liberties in the past—can suppose that this will happen. But as time goes by and the expected revulsion of opinion against the censors and inquisitors fails to materialize, there is an anxious questioning in many hearts. What has befallen us as a people? Have we truly changed, or have we only forgotten for a time the history out of which we come? Is it our fear of communism, sedulously played upon by the perpetrators of these evils, which destroys our faith in freedom, or has our faith in freedom itself decayed?

History, if honest history is written in the world ahead, perhaps will find an answer. We ourselves can only guess at one. We would guess, I think, that fear of communism is not the entire explanation. There is a limit to the extent to which a virile and sanguine people, united in a contempt for Communist theory and Communist practice, can be terrified by cries that they are about to be converted to communism by secret operatives and darkling conspiracies. We would guess also, I suppose, that the explanation is not to be found in any conscious decline in our devotion to the ideals of freedom. Those who now attack personal freedom at its roots in the universities, and who threaten to attack it in the churches and the press, are themselves obliged to use the vocabulary of freedom to justify their activities. What would seem to us to have changed, I think, is not our belief in freedom but our faith in freedom—our faith that freedom will really work—that it can, itself, and by its own means, survive the attacks of enemies as gigantic, as closely integrated, as disciplined, as controlled as the enemy it faces now.

But to say this is to say, at the same time, something more. Faith in freedom rests necessarily upon faith in man. The American belief in man was the condition precedent to the existence of the American Republic. It was because men like John Adams and Franklin and Jefferson believed in man that they believed in the possibility that men might govern themselves: the possibility, that is to say, of freedom. A loss of faith in freedom results, by the same logic, from a loss of faith in man. And it is that, almost certainly, which has occurred in the United States. We no longer wholly trust the power of the institutions of freedom to defend themselves by the methods of freedom because we no longer wholly believe in the capacity of men to live as men in a world such as our technicians and scientists have revealed to us. Our symbol—the symbol which made us the nation we were—has shriveled.

Tools & Techniques Equal Same

If this, or something like it, is the explanation of our tragic loss of heart, then at least part of the responsibility can be allocated readily enough. The underlying failure is a failure of education. We have increasingly ignored the human things, the things of the mind and spirit, the proofs of man's dignity and worth, in the teaching of our schools and even in our universities; and we are paying the inevitable price. Generations of schoolboys taught only techniques and tools produce generations of men to whom only techniques and tools are important, men who have no comprehension of their own resources or those of their neighbors, men who know nothing of those great conceptions of human destiny, those patterns of life and death, which our kind has produced over countless generations.

In the struggle for the defense of human freedom, everything depends on the vitality of the belief in man, on the health and vigor of the human things; and there is no way to maintain the human things but to know them. A man of morality in Rome was a man who knew and respected the mores, the acknowledged human ways, the forms and orders; and is not otherwise with us. A free man is a man who knows and loves the things of which a man in freedom is capable. Only those who know what a man can be at his best, in his arts, in his conceptions, in his imagination and his realization, are capable of valuing freedom, and only those who are capable of valuing freedom are likely to defend it.