

The First Crisis: Economic Reprisal

The advocate of a cause at cross-drift with popular feeling, unless he bears the curse of a thick skin, can face threats, shouting, curses, social boycott, or laughter and remain unswayed.

But there is a weapon potent enough to crack his conviction or smother it: economic reprisal. Face the heretic with words and he is unfazed; but face him with loss of professional reputation, filch from him his good name or his job, and even conscience wavers.

Common good sense and decency — on both extremes of an issue—would generally operate as a check on economic reprisal. Those who would use it sometimes find their weapon blunt, even impracticable. But economic reprisal was not blunt, deadly or impracticable enough for the trustees of the University of South Carolina when they fired the dean of the school of education, Dr. Chester Travelstead, for his views on the segregation issue. In a state where reason falls flat and stability goes by the boards when racial questions come up, Dr. Travelstead dared say that "enforced segregation of the races in our public schools can no longer be justified on any basis—and should, therefore, be abolished as soon as practicable." For that temperate remark, he met a quick and intemperate fate: he lost his job.

Here in Chapel Hill, by contrast, we may be thankful that no professor has been fired because of his opinions since before the Civil War.

But North Carolina at large is not unblemished. The threat, if not the act, of economic reprisal reared its head in the small friends community at Guilford, earlier this fall, when the school board announced its intent to comply with the Supreme Court decision on segregation in the schools. Several members were threatened with loss of their jobs.

In Georgia, there has been talk of a "loyalty" oath for public schoolteachers. In Durant, Mississippi, a Presbyterian congregation fired its minister two weeks ago for heresy much milder than Dr. Travelstead's. He had "defended" two men "accused" (sic) of advocating racial integration.

There is certainly nothing villainous about honest feelings, as perverted or unthinking as they may seem. In this question, the matter of opinion is even irrelevant. But growing pressures will bring more and more situations into the South where, in times of rashness and short-sightedness—sometimes of maliciousness—advocates of one side of the segregation issue will use economic advantage.

The real test of the durability of so-called "American" values, we can't help feeling, will come more quickly in this area than in the area of decision as to whether schools are to be mixed. Segregated schools, though unconstitutional and unethical, can be tolerated for a while. But economic reprisal can not be tolerated for a minute.

New National Review From Buckley: Wall On Toothpicks; Familiar Smell

An Unfavorable Look At A 'Conservative' Journal

That vigorous and persistent apologist for Senator McCarthy, William F. Buckley Jr., a college editor at one time, defender of the Faith and the American college system, has christened a new weekly "Journal of opinion," National Review.

National Review, whose first issue is of unblemished white, but bordered with the blue of "truth," begins Volume I as of November 19.

"Our point of view is frankly conservative," say Buckley and his associates (John Chamberlain, James Burnham, Willmore Kendall—mostly liberals-gone-sour). In a New York Times Book Review advertisement for a few weeks back, National Review represented itself as a conservative counterpart to "such distinguished liberal journals as The New York Times." The clever use of "distinguished" will be noted: without directly applying this epithet to National Review—to judge by the opening 30-page diatribe this would be out and out fabrication—National Review kinship claims indirectly.

TORRENT
New Haven, Connecticut, where Mr. Buckley edited the Yale News, has not yet risen from the torrent of controversy he brought down a few years ago. He blistered most everyone and everything, some of which needed blistering: the shameless intrusion of "white shoeism" into the vestry of the college chapel, for instance. But such attacks were minor, almost incidental, in his larger design. He mainly promoted the idea of college education as a purchasable commodity and as serum for a short-of-breath Christian Capitalism. The professor's academic freedom, he thought, ought to correspond to the merchant's freedom; it should be governed by the purchaser's demands—a minor alteration, to be sure, since demand is a little over half of mercantilism. From the doctrine that pedagogy ought to proceed from controlled truths, that the tutor must not too rudely challenge the cherished prejudices which dear junior brings to the groves, Buckley fought his noisy crusade.

Several years have now passed, and it is imaginable that in the interim Buckley has gotten lonely for an editorial soap-box from which it might be observed—unrecognizable to some other conservatives. Robert M. Hutchins, who draws two attacks in the first issue of National Review, has continually stylized himself "an 18th Century conservative." And it will surprise many that so reputable a prophet of the New Conservatism (which Arthur Schlesinger Jr., in rare form, called "the politics of nostalgia") as Russell Kirk would let his byline appear cheek-by-jowl with Buckley's. Yet, if Buckley defended McCarthy with fervor, Kirk winked.

HYPODERMIC APPROACH
National Review, says Buckley in his opening publisher's statement, will use "the hypodermic approach to world affairs... in a country widely assumed to be a bastion of conservatism." It will nobly "stand athwart history, yelling Stop at a time when no one is inclined to do so." Bully, of course, for any conservative who makes so frank an admission of his end-objective; to yell "Stop" to history.

But what about the idea that the U. S. is a "bastion of conservatism"? A bastion of conservatism we may now be, as all nations become arthritic, varicose, insensate, grasping, with the rearward vision of Lot's wife, when treated to high prosperity. But we have had radical times. We were anything but a bastion of conservatism in 1934, just as we were a bastion of radicalism in July, 1776.

One of Russell Kirk's favorite themes is that the American Revolution was conservative. Time Magazine thinks the same. Well, they can talk from now till primordial darkness fall again about the

"basic conservatism" of the American Revolution. They will be double-thinking. A revolution deposing a king, rudely washing the balm of anointment from his forehead, a revolution by arms and bloodshed, a revolution whose preamble was written by a man who believed the tree of liberty must be watered from time to time with the blood of tyrants, is hardly "conservative." Quote Edmund Burke as you will. What did it conserve? Nothing, or little, of the economic system; little of the political system; and very little of the popular mores, after the last generation of Tories went to their graves.

'CREDEMDA'

Mr. Buckley's soi-disant conservative journal, under "Credenda," lays down sure-heartedly the plights of our time. Some will be disturbed to know, for instance:



Robert Hutchins: 'Conservative' vs. 'Conservative'

That "the profound crisis of our era is, in essence, the conflict between the Social Engineers, who seek to adjust mankind to conform with scientific utopias, and the disciples of Truth (caps theirs) who defend the organic moral order." National Review believes that Truth is "neither arrived at nor illuminated by monitoring election returns, binding though these are for other purposes, but by other means, including a study of human experience." (Strangely enough, so uncompromising an enemy of Pragmatism as Mr. Buckley seems to be appealing here to that relativistic quantity, "human experience," as a criterion of truth.)

You must know, too, that:

"The largest cultural menace in America is the conformity of the intellectual cliques which, in education as well as the arts, are out to impose upon the nation their modish fads and fallacies and have nearly succeeded in doing so."

MEDIAEVAL GOD

In his eloquent rejoinder to Walter Lippmann's *The Public Philosophy*, Archibald Mac Leish maintains that modern art, as innovation from the tradition tum-tum-orthoodoxy—in poetry, in painting, in novels—represent man's furthest advance into individuality, into pure ego. "Modish fads and fallacies," as Buckley calls the modern products of the "intellectual cliques," represent man's most distant advance beyond the Medieval god, "community, and the womb of safety-through-orthoodoxy; it is understandable why they are anathema to conservatives. Mr. Buckley would probably refuse to recognize any painter since Delacroix and any poet beyond Alfred, Lord Tennyson. The interior groupings of painters like Picasso and Dali, of novelists like Joyce

and Kafka, and poets like Pound and Rilke probably throw him into blue chills.

And, yes, if you didn't see it coming, National Review will sing the song of downtrodden American business. It will "oppose the inroads upon the market economy caused by monopolies in general, and politically oriented unionism in particular; and it will tell the violated businessman's side of the story." How just! For Injun Charlie Wilson has wandered unpled these many months. Mr. Buckley might even begin his story of violated businessmen with—dare I blaspheme?—the President's cabinet: ten solid violated businessmen.

One feature of National Review which liberals will find nice is the tolerance and fairness with which the editors interpret the liberal side. Two standing columns each number will be devoted to liberal news.

PROPAGANDA MACHINE

One is "The Liberal Line," to be written each week by Willmore Kendall, which will report on the liberal's "huge propaganda machine" (italics theirs), which is "engaged in a major, sustained assault upon the sanity, and upon the prudence and morality of the American people—its sanity, because the political reality of which they speak is a dream world that nowhere exists, its prudence and morality because their values and goals are in sharpest conflict with the goals and values appropriate to the American tradition."

The second is "On The Left," a column of rapier-pricks written by an anonymous character "CBR" (probably a mockery or copy—take your pick—of The New Republic's Washington Reporter, TRB). Devices used in "On The Left" are lies (eg: "Simpler-minded folks, like our naive liberals, conceive that the Communist aim to overthrow the U. S. Government involves primarily storming the walls of the Capitol with force and violence") and insidious identification (eg: so unimpeachable and militantly anti-Communist a journal as *The Manchester Guardian* with *The Daily Worker*; both are grouped together as spokesmen of the vague "Left"). Everywhere in National Review, by the way, epithets like "childish," "infantile," "simple-minded," "naive," etc, etc, are kept to travel with "liberal" — as Homer kept "swift-footed" for Mercury.

Life Magazine welcomes National Review and hopes, plaintively, that "the shape and nature of true conservatism may become clearer to itself and to the public." Perhaps it will; but a trip through the first National Review indicates that we have exactly what we could expect of the often-infantile Buckley: A dud, essentially, a Great Wall of China standing on toothpicks, and, unless I mistake the odor, the old musk of Republican reactionism.—Ed Yoder.

Political Speech Of The Month

Doris Fleeson

WASHINGTON — The political speech of the month was not delivered at the big Democratic doings in Chicago last weekend nor in any other widely advertised forum, but in the town of Whitney, Tex., population 1,379.

In it, Senator majority leader Lyndon Johnson announced a 13-point program for the next Congress. The working politicians have looked it over and believe that with possibly one exception it is well within his power to pass it substantially as written.

There is something for everybody in Johnson's program. This is its strength in Congress whose members know that while it is theoretically desirable to put first things first, what you can actually get in a country the size of the United States is some kind of balance between opposing pressures.

The controversial exception in the Johnson program is another bill to exempt natural gas producers from Federal regulation. Texas Johnson piously describes it as a bill "to preserve free enterprise and of course provide legitimate protection of consumers."

The natural gas issue cuts across both parties and basically represents a quarrel between producing and consuming states. It still carries enough political explosive so that all during the last session, the Democratic Congress and Republican White House tried to avoid taking responsibility for it.

★ ★

Johnson believes that if the Texas leadership of House and Senate steers the bill to passage, and President Eisenhower signs it, as he has indicated to natural gas and oil interests he will, its political charge will be neutralized.

Democratic liberals will fight it on principle, however, and hope to get enough city Republican support to prevail. They also argue that it negates the party cry of "giveaway of natural resources" against the Republican Administration.

Here's the rest of the Johnson program: tax cuts for low income groups; more subsidies for farmers; more Social Security, more and better schools; higher Federal spending for roads; Federal aid to chronically depressed areas; more housing; bigger health programs and grants; liberalized immigration laws; more water-resources projects; Federal disaster insurance; a Constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax.

★ ★

It even has a slogan which Johnson said he got from his father: Take care of the people and they will take care of you.

Johnson did not mention foreign affairs, a field in which all the Democratic Presidential aspirants are strongly attacking the Administration. His own instinct will be to move cautiously there.

In this connection the Republican choice of Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., Ambassador to the United Nations, to deliver the principal speech at their national committee meeting in Chicago Nov. 30 is interesting.

Lodge, a former Senator, is a practical and astute politician who, unlike Secretary of State Dulles, has avoided controversy with the Democratic Congress. He plans to point with pride to the achievements of the Eisenhower Administration, but he will ignore the recent outcries of Stevenson, Harriman and Kefauver.

His view is that shin-kicking makes headlines but is not good business for a Republican President who must shape his foreign policy with the advice and consent of a Democratic Congress.

The choice of Lodge has this further significance. It dramatizes the Eisenhower hold on the Republican party machinery as it prepares for its next convention. Lodge is a prime favorite of the President and ran his pre-convention campaign in 1952.

Reader's Retort

Editors:

I note with dismay that the solution to the parking problem is about to be bungled in much the same way Saturday classes were. Student apathy and lack of responsibility will cause the Trustees to step in heavily handed and leave the situation irreparably worse. I have been at Chapel Hill for a number of years both with and without a car and have been a dorm advisor for two years. I believe I have a fair and practical solution to the problem. I will admit, however, I see little likelihood of its being accepted.

I would first like to say that I disapprove of any curtailment of student cars if any other solution can be found. Chapel Hill does not afford adequate social outlets for a majority of the students. A decrease in the number of cars at Chapel Hill will not only make dating almost impossible for many students, but will have an adverse effect on morale at the Woman's College, fifty miles away.

If however, some limit must be put on the number of cars at the University, a sensible means of allocation should be found. Taking cars away from freshmen, and/or sophomores is the most unfair, arbitrary method available. Precisely because there are so few first and second year girls at school these are the boys who must rely most heavily on cars in order to date at all. The privilege of having a car should be based on merit, not seniority.

The first thing to be done is to determine the maximum number of vehicles that can be accommodated by present facilities. Then, all students desiring to do so should fill out some sort of application. I think an excellent basis for allotting the available tags would be one of scholastic standing. Thus, students with the best average would have the first choice and so on down the line. I believe this method would be fairest to both the students and the University. People doing well in their class work are in less danger of being distracted from their studies than some of their less diligent friends. Secondly, the added incentive to do well in class might even raise our academic standards. And finally, the "gentleman's C" might look somewhat less dignified on a bicycle than in a shiny new convertible.

In order for such a plan to succeed it would have to be applied impartially, i. e., no special exceptions for campus wheels, athletes, or unmarried people living near the campus but not on it. There are undoubtedly some on the campus for whom lack of a car might cause some unusual hardship, but these are few. An occasional exception might be made where real need exists. Under this plan also, first semester freshmen would not be eligible. This might serve to their advantage as many fail to survive the one semester. After the first semester they could compete on an equal footing with seniors. Such a system would also mean that people originally given permission to have a car might subsequently lose it. This should prevent most from getting too carried away with extra-campus activities.

Many universities forbid the operation of cars by undergraduates. I think such blanket restriction would be especially unwise at Chapel Hill. On the other hand, there are many here who abuse what should be regarded as a privilege. Any realistic system, but someone had better come up with something to this problem is bound to displease some thing—soon.

Lee E. Paul

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 and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editors — LOUIS KRAAR, ED YODER
Managing Editor — FRED POWLEDGE
News Editor — JACKIE GOODMAN
Business Manager — BILL BOB PEEL
Associate Editor — J. A. C. DUNN
Sports Editor — WAYNE BISHOP
Advertising Manager — Dick Sirkin
Assistant Business Manager — Carolyn Nelson
Coed Editor — Peg Humphrey
Circulation Manager — Jim Kiley
Subscription Manager — Jim Chamblee
Staff Artist — Charlie Daniel

EDITORIAL STAFF—Bill O'Sullivan, Charles Dunn, Bill Raesdale.

NEWS STAFF — Neil Bass, Charles Dunn, James Nichols, Mike Vester, Mary Ackerman, Curtis Gans, Ethan Tolman, Joan McLean, Bill Corpening, Clarke Jones, Nancy Rothschild, Charlie Sloan, Jerry Cuthrell, Peg Humphrey, Betty Bauman.

OFFICE TELEPHONES—News, editorial, subscription: 9-3361. News, business: 9-3371. Night phone: 8-444 or 8-445.

BUSINESS STAFF — Fred Katzin, Stan Bershaw, Rosa Moore, Charlotte Lilly, Ted Wainer, Daryl Chasen, Johnny Witaker.

Night Editor For This Issue — Curtis Gans

'Oh, Stop Looking So Darn Smug'



HERBLOCK
©1952 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.