

# Perspectives By Yardley

Jonathan Yardley

(This is the third in a series of nine articles which will attempt to present a reasonably objective view of the leading aspirants for the presidency in the forthcoming election. The purpose of these articles is to inform, not to sway. If the author's opinions should sneak in, the reader is asked to remember that he is only mortal.)

(Further expositions on these men may be found in Eric Sevareid's excellent collection "Candidates 1960," published by Basic Books, from which the author has gleaned some of the facts contained in the series.)

## Adlai Stevenson

Mind Over Manner

Twice the Democratic party nominated Adlai Stevenson, sometime governor of Illinois, as their candidate for the presidency of the United States; twice he lost. In 1952 General Dwight David Eisenhower, running on a Republican ticket which castigated the Democratic administration of "Korea, communism, corruption and controls," slaughtered him by more than six million votes. In 1956 Eisenhower, running with the advantages of incumbency and the nation's desire for a military leader to face the Suez crisis, grounded him into seeming political death with a majority of nine and one-half million votes. Stevenson should have been, by all accounts, through. Yet this mild-mannered, shy intellectual has inadvertently gathered around him a coterie of dedicated followers who will pursue his quest for the presidency until it is gained. The key to their devotion is the key to the man.



JONATHAN YARDLEY



ADLAI E. STEVENSON

The Stevenson family has long been ardently subscribed to public service. One of his ancestors was the founder of the Republican party in Illinois; another Adlai E. Stevenson was Vice-President of the nation during the tenure of Grover Cleveland. Born on February 5, 1900, Stevenson was sent to private school at Choate, in Wallingford, Conn., and then journeyed to Princeton. He had an undistinguished career at Harvard Law School, worked for a short period as foreign correspondent for the Bloomsburg Pantagraph, and finally received his law degree from Northwestern in 1926. After settling down with a rather non-descript Chicago law firm, he married, in 1931, Ellen Borden, a Chicago debutante described as "beautiful" and heiress to a large fortune.

His career began to acquire the scope it now reveals when he went to Washington at the outbreak of the war to become a special assistant to Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox. Travelling all over the world, he began to grasp the immense problems which war and poor economic develop-

ment had brought. When Knox died in 1944 Stevenson left the position, but returned to Washington two months later as special assistant to Secretary of State Edward Stettinius. He worked on the formulation of the United Nations and foresaw in the bleak post-war months, the troubles that organization would face.

In 1947 Stevenson first began to be preoccupied with the idea of entering the elective side of politics. He entered the 1948 race for Illinois' governorship and won by the greatest majority in the state's history. His victory was marred, however, by his wife's requesting a divorce. Though she had fully supported his candidacy and had encouraged him, she did not like the limelight that her position placed her under.

As governor of Illinois Stevenson was immensely effective. He single-handedly ripped the entrails out of a corruption-torn Republican administration and restored order, of a Stevensonian variety, to a disheveled state. He brought the ablest men available into the state government, reorganized a corrupt state police, raised Chicago mental hospitals to the top of the national rankings. He was characterized as being seemingly inefficient and indecisive but always, when the important decision had to be made, he was ready and able to make it.

In early 1952 President Harry S. Truman summoned Stevenson to Washington and offered him the nomination, on a silver platter so to speak. According to Truman's later reports, Stevenson was "flabbergasted." He declined the offer. But Stevenson is a person who believes that when a person is called he must serve. And so, although he refused Truman's offer, he never said that he would not accept a draft.

In the 1952 nominating convention Stevenson was drafted to be the Democratic for president. Running on the ticket for Vice-President was Senator John Sparkman, placed on there in an effort to attract the Southern vote, which party prognosticators felt Stevenson was incapable of doing.

The campaign Stevenson waged was a strange one. Instead of harping upon his own capacity for the job and his party's chances of victory, he discussed the hesitance at accepting the responsibility and stressed the voter's need to vote not for a party or a man but for whatever he felt represented the right. This idealistic approach to a practical matter was too much for the nation's voters and for the clear-chewing professionals who daited nervously and impatiently in the background while he instructed the audience from the stage.

But his campaign won for him the everlasting adoration of the liberal intellectual of America. Stevenson was waging a campaign not of actions, tricks, or jokes; his was a war of idea pitted against idea, of intellect against intellect. Few doubted that he won the war of words, but he was a failure as a politician.

To Stevenson there is nothing more important than fitting "the word to the idea"; a conscientious craftsman with words, he labors over his speeches and ignores the rest of his campaign. He is enough of an idealist to believe that the public is more interested in the beliefs and philosophies of the candidates than in their looks, their stage presence, or their "fatherliness." But he is wrong. The American voting public frowns upon the stigma of "intellectual" or, even worse, "egghead." And Stevenson is a man who is bitterly opposed to anything that is anti-intellectual.

In his fight for the 1952 nomination Stevenson said and did what he thought was right; he was wrong. It is not the way to win an election. He lost, miserably. In 1956 he had apparently decided that he must run and run hard for this position that so many wanted him to take. He went out on the campaign trail and was forced into all primaries by an unexpected Kefauver victory in Minnesota. Again he was given the nomination.

In 1956 much of the integrity and intellectualism disappeared from the Stevenson men; he was learning, the hard way, the game of politics, and he was finding it confusing. On television he was a shrewdly, insecure failure blinded by the lights and confused by the teleprompter. Mr. Eisenhower's favorite device. On the road he became temperamental and hard to get along with. He again tried to bandy his opponent with words, but this time the sting had gone out of them. His defeat was one of the soundest ever recorded.

Adlai E. Stevenson is a gentle, kind man who is distraught by the immense problems of the world. He is a sensitive person who takes these problems seriously and personally. He is not an impressive man, and this detracts from his abilities as a leader. Men need to feel physically as well as mentally dominated in order to subject their will to that of another man.

Yet Adlai Stevenson is a leader. He is a leader of men's minds. He is a man of intense thought who wishes to convey the depth and what he believes to be the truth of his thought to every man who will hear him out. He is also a man who is as well aware of the real problems facing America and the world as anyone alive. He has the intellectual ability to help America overcome those problems, but he does not seem to have the personal magnetism.

Stevenson is also a man who is fully, deeply cognizant of the hazards and difficulties awaiting the president of the United States. He is perhaps the only candidate in recent history to have publicly questioned, during the course of a campaign, his ability to assume that position. His supporters say that such a realization shows a deep humility about himself.

Stevenson has made no formal moves to place himself in the running for the 1960 nomination. It is certain that he will not enter of the primaries, and it is also certain that he will not do what his opponents wish he would do and make a Coolidge-like "I will not be a candidate for the presidency in 1960" statement. He believes too deeply in his responsibility to the American people to make such a statement.

Stevenson really may not want the presidency at all. He is almost sixty, and though healthy is a nervous man who would live or die with every breath of the union he would control. Yet, because of the man that he is, the Democrats, somehow, can always know that "if called, he will serve."

# On Indonesia

Hans Frankfort  
Netherlands

Although throughout this article I shall try to be as objective as possible, the reader will have a better understanding of any problem that exists between Indonesia and the Netherlands, if our students from Indonesia comment on, criticize or in any way respond to this Dutch point of view.

Indonesia was a Dutch colony before it gained its independence. The struggle for self-government started in the late Twenties when Mr. Sukarno organized demonstrations against the Colonial Government. For this he was deported to New Guinea. During the Second World War the Japanese released him, thus giving him an opportunity to organize the freedom movement. When the war ended in 1945 the independence was proclaimed; the movement which earlier was termed "communist" became a "rebellion" against the Dutch who were trying to regain their pre-war authority in this island Empire. This they were not able to accomplish, mainly because of the following reasons.

First, the propaganda campaigns conducted by the Sukarno group in the period between 1941 and 1945 have been very effective, perhaps overly effective. Whereas before WW II the Indonesians were passive politically and unaware of their rights as an Indonesian nation, the evidence after 1945 showed the contrary. Three large scale "police actions" were undertaken by the Dutch armed forces against the "rebels." Territory was gained. The price? The support of the Indonesian population.

Secondly, the Dutch government in its attempt to maintain authority in the East Indies was acting against world opinion, as it appeared. The tide had turned against colonialism, whatever form it may have. Every Nation's right to rule itself had to be recognized, whether it was ready to do so or not. The United Nations General Assembly condemned the Dutch actions in the East Indies, after which a small nation like Holland naturally was obliged to consider this as an order to leave Indonesia.

Sukarno, president of the republic, and his government decided to strengthen the authority of the Central Government in Jakarta by changing the Confederation into a Union. An answer to the dissatisfaction that exists on some islands would be an even stronger Central Government: "Guided Democracy." Of course, Indonesia is independent, and it is their business what they do inside the national boundaries. But to what extent should the principle of self-determination be applied, and what body is qualified to make decisions on this matter?

This, as I understand, is the main principle behind the Dutch position on the issue of Western New Guinea, claimed as its territory by the Indonesians. This issue has been given a national stature by the Indonesians. The propaganda value is great, and the torch of Nationalism, that keeps the country together, must be kept burning. It should be understood that, although Western New Guinea was geographically a part of the East Indies, the colonial Government had always considered this area as a separate entity in important matters concerning the East Indies. Furthermore, the people of this island are of an entirely different race (Negito), still living in the Stone Age. Considering the record the Indonesian Government has shown with regard to other members of the "Confederation," and the fact that the political as well as the economic situation are unhealthy, it is difficult to believe that the Jakarta Government will be in a position to take the responsibility of preparing the people of Western New Guinea for the day that they can choose the form of government they desire.

The issue had been brought up in the United Nations by Indonesia and a number of Afro-Asian nations, but the Dutch Government has so far succeeded in keeping it off the General Assembly's agenda. A Dutch proposal to place this disputed area under the supervision of the United Nations until the people are ready for self-determination has been rejected by Sukarno's government. If the General Assembly decides to place the New Guinea issue on its agenda, it will be a decision that ultimately might become a violation of a basic principle it stands for: Human Rights.

# Fixers



Herblock is away due to illness. Copyright, 1959, The Pulitzer Publishing Co. St. Louis Post Dispatch

# Editor's Corner

Davis B. Young

By the time this column reaches you, a great many people will have spent the better part of the past three nights diligently campaigning for the passage of the judicial referendum to be voted upon next Tuesday. Support for the four measures to be considered by the student body has been overwhelming. To indicate that nobody is against the proposal would be false reporting; yet, there has been a distinct paucity of opposition.

For one thing, the chairmen of both campus political parties are supporting the amendments. Hank Patterson of the UP and Dewey B. Sheffield of the SP have signed a joint statement saying, "We do hereby declare ourselves in support of the amendments to the Student Constitution being voted on by the electorate on January 12. It is our belief that democratic principles, that popular participation will be the salvation of our campus judiciary system. We urge the members of our parties to join us." It is gratifying to note that they have been joined by a large majority of the Student Legislature, including a significant portion of each party's representatives.

The four amendments would call for the right of a defendant to a trial by a jury of his peers. These jurors would be randomly selected. This would mean that every student in the University would be obligated to serve on a jury. The defendant would also be allowed to have an "active" defense counsel. He would be permitted the right to summons witnesses on his behalf. The final change would be that members of the various councils would be elected according to a geographical apportionment instead of campus wide. This would obviously create a greater understanding of the Honor System, since each student would be closer to the members.

The advantages of these four proposals and the continued support they have been given should be a clear indication of their merits. The student body will surely strengthen the entire system by giving a resounding affirmative vote to all of them on Tuesday.

The need for having a doctor and/or nurse on duty in Woollen Gym at all times was never more apparent than during a locker-room episode Wednesday. Seems that an undergrad had fainted cold in a small shower room. A student who was leaving the building just happened to notice the fallen figure.

The student was pale as the paper this is printed on, was having chills and—when he came to again—said he was having pains in the region of the abdomen.

Two basket attendants were summoned. They did what they could, and one went to get a doctor or nurse. He returned some minutes later and said, "There isn't a doctor or nurse in the building. This is a helluva situation." Truer words were never spoken, for it was truly that sort of situation.

It's fortunate indeed that the boy was not really in dire need of on-the-spot medical attention, for, if he had been, it would have been just too bad—for someone.

So even though Wednesday's little event did not have a tragic ending, the needs were pointed up vividly. Let's hope those who are in charge of this sort of thing will take the appropriate action before it's too late—today could be too late.

R. S.

# Third Prize In Essay Contest

Paul Wehr

Posing the question, "What is wrong with America and what can be done to correct it?" is rather like asking people why they believe in God. There are as many answers as there are respondents. Should one ask this question of 1,000 persons in fifty different nations, 1,000 different criticisms, some constructive, others not, would be voiced.

It seems that Americans, more than any other people, want to "be liked" throughout the world. It is almost an obsession with many of them. Therefore, those concerned with the international situation have, of late, sought the answer to the above question in the criticisms of those outside of American society. I believe that such a realization of how others see us is vitally important. I wonder, however, if we haven't neglected the conception Americans should and must have of themselves and their country as it fits into the international mosaic. This awakening of a true self-conception will be the determining factor if America is to halt the backsliding process she has been caught in for at least a decade.

In one sentence, America has lost not only her self-conception but with it her purpose for existing, her raison d'être. In both the domestic and international spheres America has reacted, not acted. In the world she has continually been on the defensive... against the spread of Communism, against the nationalism of the emerging nations, against the problem of human want and suffering, always against something. At home, the answer to social, economic and political problems which seem to continually multiply has been a half-hearted reaction rather than strong, purposive movement. The few attempts at this type of initiation have more often than not been smothered by lack of energy and funds.

Adlai Stevenson put it rather well last year when he observed that the American way of life seems to have lost its "mainspring". There is no longer any positive, driving force by which the values which America has espoused for nearly two centuries can be translated into action. In fact, these basic values, themselves, seem to have lost their meaning for many Americans. Equality of opportunity, democracy, honesty, efficiency all seem to fade away as slum clearance programs bog down, citizens are denied fundamental rights despite "enlightenment", half of the potential electorate stays home on election day, and business ethics hit a new low.

The standard criticism, these days, by those who bother to criticize, seems to be that Americans are just too soft. Americans have too much. They have become fat, contented, lazy and unconcerned with the house which is falling down about their ears. The world's highest level and standard of living, the emphasis on the material, the unwarranted conceit of man and nation have all tended to deceive the American and lull him into dangerous apathy.

There is quite a bit of truth in all such criticisms. Yet, I would maintain that this nation, which does seem to exist, is more of a result than a cause of the failure of America to develop some "national purpose". Frozen foods, comfortable transportation, a certain degree of conspicuous consumption and American leadership in the world could all find just and rightful places in our way of life if only some at least partially unselfish purpose were to evolve around which Americans might rally. The heterogeneity of America's population makes this suggestion difficult but not impossible. Of course, the ideal purpose would be that of Christianity but that, I'm sure would be considered too unreasonable.

It is undoubtedly much easier to attempt to answer the first part of the original question than the last, for it is usually easier to define a problem than it is to solve it. I say, again, that this development of a sense of purpose can not come from a few distant State Department directives but must come from within the people themselves. I can produce no definite formula by which this might be accomplished. Consciously or otherwise, Americans are searching for leaders who will embody this purpose. With less effort required each year to provide the comforts of life for oneself and one's family, more time in each life is made available for activities outside one's occupation. If leaders (political, intellectual and religious) were found who would assume responsibility for presenting programs of positive action directly affecting domestic and international problems, to America, for rallying support around them, this would be a beginning. Hitler used the modern methods of science and communication to direct his people toward evil ends. Could not American leaders with vision at least present such a "program of purposive action" with these tools, if not gather public support with them? Something, someone must jolt the majority of Americans out of their narrow, provincial existences and in a mass culture such as ours, it must be done in a "big" way. (to be continued)

# Happy New Year

1. The nation is at war.
2. The nation is losing the war badly.
3. The nation must exert a vastly greater effort

# The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina where it is published daily except Monday and examination periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 9, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester, \$7.00 per year.



The Daily Tar Heel is printed by the News Inc., Carrboro, N. C.

- Editor: DAVIS B. YOUNG
- Associate Editor: FRANK CROWTHER
- Editorial Asst.: M'LOU REDDEN
- Managing Editors: LARRY SMITH, JONATHAN YARDLEY
- Business Manager: WALKER BLANTON
- Sports Editor: ELLIOTT COOPER
- Feature Editor: MARY ALICE ROWLETTE
- Coed Editor: JOSIE MORRIS



BY KELLY



BY SCHULZ