

The DTH offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news — 942-3112. Business — 942-2138. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

### Another View Of Academic Freedom

By DOUGLAS EISELE

"Academic freedom" is a nebulous doctrine. But if it means the unbridled philosophy that college professors can at all times promote what they believe, without reprisals, then it is wrong.

Such a statement will bring forth condemnation from the liberals, who from their ivory towers often fail to face the facts of life. They live in theory, or morals applying the most perfect rules to a most imperfect world. The two must clash.

And so they do in so-called academic freedom.

The goal of any state is self-perpetuation—the furtherance of its national integrity and of its way of life. Wars have been fought throughout history to defend it; diplomats struggle daily to assure it. Whether the state sought to be perpetuated is good or bad in the eyes of the rest of mankind is unimportant.

What does matter here is that an Ivory soap percentage in a given society believes strongly in its current social and political life. It believes it so fervently that thousands of men have died fighting for it. Its faith is so strong in the system that the society's wealth has been committed around the world.

There is justification, then, that this same society should fight to protect its system at home.

In Communist states, this protection is assured by the complete control of the system—social, political, economic, educational—by the state. There is no questioning its effect. The result has been not only to foster the Communist doctrine at home but to peddle it abroad wherever a disciple could be found.

The lesson in the Communist case is not that its philosophy is good. It lies in the fact that strong control is effective in perpetuating the state. And it follows that if strong control produces results in a highly regimented society, then some control would work to perpetuate the philosophy of a free society. The question, and a serious one, is where to draw the line.

In our society, the control should be extended over public employees in those affairs which could be used by them to the detriment of the state. This includes control over the academician in some areas of political expression. It does not mean he is refused the privilege to expound the merits of a Communist economy, to condemn the CIA for its role in international politics, to curse the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

It does mean that he should conform to the broader concept of Democratic philosophy—so long as he is on the public payroll.

The justification for this conviction lies in the right of a society to determine its own course in political philosophy. It lies in a society's right to perpetuate itself. That same society should be able at will to cast from its employment those who disagree with the course selected.

This kind of feeling will bring from the liberals cries that what is proposed would make this a Communist state, not protect it from one. To the extent that some expression would be controlled, their cries would have merit.

But to equate such control with Communist regimentation is invalid. Rather, the control would work to perpetuate the society such that it could not slip silently and without notice into the Communist norm. It would, therefore, serve the best interests of the state.

It is feared that complete academic freedom in the hands of a few would be a dangerous tool by which control could be gained over the many. This is a more ghastly possibility than that some liberal thought would be offended by effective restraints. The result would be a relaxation into which the new thought—the currently unacceptable political thought—would pour. Then there would not only be restraints upon a small corner of academic freedom, but controls upon every area of human conduct.

The state should possess the privilege to perpetuate itself. It also should possess those tools necessary for the job. And if the tools are used inappropriately for the task at hand, the cries should come not from the ivory tower liberals but from that great mass of society which knows best how to promote its interest.

Given a choice, a free people will make the right decisions—even if they lag behind what others consider to be the right choice with all deliberate speed.

### "Bah! You're Not Trying To Make It Grow"



## Radical Right Obscuring Real Danger Of Our Times

By HERBERT P. HALBERG  
The Collegian  
Colorado State University

America's Radical Right is performing a grave disservice to the American people. The emphasis of the Radical Right propaganda on hate, destruction, suspicion, and distrust serves to obscure the real threat of our times. Hiding behind their slogan "better dead than red," the Radical Right ignores completely the very real problem of the international arms race.

Led by businessmen, fundamentalist clergymen, retired military officers, and professional patriots, the Radical Right is amply financed. Professor Alan F. West of Columbia University says, "A cautious estimate would show that the American business community contributed \$10 million to the Radical Right last year." Financing on a scale such as that makes the Radical Right, no matter how irrational they may sound, a formidable influence. The history of Hitler and the "big lie" is too very recent to completely dismiss the "line" of the Radical Right as rantings of deranged personalities.

Mr. W. P. Strube, director of radio and television for the Christian "Anti-Communist" Crusade, is quite candid in stating that the Radical Right "need not be encumbered by rationality. He says, 'You don't have to be objective about narcotics, morals, or communism.'" Mr. Strube is correct in an unethical sense. Communism and socialism have unsavory connotations for many Americans. Liberal legislation is equated with socialism in an effort to discredit the legislation. Political figures are accused of being communists or "soft" on communism for the purpose of smearing them. The Radical Right spokesmen exploit the American's innate hostility to left-wing ideas to the fullest extent.

Fred Schwarz, an Australian medical doctor turned evangelist, heads the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade schools. According to Fred J. Cook's article in the NATION, "These schools become exercises in revivalist emotion rather than exercises in logic. Schwarz leaves in his wake the atmosphere of the vigilante and the fanatic." With utter disregard for logic, Rear Admiral Chester Ward, USN Ret., thundered from Schwarz's pulpit, "We are at all times ready for war to keep the peace."

Without exception the message of the Radical Right is a consistent exhortation to hate communism. As far as the Rightists are concerned, communism represents the anti-Christ. Even now, they contend, we are engaged in a Holy War with Russia. The foregoing observation is illustrated by Schwarz's tirade, "Christians to arms! The enemy is at the gate

... let us smite the communist foe... coexistence is impossible... we must hurl this thing back into the pit from whence it came."

From the west coast Henry W. MacFarland, Jr., echoes precisely the same irrational message of hate. He says, "If our republic is to survive... the forces of Hell let loose upon the world in October, 1917, must be destroyed." There can be no doubt about the views of the Radical Right. For them war with Russia is the only solution to world problems. Any effort by national leaders to seek peaceful solutions to problems is derided by the Rightists as tantamount to surrender to Russia.

Commenting on the Disarmament Agency Bill, Dan Smoot says, "Our danger lies in the fact that the Kennedy Administration is moving... behind a veil of deceit and propaganda about world peace toward the American Armed Forces and American Sovereignty to a Communist-controlled United Nations."

In the same vein Smoot refers to the Council on Foreign Relations. He says, "They (the Council on Foreign Relations) want the Constitution abolished so that the Presidency, which is in their control, can move quickly to socialize the economy of America and then surrender her sovereignty to a One-World Socialist System."

Historical facts are blithely disregarded by speakers of the far Right. Robert Welch, founder of the JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY contends, "In 1940, the most important thing in the world to Stalin was to get the United States into the war. For several years his agents had been scheming and lying and convincing to bring on world war II." There is not a word about the machinations of Adolph Hitler, only the inference that our national leaders were inept, duped and outwitted by a crafty Josef Stalin.

Our leaders are guileless while the Communist leaders are cunning is a theme that courses through the fabric of the propaganda from the Right like a red thread.

Joe Crail's FREE ENTERPRISE BUREAU circulated the following alleged statement by Nikita Khrushchev, "We cannot expect Americans to jump from capitalism to communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving Americans small doses of socialism, until they suddenly wake up to find they have communism." Senator Lee Metcalf, doubting the authenticity of the statement, employed every knowledgeable government agency to trace the quotation, to no avail. The Senator concluded that the statement was spurious.

Instead of a rational consideration of the consequences of war, the Rightist buries himself beneath the slogan "better dead than red." The slogan may have a heroic ring but it conveys no information. Thus, buried beneath a

slogan the Rightist completely ignores the arms race.

Fanning the flames of hate, discrediting national leaders, and promoting suspicion and distrust of international institutions can serve only one purpose and that is to intensify world tensions. America's Radical Right is not only performing a disservice to the American people but to the entire world.

Erich Fromm in his book MAY MAN PREVAIL? adequately points out the effect produced by the Rightist's propaganda. He says, "Many still continue to believe that communism is the epitome of evil; and that we the free world... are the personification of all that is good. The result is a narcissistic and unrealistic picture of the West as the fighter for good, for freedom, and for humanity, and communism as the enemy of all that is human and decent... If projection is mixed with paranoid thinking, as is the case in the 'cold war', we have indeed, a dangerously explosive psychological mixture, which prevents sane and anticipatory thinking." It cannot be denied that the propaganda of the Right leads to stereotyped thinking which must ultimately result in war.

The inventory of destructive weapons extant in the world today is staggering. What would happen should these weapons be used almost defies comprehension. Norman Cousins paints a gruesome picture in his book IN PLACE OF FOLLY. He points out, in the event Russia launched a nuclear attack on the United States, military experts estimate that 95% of the population would be doomed. The estimate of casualties for Russia is less since their population density is less than that of the United States.

The real threat that confronts the world is the continuing arms race. Jerome Wiesner's preface to the special edition of DAEDALUS emphasizes the danger of the arms race. He says, "The consensus among the contributors to this special edition of DAEDALUS is that civilization is faced with an unprecedented crisis. If the arms race is allowed to continue, our country will have less security with each passing year. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have enough nuclear explosives to kill each other several times over. As a result, there is an ever increasing likelihood of a war so disastrous that civilization, if not man himself will be eradicated."

The slogan "better dead than red" is an eloquent testimonial to the intellectual paucity of the Radical Right. Thinking, testing, and trying in effort to solve problems is the path followed by temporizing men. The path is difficult to travel. Like a wilderness there are no guide posts. Yet, if mankind is to solve his problems rather than eliminate them along with himself, that is the path he must travel.

## Broke Or Rich, You Can Get To Europe Easily

By PETE RANGE

"Fan!" swore Bjoern, my cabin-mate, in a typical sailor's greeting to the morning.

We staggered out onto the pitching deck crossed to midships, and ducked through two hatches into the crew mess. There sleepy seamen were drinking hot coffee from the heavy, old mugs and smoking hand-rolled cigarettes.

At seven, Bos'n stuck his head in and said, "Ok — Kloeken sys; vi skal arbeider!" and we all tumbled out into the grey morning to begin work. Paint decks, splice cables, wash booms, scrape paint, make fast the cargo, and fifty other things kept us busy for eight hours.

At eight we stopped half-an-hour for breakfast. And at twelve there was an hour for lunch. We ate fast and then napped or played cards before pulling on our caps and boots again and attacking the salt and sea which slowly rusts away every ship in the water. Then thirty minutes for coffee at three. At five our work-day ended.

So it was for thirteen days between Genoa and New York when I came home this January, working as a non-paying, non-paid deck-boy on a Norwegian freighter. So it was, too, last September, when I spent ten days deckboying on a Norwegian tanker bound from Egypt to Kuwait, only then we worked almost naked in the one-hundred degree heat.

Work-a-way travel is supposed to have gone out. And it almost has. But any ambitious, determined fellow ready to live the seaman's life a while can probably work his way to Europe if he wants to badly enough.

There are two tricks: Go only to ships from Scandinavian countries; and go straight to the captain, not to the agent or anyone else. Tell the captain you are a student with insufficient funds for passenger travel and would like to work on his ship.

Probably only a few students will voyage to Europe this way this summer. For girls work-a-way is more or less impossible. And if you can afford it, passenger travel is more comfortable anyway.

Passenger fare to Europe is available on freighters, where a maximum of twelve passengers live in first-class accommodations, dine with the captain, and enjoy the more intimate if somewhat quieter society of a small company during their crossing to Europe. Fares average about \$150 one-way.

The disadvantage is that freighters travel slower and are not bound to their schedules. My first ship (a coal freighter upon which I was a passenger) left Norfolk five days behind schedule and took thirteen days reaching port in North Germany.

For the fun-seeking Dayton-type, twenty-four-hour-a-day social life, student ships are best. Usually an entire ship or, say the whole tourist class of a ship will be reserved for students at reduced rates (about \$185-220 one-way).

To get there quick, avoiding seasickness and social life as well, one flies jet. In about eight hours you whiz from New York to London, or it takes sixteen if you travel Icelandic Airlines, by way of Reykjavik.

Reduced student rates start at about \$320 round-trip. See Graham Memorial to take advantage of this possibility. The flight to London normally costs about \$270 one-way.

For student ships, information is available from the Council on Student Travel, 179 Broadway, New York 7, or see Mr. Shotts at the YMCA.

For freighter travel you may contact any one of hundreds of freight shipping agents — for instance: A. F. Klavness, 17 Battery Place, New York 4.

For work-a-way, go either New York or Norfolk and look for Scandinavian ships headed for Europe — and don't get discouraged!

## Fire At Will

"Parting Shots," the program of 'last words' by six graduating seniors scheduled for 8 o'clock tonight in Memorial Hall, promises to be one of the most novel and stimulating events of the year.

These seniors have been asked to share their final critical thoughts about the University with the entire student community, and before we lapse into traditional year-end sentiment, such objective remarks will be welcome indeed.

What we hear tonight from six of our fellow students will be motivated by their deep love and concern for the University. However critical some of it may sound, it will be heartfelt and meaningful.

## Tool Or Juggernaut?

A small and what might be called a rebel band of serious-minded educators recently threw a grenade at basic American military policy, but the noise of their explosive package seemed to attract no more attention than the backfire of a delivery truck on Pennsylvania Avenue.

The situation has the makings of a cruel joke. The New Frontier is supercharged with intellectuals whose lines of communication are supposed to hum and throb with unorthodox ideas but so far, it appears, the would-be innovators have been unable to tune in on the Kennedy Administration wave length even to get their unusual proposals seriously discussed.

This is not to say that the educators, headed by Seymour Melman, professor of industrial and management engineering at Columbia University, have discovered a foolproof recipe to end the cold war, or guarantee the avoidance of a hot one. Their attack on the military budget, contained in a study entitled "A Strategy for American Security," is loaded with unanswered questions.

But the situation, in which their study got virtually no initial attention in the press or reaction from any branch of government, despite the fact that copies of it were delivered to every member of Congress, to key offices in the executive branch, to every state governor and to the Washington press corps via an open briefing on Monday, this state of affairs raises the disturbing possibility that the government and the country may be incapable of examining U. S. strategy with detachment. (The DTH carried the story this past Saturday, based on a Charlotte Observer dispatch.)

Is the momentum of our policy in proliferation of nuclear weapons so powerful that we can't pause to see where we are going? Has the overwhelming bigness of our defense machine set us in motion on a course which we did not intend? Can we, expert and layman alike, see only what our previously formed conceptions allow us to see?

If any answer here is yes then our military policy has become a juggernaut which we do not control and we must exert every effort to get back in command of it. If the concepts of the Melman group do no more than force us to face these questions honestly, their work will have been of great value...

The group does not propose disarmament. But it argues that there is a new instrument of power in the world which we are not using — industrial productivity.

And one main reason we are not

It should be listened to and pondered with care.

The Carolina Forum (which has been responsible for a considerable amount of excitement this year) and the Senior Class are sponsoring tonight's affair, and we hope that such 'last lectures' become an annual affair.

Although no one has been able to get any information about the contents of the speeches, we have every reason to expect these parting shots to be noisy indeed. The students involved have raised their voices before during their careers here, and they will leave, we are sure, in a burst of glory.

using it is that we are stifling it with over production in defense.

The old concept that any addition to offensive capability increases military power or the deterrence of nuclear attack, is, these men insist, obsolete strategy. Why? Because of a new military condition which the Pentagon calls "overkill." They estimate that the U. S. now has about 3400 strategic weapons vehicles — bombers, missiles, Polaris submarines — capable of delivering nuclear warheads with explosive power equivalent to 22 billion tons of TNT — approximately seven tons for every man, woman and child on the face of the earth.

The Melman group calculates that "for the 140 major cities of the Soviet Union, the U. S. overkill capacity is 78 times, even allowing for a 50 percent attrition of carriers." Yet the size of our stockpile and the number of our delivery vehicles continue to increase. Where is the limit?

To the argument that we need more defensive systems to protect enough people to insure "an on-going society," in case of attack, Melman replies that the Soviets possess overkill too and "if someone can destroy you 100 times over and you knock out 99 percent of his capacity he can still kill you" with that remaining one percent of overkill.

The study advocates what it calls a maintenance - of - present-forces budget of \$34 billion or a cut of nearly \$23 billion from the \$56.7 billion the administration asked for military spending in fiscal 1964. The big cuts would be in military procurement, research and development. These experts do not believe that this "freeze" in our nuclear arsenal would encourage the Soviets to aggressive adventures but would instead influence them to take similar action — so powerful are the needs and demands of their domestic economy.

The study blames our "overkill" military strategy almost exclusively for the questionable state of our own domestic economy, for the steady drain on the dollar (in overseas military commitments) despite a favorable balance of trade, for our faltering technological growth. Indeed a New York Times Washington dispatch only today reported a dwindling of industrial research because great government demand has robbed civilian industry of scientists and technicians.

Obviously the Melman report does not begin to supply all the answers but it has posed great questions which the country should not let the government ignore.

—Edward P. Morgan,  
ABC News