The College News

VOL. XLIX—NO. 5 | ARDMORE and BRYN MAWR, PA., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1952 | Copyright, Trustees of Bryn Mawr College, 1952 | PRICE 20 CENTS

English Writer Probes Causes Beneath Revolt

Continental Differences Fatal to Charles' Sovereignity

Miss C. V. Wedgwood opened her lecture tour in the United States on October 22 in the Deanery at 8:30 p. m. Her topic was "British Society on the Eve of the Inter-Regnum Civil War." Although Miss Wedgwood believes that the internal causes of the English Civil War, traditionally listed, are the most important, she brought out certain aspects of the European situation which effected Charles I's unpopularity, thereby contributing to the growing discontent of the people.

Charles, lacking funds, was forced to tolerate the **Long Parliament.** This body had its own way for eighteen months, when "the King at last dug his heels in" over control of the army militia bill. In 1641 rebellion broke out in Ireland. Parliament wanted control over the army because they did not trust Charles to fight for the Puritan interests, since various incidents had indicated his possible alignment with the Catholic powers. So the spring of 1642 found Parliament and the King trying to raise separate armies.

At the same time the Continental Religious Wars were lingering on between the Catholic Hapsburgs of Spain and Austria and the Protestants. France, Miss Wedgwood continued, though Catholic internally, often allied herself with the Protestant States against Spain. When Charles announced a French-English Alliance, the English people saw only that he was uniting with a country which persecuted the Protestants, not the fact that the two countries were allies fighting a common enemy.

Continued on Page 2, Col. 3

Faculty Members Assert Varied Political Opinions Most of Professors Polled Favor Adlai Stevenson

Mr. Bachrach:

Mr. Schneider:

"Fear, greed, and hatred of reason have all but engulfed American life in the past few years. The fear of the subversion of our government by a handful of communists and the evidence of widespread corruption are symptoms of this socio-political decay. To reverse this trend it is necessary to elect a man who still has the courage to fight FOR freedom rather than being goaded into acceptance of McCarthyism. What is needed is a positive program of economic and social reform which will capture the imagination of the people. It is clear that Stevenson has the will and ability to rally behind him the democratic forces of the nation toward a realization of such a program."

Mr. Broughton:

I was undecided but I am now going to vote for Stevenson. Of the two main problems on each side, corruption in Washington and McCarthyism, the Democratic candidate seems more able to clear up his side.

Mr. Carpenter:

"I find it amusing (but baffling) to contemplate the Bryn Mawr faculty perched high in their shaky economic tree, busily sawing off the limbs on which they are seated."

Miss Clayton:

Both are fine men, but Ike can certainly do a better job of cleaning up Washington than any other candidate.

Mr. Dudden:

"I am not yet convinced that Eisenhower has done what he had to do in order to lead a five-times defeated minority party back to power. As matters now stand, I venture that Stevenson will be elected President by a comfortable electoral majority, but I think his popular margin may well be extremely slim or even non-existent."

Mr. Goodale:

I am for Eisenhower. Some really strong leadership is needed to get the world out of the mess it is in today. Even a little military leadership wouldn't be a bad idea. Did you know that everyone up at Princeton is for Ike?

Mr. Herben:

Since my two choices, Groucho Marx and William McKinley, were not nominated, it is hard to say whom to vote for. I don't like what that little man from Missouri is doing running around the country making a fool of himself . . . If you want some more Harry Truman, that's the guy to vote for (Stevenson).

Mr. Hubbard:

"A plague on both your houses!"

Miss Lang:

"Stevenson . . . a man of tremendous integrity."

Mr. Lattimore:

"Stevenson, through a combination of wisdom with personal and intellectual honesty, is to my mind the best presidential candidate who has come up for election in my time. He is shrewder than Wilkie and more forthright than FDR. I like Ike personally, but not as a presidential candidate. I don't want Nixon."

Miss Leighton:

"Stevenson's election is important, it seems to me, because his understanding of the complex forces leading to political action is superior to Eisenhower's. In times like the present when decisions of magnitude are inevitable, the President must be in command of these forces. What makes Stevenson remarkable is that he combines this talent with vision."

Mrs. Manning:

I am going to vote for Eisenhower because I do think that it is "time for a change" and because the record of the Truman administration makes a change imperative.

Mr. MacGregor:

As an alien, I can not vote, but I am taking note of this election with great interest. The election is much more colorful than a similarly important one would be in Britain. I gather that both Ike and Stevenson are excellent exponents of their parties.

Mr. Nahm:

An election should not be run on an ethical basis, but on a poli-

Continued on Page 2, Col. 5

Election Eve Rally Features Faculty's Soapbox Eloquence

The results of the presidential election on the Bryn Mawr Campus, held Monday, November 3, will be counted that night at a mass rally in the gym. While four faculty members speak about their election choices, the Undergraduate Council will count votes and post the returns after every fifty ballots are tallied.

Mrs. Helen Taft Manning, Miss Janet Yeager, Mr. Donald Brown, and one other professor will speak on the subject, "How I am voting and why." Two favor Stevenson, and the other two are voting for Eisenhower. Following the speeches and adding to the excitement of the occasion will be a song fest.

Throughout the day, Monday, everyone in the college will have an opportunity to register his preference of candidate. Undergraduates and graduate students, the faculty, administration, maintenance staff, and maids and porters will be included, totaling almost a thousand votes.

The Editorial Board takes pleasure in announcing the addition of six new members to the staff of the College News:

Lynn Badler, '56
Jackie Braun, '54
Ellie Fry, '54
Joan Havens, '56
Sue Habashy, '54
Jan Warren, '55

Miller Explains Democracy and Role of Genius

Emerson's Study Poses Still Existent Problem

"Emerson was a genius, this was his burden," stated Mr. Perry Miller in his lecture on "Transcendental Genius and American Democracy." Mr. Miller, Professor of American Literature at Harvard and noted scholar of American Puritanism, gave the Ann Elizabeth Sheble Memorial Lecture in Goodhart auditorium on October 27 at 8:30 p. m.

"Emerson was a product of his culture; he was a child of Boston" and of Harvard. For reasons deep in New England society, after 1812 the concept of Democracy became almost stagnant. A few men, however, found "new flavor" through transcendentalism, and Emerson was one of these men.

Bored with Democracy, Emerson fled back to Nature; his Bostonian heritage was corrupted by his genius. He wished the path of trancendentalism had never opened itself to him, but "new ideas pressed upon him, and another part of his nature was forced to respond." That is why he was a genius, and why his genius was his burden.

The genius Emerson, then, entered into literature as the "castigator of Boston." He castigated not the masses, but the complacent, indolent scholar which the society that he knew had produced. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the best literature evidenced a "revolt against convention." Most Harvard men preferred the sobriety of colonial New England, but the few who accepted his "challenge of revolution" over night became lesser geniuses.

This problem of genius constant-

Continued on Page 2, Col. 4

Sophias and Pallas Fill Cloisters In Annual Lantern Night Service

by Margaret McCabe, '54

My house guest was a little puzzled. She stumbled down two more steps only to be faced by a high beam flashlight behind which a voice said, "Watch your step on the window sill, please." Across her face marched various and sundry expressions; a bewildered squint in the dark and frank curiosity. She had heard of Lantern Night.

As the first red lanterns rose in the air to announce the coming of the sophomores, she went up on her toes and craned her neck to follow the syncronized swing of the lanterns. Before she could quite swallow the fact that the words she had been hearing were Greek, the solemnity was broken by a stampede on a small scale.

The large black spot across the cloisters had dispersed into minute fragments, shifted its position, and solidified in the opposite corner. There was no time now to explain the situation. The freshmen were leaving the cloisters and, at that point, my guest was in an extremely precarious position, hanging half way over the wall of the Library roof counting the lines of the retreating freshmen.

When the strains of the music became blurred, a faint melody was obvious in the immediate vicinity; she was humming a tune which was a cross between Sophias and Pallas. It was distinctly out of tune, but, rather than verbally admit she was impressed, she gaily struggled through two more phrases. Her expression had become one of satisfied interest, but she would allow no smile to betray her. But betray herself she did. Outside the Library she drew on her gloves and said, "You must enjoy remembering this". That was sufficient. She understood.

CALENDAR

Thursday, October 30

4:30 p. m. International Club tea in the Common Room.

Friday, October 31

8:00 p. m. Freshman Hall plays in the Mrs. Otis Skinner workshop. Pem East, Non-Res, Rock, Radnor.

Saturday, November 1

8:00 p. m. Freshman Hall plays in the Mrs. Otis Skinner workshop. Rhoads, Denbigh, Merion, Pem West.

Sunday, November 2

7:30 p. m. Mr. Geddes D. Mac Gregor, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Religion, will give the address at the evening chapel service.

Monday, November 3

7:30 p. m. Alliance election rally in the gym.

Tuesday, November 4

Election day.

Wednesday, November 5

7:15 p. m. Marriage lecture in the Common Room.

9:00 p. m. Legislature meeting in the Rumpus Room.

Thespians of '56 to Tread Boards Repetoire from Thurber to Pooh

The Mrs. Otis Skinner Workshop will be host once again this Friday and Saturday nights at 8:00 p. m. when the '56 Freshmen present their one-act plays—the products of their first combined efforts.

Denbigh freshmen, directed by Doris Kaiser, are giving **Rosalind** by J. M. Barrie on Saturday night. This is a whimsical story with just a touch of the fey about the life of a famous actress. **The Long Christmas Dinner** will be Merion's presentation, also on Saturday night. Directed by Jane Keator, it paints a searching portrait of a family over a period of years.

Star Struck is the hilarious representation of life in the home of a famous movie star — complete with lion acts and starlet suicides. Pembroke East is giving it Friday night under the direction of Marianne Clark.

Pembroke West's offering on Saturday night has an interesting story behind its authorship, as it is an adaptation by Helen Goldberg, a Bryn Mawr graduate, of a story by Katherine Mansfield. Titled **The Daughters of the Late Colonel**, it is being directed by Lynn Dallett.

Another adaptation, this time taken from James Thurber, is **A Ghost in the House** by Richard S. McKinley. This mysterious presentation on Friday night is Radnor's, directed by Connie Alderson. Suspense and revenge in India is the story of **Command Performance** which will be presented Saturday by Rhoads. Amy Heinel is director.

A third adaptation is Rock's **Winnie the Pooh**, taken from two chapters of the A. A. Milne story by Sallyann Burgess of the Class of '56. Nonnie Powers is directing the show to be given on Friday night. Also on Friday night is the Non-res comic production **Juliet and Romeo**, directed by Kit Masella.

THE COLLEGE NEWS

FOUNDED IN 1914

Published weekly during the College Year (except during Thanksgiving, Christmas and Easter holidays, and during examination weeks) in the interest of Bryn Mawr College at the Ardmore Printing Company, Ardmore, Pa., and Bryn Mawr College.

The College News is fully protected by copyright. Nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part without permission of the Editor-in-Chief.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Sheila Atkinson, '53, Editor-in-Chief

Claire Robinson, '54, **Copy** Frances Shirley, '53, **Makeup**

Margaret McCabe, '54, **Managing Editor**

Barbara Drysdale, '55 Elizabeth Davis, '54

Judy Thompson, '54 Mary Alice Drinkle, '53

EDITORIAL STAFF

Mary Jane Chubbuck, '55 Sue Habashy, '54

A.A. reporter Marcia Joseph, '55

Joyce Annan, '53 Anne Mazick, '55

Ellen Bell, '53 Pat Preston, '55

Ann McGregor, '54 Caroline Warram, 55

Kay Sherman, '54 Jan Warren, '55

Barbara Fischer, '55 Lynn Badler, '56

Ellie Fry, '54 Joan Havens, '56

Jackie Braun, '54, **Science Reporter**

STAFF PHOTOGRAPHER

Judy Leopold, '53

BUSINESS MANAGER

M. G. Warren, '54

Julia Heimowitz, '55, Associate Business Manager

BUSINESS STAFF

Vicky Kraver, '54 Claire Weigand, '55

SUBSCRIPTION MANAGER

Elizabeth Simpson, '54

SUBSCRIPTION BOARD

Barbara Olsen, '54 Adrienne Treene, '54

Saren Merritt, '55 Mary Jones, '54

Diane Druding, '55 Diana Fackenthal, '55

Mimi Sapir, '54 Dorothy Fox, '55

Sally Milner, '54 Gail Gilbert, '55

Cathy Rodgers, '55

Subscription, $3.50 Mailing price, $4.00

Subscriptions may begin at any time

Entered as second class matter at the Ardmore, Pa., Post Office Under the Act of March 3, 1879

Self-Gov

The Self-Government Association wishes to clarify its position on the drinking rule for the sake of those who have been wondering about borderline cases. The rule stands that "cases of intoxication will be severely dealt with".

If the behavior of a girl is such as to unnecessarily draw attention to herself, or is unnaturally loud, or in any other way obnoxious to anyone, then she will probably be considered intoxicated and as such bring disgrace on the college.

Too Many Cuts

One of the greatest privileges given to members of all four classes at Bryn Mawr is our present system of unlimited cuts. This system was established by students here several years ago. Since over a period of the last ten years the amount of cutting has increased, the administration feels that the privilege is being abused, for it considers it the duty, not the free choice of every student to attend every class.

On the basis of this administration policy, all courses at Bryn Mawr are planned to necessitate both their class hours as well as their outside study hours, all arranged in the minimum five-day class schedule. Thus, it is not possible to obtain a complete working knowledge of any subject without regular preparation and class attendance.

We have the opportunity, under our present cut system, to arrange our time freely and, when the necessity arises, to take class time off to attend other events. If we continue to abuse this system, however, the administration may see fit to change it. Because of this, we must plan our activities around a regular attendance to classes to retain our privilege.

Elizabeth Cadbury Jones

Bryn Mawr notes with regret the death of Elizabeth Cadbury Jones, member of the class of 1896, and wife of the famous Quaker leader, Rufus M. Jones.

Mr. Rufus Jones, who is considered one of the most distinguished members of the Society of Friends, was elected to the Board of Trustees of Bryn Mawr in 1898. He remained a member of the Board for fifty years and was president for twenty. Mr. Jones was a close associate of M. Carey Thomas, and his intimate connection with the college is part of our heritage.

His wife was a great inspiration to him and a much respected leader in her own right. She embodied the best in the Quaker movement which is the inspiration that founded and has guided the development of Bryn Mawr.

Letter

Seniors Away Recently Feel Foundations Shattered

To the NEWS:

We, the four pillars of the French House have almost been removed from our foundation. We have been unearthed by the lack of confidence shown us. It seems that an absence of nine months from this college has made us pregnant with ignorance. We have to come back to a freshman status and must take an examination on Wed. Nov. 19 on self-goverment rules. As anyone may guess we could not have stayed two years at Bryn Mawr without having taken this exam, passed it, and abided by its rules. Furthermore, it appears to us, that there is no provision in the Constitution of Bryn Mawr for obliging seniors who have been abroad their Junior Year to take the exam again. Unless an amendment is made to the Constitution we will refuse to take this exam. We demand judicial review.

Legally yours,

Beatrice Camille Freeman, '53
Maxine Anne Skwersky, '53
Millie Filiniora Thompson, '53
Nora Anna Valabregue, '53

Wedgwood Indicts Irish For Monarch's Downfall

Continued from Page 1

Charles' sister, the Queen of Bohemia, because of her beauty and wisdom, had become a Protestant heroine, so when Charles would not send armies to aid her husband, Frederick, elector of Palatine, he became even less popular with the Protestants of England.

During the ten years Charles reigned without Parliament, his chief anxiety was the shortage of money which caused his policy of neutrality on the Continent, and which was again very unpopular with the Puritans.

As was previously mentioned, the position of France was extremely equivocal because of the differences between its political and religious policy. Also, Charles was married to Henrietta Maria, sister to the King of France, who, though charming in the court, was unpopular with the English people because she was too ostentatiously Catholic. There were many fashionable conversions among the nobility, and the penal laws against the Catholics were lifted. For the first time in years, the priests wandered about the streets in comparative freedom.

The biggest objection to Charles was the Ship Money tax he imposed to better the Navy. Although the people under ordinary circumstances would have been glad to see the Navy improved, again they feared Charles would use England's strength on the wrong side. The Spanish had been chased into English waters by the Dutch, and Charles had more or less promised to aid them. But instead of participating in the battle between the Spanish and Dutch, lazy Charles, Miss Wedgwood remarked, preserved his precious fleet and "went down to Windsor and started hunting." The Dutch destroyed the Spanish fleet. If he had aided the Spanish, it probably would have produced revolution, and even as it was it made a poor impression on the English people.

The Irish Revolt in 1641 was an important cause of Charles' downfall. The beheading of Stratford precipitated the revolt. Though severe, Stratford had the trust of the Irish people. At his death unrest spread throughout Ireland and in 1641 there was news that the Irish were rising. Because the Irish carried the King's banner and did not revolt against the crown, although they did drive against the rest of England, Parliament distrusted Charles even more.

Miss Wedgwood concluded that the incidents she wished to em-

Continued on Page 5, Col. 5

Genius Does Not Always Support Law of Society

Continued from Page 1

ly worried Emerson: how could the genius, who must live by the law of genius to produce his best, be reconciled to American Democracy? "To genius is everything permitted, and not only that but it enters into other men's labors," he stated in his journal. But does everything have to be permitted? And, what is everything? In other words, genius is a challenge to social serenity.

Napoleon and Goethe, two realistic geniuses who represented to Emerson the reaction of Nature against convention, did not comply with the mores of society. Goethe was immoral; Napoleon "the very bully of the common." Yet, these two men, according to Emerson's criteria, in some ways incarnated the highest nature, and, therefore the genius should emulate them. It was impossible for Emerson to separate the genius of the artist Goethe from that of the politician Napoleon. Genius could not emulate one and not the other.

But besides believing in genius, Emerson had faith in Democracy, which to him was "the spirit of love for the general good." His Bostonian snobbery would not allow him to respect Jackson and his "democratic" followers, however. He thought that the more sophisticated means which the Whigs used were preferable to those of the "democrats," but that the ends which Jackson strove for were superior to the aims of the Whigs.

Although the outlook seemed black to Emerson when he surveyed the vulgarity evidenced in the practice of Jacksonian democracy, he said, "I do not for these effects despair of our republic." Emerson saw Democracy not as "an especial prerogative of this country, but of all times." Therefore, a gentleman could not repudiate it and remain a gentleman.

So, the enigmatic element in man presented the problem of reconciling genius with morality, of reconciling the political genius with democracy. Unless Napoleon were a devil, and therefore unable to be controlled, Napoleons must be domesticated in America so that young geniuses could develop their potentialities.

In his later life, Mr. Miller concluded, Emerson decided that no Napoleon was ruled by a devil. Such men only accentuated a part of ourselves, for all men are one. Therefore, they could be domesticated by society, and, by the same token, genius was fragmentary, i. e. deficient.

The eternal law of man and the world which beat Napoleon, although that law entails desolation, will always win. Here, Emerson rather complacently assumed that Democracy will always prevail, for "conversions do not make people completely over", and the role that the genius should play which Emerson had spent his life defining could never quite conquer his heritage and his ultimate faith in Democracy.

The problem which confronted Emerson, that of the conflict between genius and Democracy, was a part of a greater problem, "the ordeal of what it is to be, or what it is to try to be, an American."

Current Events

Agriculture Vote Plays Important Role In Election

"The role of agriculture in the campaign" was Miss Mildred Northrup's topic at the Current Events lecture held Monday, October 27, in the Common Room. The agricultural states may hold the balance of power in the current election. The farm bloc is a powerful one—its vote will be even more decisive because it is difficult to predict just how it will vote.

A main issue is the fact that the Republicans seem to have nothing better to offer than virtually the same program with which the Democrats have been successful for the past twenty years. Where Stevenson has stood on the Democratic record with regard to farm aid and legislation, Eisenhower has no such bulwark. Eisenhower is hindered by the public memory of the agriculturally unprofitable twenties, when the Republicans were in power. Since the Republicans must accept Democratic policy, they are being forced to run in other issues, citing current high taxes and inflation as unbeneficial to the farmer.

It is difficult to tell just what the farm vote is thinking. Agriculture doesn't respond in the typical pattern to supply and demand. Usually price and supply rise and fall together, but if agricultural prices fall, the farmer is forced to produce more to keep up his profit. Due to this increased supply, prices keep on falling.

Miss Northrup stated that from the twenties and thirties the political meat of the current campaign is being made. She summarized the role of the farmer from his prosperous World War I years, through the Depression, during which he suffered greatly, and the pre-World War II years when the "support for agriculture" cry grew stronger, to the present.

The fact that in 1948 the parity price formula was given up and a sliding scale formula, which is not to the advantage of the farmer, was adopted, has caused much bickering. Other issues concerning the farmers are those of Soil Conservation, the Rural Electrification Program, Home Ownership Program, and others. Agriculture's response to these issues is a basic problem today.

Majority of Professors Rally for A. Stevenson

Continued from Page 1

tical basis. Change for its own sake is not an asset. I guess I am just a good Democrat, although I thought that I was an Independent.

Miss Northrup:

"I am going to vote for Stevenson because of his record as a man and as an administrator, because his campaign has shown him to be a person with an honest mind and because on most of the issues discussed I am in basic sympathy with the position taken by him."

Miss Robbins:

I would not place any bets on who is to win, although I am a Democrat and I certainly hope it is Stevenson. I'm very encouraged by the fact that a new person of such ability, someone who has not been a general or been in the limelight before, has come to light in national politics.

Mr. Sprague:

I am still on the fence, but tending toward Stevenson. The campaign speeches of the candidates have changed me from a definite Republican vote.

Miss Stapleton:

Stevenson is better qualified for President in regard to civil gov-

Continued on Page 5, Col. 3

Youth For Eisenhower

C. Sonne Assails Economic Policy

especially contributed by Carol Sonne, '53

Economic policy is a large term that has been flung around rather loosely lately. But obviously in these years of increased government control it is a factor which will affect every one of us. Very few people can honestly say they are satisfied with economic conditions as they stand now. Will the Republican party be able to change any of that? I firmly believe they can.

The most pertinent economic threat to our country today is an internal one, the threat of inflation. It is wiping out the middle class business men, impoverishing the fixed income group, and slowly strangling everyone except the government itself, and, ironically enough, big business. Why? Spending is fine—say the Democrats. More money is pumped into the system, prices go up, but then so do wages, so everything is fine. More goods are being produced, because more people can afford to buy them.

Cash for Production

The government is better off, for it has printed and spent these extra dollars, the country is better off because it has more cash for new production, and the people are better off because their wages increase correspondingly while increased productivity has given them better goods to buy.

Moreover, say the Democrats, this increased government spending gives a certain stability to the economy. Government bonds in every bank insure security for all.

Beautiful on paper, beautiful in theory, beautiful to the "intellectuals"—but let's get our feet on the ground, even if we are in an ivory tower.

With government spending, prices most certainly do rise because there are more dollars to pay for the same amount of goods. But, as every American knows, wages do not increase correspondingly. There is on the average a two-year lapse before they are raised at all,and even then it never covers the rise in the cost of living. I am sure the Bryn Mawr faculty would be the first to agree with me there! So the wage earner is hit—hard.

Who Benefits?

Who then benefits? The government, because it spends the money before prices start rising and is ahead of the spiral. There is also another group which benefits—and this is where the Republicans really have the last laugh. Who? Big business, because they can pay off their debts more and more easily as the value of money decreases, i.e. as the dollar that they owe is worth less, while at the same time nothing keeps them from shooting their prices sky high—for the government buys much of their produce, and they seemingly can afford anything.

All right, what can be done about it? Obviously, cut spending. Hear the Democrats laugh and say, "Impossible," but the Republicans have a more positive approach to the whole thing.

Two major ways in which the Republican party can cut down spending are:

1) Cut thirty per cent of the government officials; this would not only shrink the pay roll and the swivel-chair obligations of the

Continued on Page 6, Col. 2

Ike Explains Policy On Farm Program

especially contributed by Sally Moore, '56

Eisenhower's views on farm policy were most clearly expressed in his speech at the national plowing contest at Kasson, Minnesota, on September 8, when he stated that he favored full parity and federal aid on a basis that would leave the farmer his own boss. He pledged that the Republican Party would go forward with positive, aggressive, farmer-run programs.

General Eisenhower said the Republican Party stands behind the price laws now on the books which were the result of unpartisan effort. He added that in making future farm laws, he would call upon the farmers for knowledge. He stated that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of national income, and that the farmers would rather earn their share than have it as a government handout.

The General criticized the administration for its "bungling, fumbling" handling of agriculture's problem. He charged them with trying to get federal control of agriculture, and denounced the Brannan Plan as a slave act which aims to control the farmer and socialize agriculture. He favored conservatism, but claimed that with too many federal programs, the administration was defeating its purpose. He wants more extensive conservation programs carried out by state governments.

State Control

Governor Stevenson lost a great deal of necessary support in Louisiana and Texas when he came out in favor of federal control of the Tidelands. Eisenhower gained this support when he came out for state control, and gave his reasons. The federal government, he said, was overreaching its powers and becoming dangerously centralized. The federal government has no right to seize the profits from these off-shore oil lands which rightly belong to the states, and which the states need.

The state governments need and have been using the money from the Tidelands to promote civil projects in their state, and particularly in the field of public education. The University of Texas, subsidized from the Tidelands, has always been a wealthy college, well known for its high standards. If the federal government takes away their source of revenue, their standards will fall hopelessly.

Eisenhower believes firmly in states' rights. He not only wants state ownership of the Tidelands, but also state and local operated programs for conservation and development. He contends that the federal government, if they operate many large scale programs in different areas, cannot possibly have the interest in each program that the people directly concerned will have. It is a well known fact that mass production lowers the standard of the individual product. And why should every state in the union pay for all the other states' projects?

Governor Shivers of Texas and Governor Kennon of Louisiana have supported Eisenhower on the Tidelands issue, for they know how necessary those Tidelands are to the states. Governor Shivers has encouraged the pro-Eisenhower faction in the Texas Democratic party, and Governor Kennon has come right out and said he will vote for Ike.

Harvey Berates Arrogant Party

To the Editors:

It has become fashionable for Stevenson supporters, when confronted with an Eisenhower voter, to assume the too-polite expression of a cultivated lady thrown into conversation with a country milkmaid. Remarks the worldly one: "You mean you're **not** for Stevenson? Why, how could anyone be for Eisenhower?"

Either this smugness is decidedly out of place, or there is something terribly wrong with a theory of government which has held that reasoning power and leadership abilities may occur from time to time—even so long a time as 20 years—in more than one party organization. When a party has been so long in power as to presume, with blatant certainty, that no other party could possess the intelligence to govern this country, and to proclaim that presumption in the very face of its own failure to govern successfully, then, indeed, is it time for a change.

The Democrats assert, of course, that they have really governed with unerring hand: human nature or Russian ubiquity are blamed for their failure to protect American power and moral prestige. But I am far from convinced that the Democratic administration has always acted wisely in its conduct and formulation of this nation's foreign policy. Since when are Koreas classified as unavoidable accidents? Nor, in domestic issues, can I accept philosophies which hold corruption a normal, albeit regrettable, state of affairs, and the evolution of Bigger, Omnipotent Government the sole protector of the dignity and values of Western man.

International Position

During the past 20 years this country has faced unprecedented problems at home and abroad. Both Republicans and Democrats appreciate measures of social reform and the mounting responsibilities of our international position. It is therefore utterly ridiculous to label Republicans union busters, isolationists, "Aryan" racists, or Wall Street warmongers aching for another depression.

No one disputes that during 20 years of Democratic administration this country has changed, and progressed, in many ways. Republicans do assert, however, that these changes have not always been for the best and that Democratic leadership has, in fact, made some grave mistakes in the name of "progress".

Now it is one thing to make mistakes, quite another to be unable, by the very nature of the political processes, to acknowledge these mistakes. The dynastic Democrats of today's government suffer from acute myopia: they cannot see their mistakes and are not looking for new viewpoints, personnel or policies. They have become so certain of their own infallibility as to be more high-handed than open-minded about their own actions and depression-born slogans.

In this campaign much has been made of the "captive candidate" theme. Eisenhower's nomination must be taken for what it is: a defeat of the Old Guard. The Democrat's convention, on the other hand, ignored the popular candidate and nominated, with predicted ease and casual arro-

Continued on Page 5, Col. 1

Castor Considers F.E.P.C. Problem

especially contributed by Jane Castor, '53

The political issue of the F.E.P.C. is a real problem in America today. Everyone realizes that all people should have equal rights of employment. Although there is an agreement as to the end, there is disagreement as to the means. The F.E.P.C. would allow the federal government to enforce this equality; basically this seems the same as equality to justice in the courts of the land, and thus the right of the federal government to enforce this equality apears to be a "good" idea.

But this is mere theory and to bring real and lasting results one should consider the practical, instead of the theoretical. In 1948 the Democratic party was successful in electing its Presidential candidate and in securing a Democratic majority in the United States Congress; although the Democratic platform had supported F.E.P.C. the Democratic Congress and President were unable to pass legislation.

The reason was the attitude of the Democrats elected from the South to the Congress. These men knew the problem at first hand. The Democratic party has played politics with this important issue by appealing to the Negro vote in many of the doubtful Northern states (for example, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York) in order to maintain their balance of power there; the Democratic politicians of the North have ignored the fact that the people of the South have to live with the problem that the mass of uneducated Negroes present.

General Eisenhower faces this problem realistically and has declared that he is against the idea of forcing such legislation on the South. He realizes that aside from the fact that there are not many Negroes in the South who are well-educated enough to actually present a problem of unequal job opportunities, that forcing the South in such a matter will not end in real and lasting results—instead, the people of the South

Continued in Page 6, Col. 5

Army Experience, Integrity Aid Ike

To the Editor:

No, I am not a Democrat for Eisenhower. I am a Republican for Ike, and I think my party has made a fortunate choice in him, because

1) He has had vast experience in foreign affairs, both in peacetime and in wartime. He knows how to get along with people who think differently than he does, and has never adopted a "let Papa show you how this is done" attitude. Being a military man, he knows what is practical for us to do and what is not.

2) Since he is an Army man, and used to years of no nonsense, he can and will make decisions after considering all sides of the question and act firmly on his decisions. Furthermore, he is a practical man and will not allow vacillation, hangers-on, inflated payrolls, corruption, graft, laziness and the general downright thievery of the people's substance, all of which now characterize the administration. No group can or ought to expect special favors

Continued on Page 6, Col. 1

Time to Change; Roosevelt Views Ike As The Man

especially contributed by Sara D. Roosevelt '54

The Republican cry throughout this campaign of 1952 has been "it's time for a change." This seems to many a too-oft repeated empty phrase, so they ask "why"? Why will a Republican administration put us in any better a position than we are now; and after all, what is wrong with what we have and what we have had for the last twenty years? I would like to try to answer these questions.

Foreign policy seems to be a major issue at the present time. We are in an extremely dangerous international position, which is the result of an unsteady policy, and a lack of foresight. It is useless at this point to spend time "blaming" the Democratic administration for each of their mistakes that have led us further and further from international security, but I would like to point out that if the administration credits itself with steps forward we have made, it must also acknowledge responsibility for the errors it made.

Entrance in Korea

For instance, our entrance in Korea was a necessary move, but the steps leading up to this move were contradictory and indecisive. The support of the Israel state was policy of the Democratic party, but at the same time the Arab States' good will was unnecessarily lost. The Marshall Plan is doing tremendous good to hold Western Europe in the community of the Atlantic Pact, but Eastern Europe has fallen behind the iron curtain.

The Democratic party has also failed to take a definite stand either on the Egyptian issues or on the Persian issue. It seems to me that one of the reasons a change of party is so important at this time is that the government needs a shot of new blood in its arm. Men would come into important positions who were not hampered by a past record.

Whichever party wins the election will find no pat solution to the foreign situation, but with a changed administration, there will be no need to waste time apologizing for past mistakes. Men like John Foster Dulles will be able to test a policy of initiative on our own which might be strong enough to anticipate and stop the moves of Russia.

Economy in Government

What about economy in the government? It appears that those at present in control of our government feel the United States has unlimited amounts of money to spend. This country cannot afford unplanned spending such as has been going on in regards our armed forces.

It cannot afford the inflationary results such heavy government spending produces, and it cannot afford a tax system which virtually wipes out the small business man and the professional man: backbones of our economy and our culture. In so vital a time America must be internally strong economically to be able to survive herself and to put her money to the best use externally.

Much has been said during this

Continued on Page 6, Col. 4

Students For Stevenson

Storch Analyzes Major Concepts Of Ike v. Adlai

especially contributed by Marcia Storch, '55

America votes for the man. The issues, of course, are a determining factor in any election but we are not too concerned with the stand of a party on this or that, rather we tend to decide whether these men can better help us through our dilemmas.

" . . . Intelligent self-interest whether conscious or instinctive, is one of the motive forces of human progress." All of us will agree to this statement by Arthur Schlesinger. And there are some people who feel that the past 20 years have endangered their interests. They fear that there is no longer any meaning to one of the basic principles of our democracy—limited government. "Should it not be limited will of the people?" they cry.

Some Republicans (and some Democrats) are afraid of social security, labor unions, higher living standards, increased housing, Civil Rights—afraid that such massive social gains will destroy business and free enterprise. It is this fear that makes the Republican Platform one upon which Abraham Lincoln could not have run; which causes Eisenhower and Nixon to embrace a states' rights slant on the majority of our federalistic controversies; and which forces the Old Guard Republicans to hang like a dead weight on a sincere, but not a politically dexterous candidate.

Let us think about the things which the fear mongers call the anti - capitalistic or socialistic trend of the New and Fair Deals. There are few who would call the principles which are embodied in these programs bad or wrong, for the basic concept of a democracy is a society in which every man has the opportunity to develop his capacities to their fullest extent. Certainly this requires more progress of the type we have seen in the past 20 years—more education, more housing, more employment, less lynching.

Time for a Change

The Democrats are not trying to force anyone to look at those 20 years through a rose-colored window. Mistakes have been made, grave mistakes, under the recent administrations. It IS time for a change. It is time for a positive attitude and positive moves at home and abroad. And if the Republican party had a leader, a man with control over his affairs, a man who could make a decision and stick to it; if the Republican party had senators and representatives who could see their way clearly through the issues of the present day and could handle these issues in an intelligent and capable manner; IF . . . then I and many other people would not hesitate to endorse them.

But despite their pleas . . . "We are not isolationists. We recognize social and economic progress and will continue to further these programs. We believe in foreign aid. We will wipe out corruption and graft" . . . the many personal and public evaluations of the Republican party and their own recent record prove beyond a doubt that these claims cannot be and are not valid.

It's old but it's true—the facts don't lie. And the facts show that the Republican party has consistently voted against policies which would check Soviet aggression, against the Marshall Plan, against the North Atlantic Pact, against Mutual Security, against military aid to Korea, against Point Four. The domestic affairs record can be left to your imagination or research—they even voted against Taft's own housing bill!

The answer, then, lies in combining the progress made under the Democratic administrations toward general welfare and world peace with intelligent and directed leadership. I see this type of leadership in the man who said, "I have no fixed principles by which every issue is to be automatically resolved. I do not identify big government with good government . . And it is an error not to make government as efficient as possible, because inefficiency in government as in business makes for size and waste.

"No one wants government to control every detail of human life . . . I don't like any interference with free markets, free men, free enterprise. I like freedom to succeed or (freedom) to fail . . . ".

Governor Stevenson started his campaign on a level which is foreign to American politics—a high level of thought and speech. He is becoming increasingly better liked as he becomes better known. He has shown an extraordinary understanding of current issues, and in him one finds integrity, strength, humor, and humility — qualities well fitting a president, and showing that Stevenson is the man with whom the United States of America can work for a greater tomorrows.

Governor Adlai Stevenson

Five Stars Dwindle To A Dark Nothing

Five little stars shining on his head,
Along came Taft and one dropped dead;
Four little stars, cocky as can be,
McCarthy and Jenner reduced them to three;
Three little stars, brave amid doubt,
Cutting old friends put another out;
Two little stars, showing signs of strain,
Tidelands oil sent one more down the drain;
One little star fighting mighty hard,
But what could it do against the Old Guard?

Five stars bright spelled a nation's hero,
But five stars dark, add up to zero.

Hortense Flexner King

G.O.P. Loses Out On a Campus Walk

especially contributed by Mary Cahn, '56

It was a beautiful fall day and two girls were strolling along, whistling, and kicking up the leaves as they walked.

"So you're for Stevenson", mused one of the girls. "Just tell me why"? she asked with a smug look on her face.

"You really want a speech?", laughed the other.

"No, gad no!", said the first quickly. "Just some good points if there are any."

"Well," said my Democratic friend, "it seems to me that Stevenson has the better labor program. His program calls for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and a new, fairer bill."

"Well, of course, the Democrats are labor's slaves," shouted the first.

"I don't know about that. Seems that big business has done mighty well in the last twenty years. The number of private businesses have risen remarkably. Business has received R.F.C. loans, tax deductions and many other privileges."

"Go on to your next point", said my Republican friend a little too quickly.

"The Democrats have a superior civil rights program also. It calls for a F.E.P.C. law, in order that real progress can be made. The party has a remarkable record on fighting segregation in housing, education and the armed forces."

"I'm not going to vote for a party", said the first defiantly, "that has gotten our country into this inflation. The dollar's not worth a thing anymore!"

"Just a minute", said my Democratic friend. "Remember the Republicans are in Congress also. Let's take this from the start. Inflation came after World War II, when the O.P.A. was eliminated, largely due to the Republicans. But time and again, President Truman has tried to initiate stronger rent and price controls to combat this inflation menace and time and time again the Republicans have made this impossible. If the latter were elected, more controls would be lifted and prices would probably rise!"

"Your party's gotten us into a national debt", said the first with authority. "Why should we, the richest country in the world, have such a thing?"

"Well", said my Democratic friend, "the debt has gone down 9% since World War II, and you forget, though we may be the richest, we are also the country with the greatest responsibility. We have found it necessary to help war-torn countries and arm for our own security. If we don't spend now, we may have to spend lots more on a third world war!"

"But how about the two party system? Seems to me that if the Democrats win again, this country will be run by one party. Is that true democracy?"

My young Democratic friend smiled unbelievingly. "Why," she exclaimed, "the Republicans are in Congress, are in state governments and are certainly a very important force in American government. Twenty years out of the White House can't kill a party. Why, between the end of the Civil War and 1914, only one Democrat was president, but we certainly haven't died!"

"But staying in office", said the Republican slowly, "makes for corruption."

"In every government", said the Democrat, "there will be some men who are dishonest. But the corruption issue has been greatly exaggerated. President Truman and the Democrats have exposed the corruption and eliminated it. And the Democrats have fought the biggest corruption of all, that of big business favoritism.

"Stevenson and the Democratic party stand for the people and the rights of the people. They believe that government is in the interest of everybody and their record shows this. The "Tidelands Oil" dispute proved Stevenson's courage, for he lost votes, but showed America that he was interested in the benefit of all, and not just a few special interest groups."

"Maybe you're right", said my Republican friend, slowly.

"You bet I am!", said the other, and the two strolled on, kicking the leaves as they walked.

Gottlieb Sees Ike In Over His Head

To the Editor:

I was for Eisenhower and I have switched to Stevenson. Under Eisenhower the Republican Party has not come forth with the positive new program it was its high responsibility to deliver. Eisenhower himself, still unquestionably a great American of essential integrity, has floundered badly in political waters, has inextricably committed himself to what he does not really support, and has fallen in over his head.

In the words of John Steinbeck: "I do not know, but I can imagine the pressures on candidates for the Presidency. They must be dreadful, but they must be equally dreadful for both candidates. With equal pressures we have seen in a pitiful few months the Eisenhower mind crumble into uncertainly, retire into generalities, fumble with friendships and juggle alliances. At the same time, Stevenson has moved serenely on, clarifying his position, holding to his line and never being drawn or driven from his non-generalized ideals.

Pressures on a President

And if the pressures on a candidate are powerful, how much more so must they be on a President? I find I am for the man I think can take the pressures best and can handle them without split loyalties and expedient friendships."

Some people are not voting for the man. They are voting for a change, or for the maintenance of a 'disintegrating' two party system, or against Truman (in Adlai's clothing). In the little space that remains to me let me say simply, first, that I believe the "man" to be of paramount importance in filling the extraordinarily powerful position of Chief Executive, and, second, that I cannot sanction the "blank check made out to change". I also find that the "medicinal" concept of electing a party to office every time its unity has fallen apart is manifestly ridiculous. Finally, I find the difference between Truman and Stevenson obvious and inspiring.

Sincerely yours,
Ronnie Gottlieb, 1953

deShazo Decries Red-baiting GOP

Dear Editors:

The choice before us in this election for our next president is not a clear-cut "powers of light" versus "powers of darkness" choice. There are valid arguments for both candidates; however, it seems to me that Stevenson is less handicapped, better prepared for the presidency, and generally more capable and realistic. The following points are a few of the reasons for the above conclusion.

Undesirable elements in both parties handicap the two candidates, but, even though living in Washington, D. C., I would choose the domestic embarrassments and corruptions of the Truman administration (which I believe Stevenson could correct as he did a similar situation in Illionis) to the isolationistic communist - baiting trends of Taft and McCarthy (which I fear Eisenhower could not avoid as he has not avoided compromises with these elements in his campaign).

I consider the trends toward isolation and communist witch-hunting some of the most poisonous elements in America today, for thus free speech and free thought are endangered through fear, and America seeking her own life above the world's good is losing her life from within and without.

Better Equipped

In my opinion Stevenson is not only less handicapped by his party's policies, but better prepared to provide the world leadership needed at this critical time. Why? —because the positive effort of the United Nations will be the most significant step in world peace and progress, and Stevenson, being as Ralph Bunche says, "one of the best informed men on the United Nations in the country, a first rate man in every respect", has helped in the formation of the U.N. and served it in various capacities. Furthermore, Stevenson is a lawyer, a man experienced in civil government and does not have to transcend a lifetime in the military tradition which by its very nature emphasizes obedience rather than personal initiative and necessitates thinking of individuals as instruments for obtaining a good end through "justified" evil means.

Impressions

As for believing Stevenson the more capable and realistic individual of the two outstanding candidates, I can only judge from the impression they give in their press conferences, speeches and written statements. In these, Stevenson seems to have a more definite, consistent and positive approach to the problems of our country and world than Eisenhower.

Moreover, Stevenson appeals more to the intelligence of the listener than to his emotional response to issues. In my opinion, Stevenson continually creates the impression of a great statesman, humble, selfless, morally courageous, and ideally suited to lead our country and world as the next president of the United States.

Respectfully,
Sidney deShazo, 1955