

Chafee Challenges All To Join Battle Against "Thought Control" Movements

Freedom should be everybody's concern! The man who hides while others fight the battle merits contempt. Nor in these times can any university worthy of the name avoid its responsibilities for the freedom of men's minds and souls. These were the thoughts to carry home from the University of Oregon's first Charter Day which saw the installation of President Meredith Wilson, a man who has shown that he not only knows the meaning of freedom but how to fight for it.

These are "echoes" of the addresses made by three distinguished visitors—Julian Huxley, world famous British scientist; Clarence H. Faust, of the Ford Foundation, and Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of Harvard, a law school professor whose valiant work has earned him the highest honor Harvard can bestow on a teacher, "University professor," welcome in any school or department.

(Even at Harvard, there may be a few dusty corners where this thorny personality is not always greeted with cheers.)

No Dull Moments When Chafee Gets Under Way

For three hours, Tuesday night more than 600 people sat on hard chairs in Erb Memorial Union, waiting to hear Chafee (while the customary ceremonies were being performed). Chafee spoke for another hour but there were no dull moments, from the beginning where he said:

"If the universities had not recently brought the social sciences into the curriculum, they would have saved themselves a lot of trouble . . ."

Through his swift review of the historic follies of trying to regulate teachers' thoughts or teaching methods:

"In 1643 the Puritans . . . required all teachers . . . to take a test oath called the Solemn League and Covenant . . . obliging them to assent that they were bound to resist the King (Charles I). In less than 20 years Charles' son had regained the throne . . . a law of 1662 required all teachers to swear they believed it wrong to resist the King. . ."

There were touches of ironical scorn for the persecutors of teachers:

"They think that students believe what they hear in college. Did these anxious folk do that when they were in college themselves? . . . Undergraduates do not believe all their professors tell them even if it happens to be right. . ."

He used many devastating analogies such as this one in regard to so-called teachers' oaths:

"Scholars object to being forced to plead 'Not Guilty' before any evidence of guilt is produced. Picture a loyal wife whose chastity is questioned by a suspicious husband. He demands a public assertion—at a dinner party—before all their guests . . . he insists that his wife say she never has been unfaithful, particularly not with John Smith. . ."

"Let us require every legislator to swear there were no illegal practices in his election . . . every lawyer to swear he never has solicited clients . . . every doctor that he never has committed an abortion . . . every business man that he never has violated anti-trust laws. . ."

It was a speech which was remarkable for rollicking humor, mordant wit, sallies which crackled over a tired audience like a bullwhip. He brought them to sharp attention with this final challenge:

"The time has come to strike back. Not just single professors, brought under fire and easily picked off like an isolated sentry . . . To presidents, trustees, regents, alumni, I say—THIS IS YOUR FIGHT! . . . No more concessions . . . the time has come to stop retreating . . . we ought to educate more than our students. We must educate our masters—the legislators, the citizens who in the end make educational institutions possible . . . We need to make our fellow-citizens realize that freedom is NOT SAFETY but OPPORTUNITY."

No 'Sympathy For Communism' in Chafee's Approach

It was the speech of a man who detests communism and for that reason deplores those who debase American ideals by adopting the repressive methods characteristic of communism. His sincerity is accentuated by the fact that 30 years ago he himself was a target for "mobsters" because of what he said or wrote.

Chafee's speech was a fitting climax to a day devoted to the theme of a University's responsibilities to freedom. Those who enjoy worrying about schools

as "hotbeds of communism" could have found reassurance in the discussions.

If man's salvation can be found by "using the brains which God gave him," then there certainly was comfort in Dr. Faust's able dissertation on man's ability to REFLECT upon his experiences—the one quality which distinguishes him from the lower animals and makes him master of his environment, if not yet of himself.

(We don't have to worry too much about our mistakes as long as we can learn something from making them.)

Huxley put this time of trouble into both scientific and historical perspective. Here is one of the few famous men of our times who isn't worrying about the destruction of the so-called human race or even the end of what we call civilization. Why? We shall try to repeat one illustration:

"If you took the Empire State building in New York and let it represent man's first 1,000 million years, you would have to use a postage stamp to represent the last 5,000 years or so of man's recorded history. All this time he has been developing and learning and he has perhaps another 1,000 million years ahead. . ."

Man has spent most of his time on earth learning to live and he is still in that process and KNOWLEDGE is indispensable to his future—or more important still the FREEDOM TO LEARN.

What Chafee added to this discussion was simply that note of challenge. As he pointed out, if you forbid an artisan to utter his thoughts he can simply "clam up" and ply his trade, but if you silence a teacher he has nothing left. Therefore this fight for freedom is everybody's fight!

So We Shall Print Chafee's Text For All To Read

Naturally there were a few—even among those present—who did not like everything Chafee said. Indeed we suspect there were a few who came to be shocked because Mr. Chafee's name is on some of the "suspect" lists which are purveyed by professional patrioteers.

(On Tuesday we heard a little mumbling that "such a man" should not be allowed to speak here. This paper with its long record of upholding the right of every person to be HEARD has no sympathy for such talk.)

So—we are going to print the Chafee speech, COMPLETE AND UNALTERED, on this page in four installments beginning today, and for these reasons:

- 1. To settle any arguments as to just what he said.
2. Because in our opinion it is a speech which every American may profit by reading.

We find it impossible to agree with some of the sentiments we heard as we were leaving the Union:

"Yeh, he can talk. He isn't in a tax supported institution. It's easy for him to be brave with Harvard back of him. . ."

"That was an incendiary talk! As an alumnus I'm disturbed. Folks out through the state are goin' to get the idea this is a radical institution. . ."

"I hope some of the hotbeds in the faculty don't take this as a signal to go out and try to be heroes."

We have seen enough of President Wilson's calm, determined leadership to have no fear that the campus will run amok just because of some very plain talk by an elderly gentleman from Cambridge, Massachusetts. We are very glad that many of Oregon's highest officials including Governor Patterson and members of the State Board were sitting right there.

(There might be a few among "the brass" who need to hear such a speech.)

To be prepared for trouble is entirely different from looking for trouble. If Oregon so far has been able to avert the legislative inquisitions, the degrading teachers' oaths and the police state tactics which have afflicted so many other states, it is mainly because so far it has been possible to MOBILIZE INTELLIGENT PUBLIC OPINION IN TIME.

That is precisely what the Chafee speech suggests—nothing more. It was a Charter Day to be remembered—with its colorful processions, its stately rites, its stimulating music and on all sides the incomparable beauty of eager, idealistic youth. The talk was of freedom—all day—and many will remember that it ended with THIS IS YOUR FIGHT!



"I don't see why you get so excited about a \$2 overdraft! Can't you use some of that \$7,000,000 surplus you advertize?"

Hal Boyle

'Aunt Alice,' 'Children's Hour' Observe Silver Anniversary

NEW YORK (AP)—Any mother who has survived the tense ordeal of preparing her moppet for a grammar school pageant might regard Mrs. Alice Clements with awe.

For Mrs. Clements, the show world's most durable foster mother has auditioned some 300,000 talented and not so talented children in a quarter of a century.

More than 12,000 kids have appeared on "Aunt Alice's" famous "Children's Hour" Sunday program over WNBC and WNET here. The program, which recently celebrated its silver anniversary, has been a springboard for many now famous entertainers.

"So far as we've been able to find," said Mrs. Clements, "it's the oldest continuous show on radio. It has gone on for some 1,300 consecutive weeks."

COMPENSATION?

It is now only a part-time task for busy, warm-hearted Mrs. Clements, who was once a Broadway dancer herself. Five years ago, after the death of her husband, she took over the operation of his Philadelphia advertising agency. Three days a week she commutes here, where she holds auditions, and writes, directs and produces her show.

She loves to work with children, handles them easily with a firm knowing kindness.

"I had twins, but lost them as babies," she said, quietly. "Since then, I've—well, I've learned to be fond of other people's children."

ART AND THRIFT

Each year she contributes to the education of a number of talented children whose parents can't afford to give them the training they need.

"I've always been interested in show business," she said. "I was the youngest of seven children in a Pennsylvania Dutch family. My father had paid \$400 for a piano, and none of the older children cared to play it."

"When I came along, I had to. My thrifty father simply wasn't going to let that piano go to waste. I gave my first concert debut at 8, and I wore panties made of flour sacks with the

name of the company printed on them.

"As I sat down to the piano, everybody in the audience started laughing. In flipping back my starched dress, I had given a free ad to the flour company."

Each night now Mrs. Clements looks at television her heart is warmed by the sight of at least 6 to 8 performers who got their start on her program.

"Not all are stars," she said, "but they are making a living."

Among the better known graduates of her Children's Hour are Ezra Stone, Robert Q. Lewis, Arnold Stang, Joan Roberts, Eileen Barton and Roberta Peters.

What has she learned from 25 years of working with children?

TALENT OR NOTHING

"Well, the most important thing is—to treat them as adults," she said. "Children respond to reason at least as well as grownups—and they're more obedient."

"The parents often are more of a problem than the children. They never seem to be satisfied if a child has one talent. They want to push the child into everything, or claim he can do anything."

One father offered Mrs. Clements a new car if she'd put his child on her show. A jeweler offered her an expensive watch on the same basis.

"I had to turn them both down," she laughed. "The children get on the show only by their own talents. We don't audition their parents' pocketbooks."

BUSY HANDS

Mrs. Clements believes that encouraging children to develop their talents helps cut down juvenile delinquency.

"A child trying to become good in anything simply doesn't have time to get into trouble," she said.

She has found that child ventriloquists usually are the most highly intelligent of young performers, young comics the most mischievous.

"It's hard to hold their attention—they are always trying to make me laugh," she said. "But I suppose I really love them best of all. I always dreamed of being a comedienne—but I wasn't."

That is the key to "Aunt Alice's" success. She shares the yearning behind every child's most impossible dream, and does what she can to help it come true.

THE EDITOR'S MAILBAG

WORD AND SPEECH

EUGENE (To the Editor) — Nope. I wasn't the "one Democrat" included in the Republican gathering at the Woodrow Wilson Junior High Tuesday. I read what was said in the pages of the Register-Guard.

In Senator Cordon's review of this administration's record on taxes, appropriations, wage, price, rent and material controls, social security, unemployment compensation, farm legislation, tidelands oil, housing, etc., he called it a "good record."

We who compose the largest segment of the population of these United States, the wage earner upon whose continued prosperity and employment depends the prosperity of the small merchant and in turn the whole country, say, relative to Cordon's speech, "Taint So."

Further, we say the administration's record is NOT a good record. How do we know this? By what we experience when we pay our income tax, by our pay checks, by our purchases at the store, by our rent receipts, BLM statistics on cost of living today compared to B.I. (Before Ike) and last but not least, by unemployment figures.

By implication, Senator Cordon refers to American citizens of the Democratic Party as "left wingers." In a speech in Chicago, Secretary of Defense Wilson did likewise. Secretary of Interior McKay, Vice President Nixon and

other "big wheel" spokesmen of the Republican Party have also implied that those who voted or aligned themselves with the Democratic Party were "left wingers."

The thousands of veterans of two world wars, who are staunch Democrats, as well as thousands of other Americans, must resent this arrogant, haughty, bumptious insinuation as to their loyalty and patriotism.

Surely this wonderful democracy of ours must maintain the two-party system. Just as surely, those interested in the total welfare of the peoples of these United States and particularly the working men and women and small merchants, cannot vote the Republican ticket Nov. 2, considering the present complexion of the Republican Party.

To paraphrase a quotation in the Bible (1 John 3, V. 18) and in reference to the campaign speeches of the various Republican spokesmen and candidates, placed against a background of our factual experiences, the Republican Party "loves us in word and speech, but not in deed and truth."

Respectfully, CHRIS JENSEN, 1087 West 8th Ave.

So They Say—

Employment is high and steady, but unemployment is still too high.—Labor Secretary Mitchell.

Fear of Teachers' Power Over Students Unfounded

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the first part of an address delivered by Zechariah Chafee Jr. on the University of Oregon campus Wednesday. Succeeding portions of the address will be published later.

(PART I)

The first thing I have to say about university responsibility in the tradition of freedom in the social sciences is this: If the universities had not recently brought the social sciences into the curriculum, they would have saved themselves a lot of trouble. Their freedom would be attacked very little in the twentieth century. The struggle between the natural sciences and religion ended in an armistice decades ago. Geology no longer battles against Genesis, and evolution can be taught with impunity outside Tennessee and Mississippi.

New theories and discoveries in physics, chemistry, and biology are enthusiastically heralded. They may enable us to save sick men by the hundreds or slaughter well men by the hundreds of thousands. They may bring about inventions which will add to our comfort and help the advertising business. As for the humanities, innovation has always been welcome since Homer said, "Men ever love the song that rings newest in the ear."

An occasional letter to the editor does lash out at abstract art or free verse, but the modern artist sells or starves like his predecessors and the new poetry is read as much or as little as the old. If universities had only stuck to the classics, professors of Latin and Greek might have imparted radicalism to their students by insisting that the Conspiracy of Catiline was a frame-up by Cicero just as the Reichstag Fire was frame-up by Hitler, or injected Fascist ideas into lectures on the Republic of Plato. Most people would not have known what they were talking about and nobody would have cared.

No Obscurity on Campus

No such obscurity and no profitable attention await the professor who indulges in heterodox views about economics, government, international affairs, law. He occupies the front page of newspapers beside bank-robbers. Columnists bracket him with spies. The lightning he keeps attracting does not spare the university where he works. If it protects itself from the storm by sending him away, it will often lose the teaching and research of a distinguished scholar, and it will surely demoralize his colleagues and lessen its future power to recruit a strong faculty. On the other hand, if the university dares to retain the unpopular professor, it too will become a favorite target for professional patriots.

The sources of indispensable funds may perhaps dry up, and many parents of desirable undergraduates, present or potential, will be honestly disturbed. No discussion of the problems of academic freedom is fair unless it takes into account the difficulties confronting a university president and the governing boards. These men, it is true, do not run the risk of ruining their lives like the teacher who dares to speak out what to him is sound and true. Still, the professor is not the only man in trouble. One of the great calamities of these angry attacks on disliked ideas in universities is that they distract the heads of an institution from their vital task of facilitating thought and ask them to stifle thought.

This special vulnerability of the social sciences to frequent and bitter attacks is due, I think, to three commonly held beliefs on the part of citizens at large.

In the first place, the public feels strongly that the social sciences are intertwined with valuable basic traditions of our society; hence, the purpose of teaching these subjects is to maintain those traditions. This is true to some extent, but it is far from being the whole story.

Courses which help growing youngsters to understand American institutions and the ways of their fellow-citizens are indeed a chance for teachers to hand on the good that has been learned through long experience since the colonies were settled. "We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works in their days, and in the old time before them." Chief Justice Vinson rightly said, "A teacher works in a sensitive area in a schoolroom. There he shapes the attitude of young minds toward the society in which they live."

The youngster ought to be trained to have qualities which past experience has shown to be valuable for life. He ought to get the benefit of the tried judgments of the community. The bird has to be taught to fly, and the boy to wash behind his ears, be helpful to women and cripples, that seven times nine is sixty-three and taxation without representation is tyranny. A society cannot act fruitfully, North Whitehead observes, unless each member has "fairly accurate expectations regarding the sentiment and behavior" of his fellows. Human beings need to be predictable for each other, they need to fit together.

Controversial Issues

The tried judgments of the community should surely be passed on, but they are possible only on issues where specific conclusions have long been generally accepted. I am ready to go along with a very able defender of authoritarian teaching, Fitzjames Steven, when he writes:

"A man who did not, so far as he could, decide for his children the questions whether they should be truthful, industrious, sober, respectful, and chaste, and (do it) 'without allowing them to hear what was to be said on the contrary side,' would be a contemptible pedant."

Yet how far does this really carry us? It is all very well to put truthfulness, industry, sobriety, and chastity on the list of "musts," but how shall we ascertain the established truth about very controversial issues which have arisen recently? New events and facts refuse to be fitted into the tried judgments of the community.

And after all, we are talking about universities, not primary schools. How old must boys and girls be before they can stop being told to believe everything their elders believe, regardless of the risk that the elders may be wrong?

I begin to wonder still more when Stephen goes on about compelling teachers what to teach:

"The attitude of the law and of public authority . . . will and ought to depend on the

view which happens to be dominant in the being."

This theory would produce frequent assaults in the curriculum. For instance, the electric power would have had to be very strong to it from 1933 to 1935, and throughout the inauguration.

Let me go to the safety of the distant past, an actual example of such somersaulting. When the Puritans in Parliament had passed a government of southeastern England from I, they required all the teachers, all the scholars at the University of Oxford, all the bridge to take a test oath called the Solemn League and Covenant. This obliged them to that they were bound by law and duty to the King and help Parliament fight him. In twenty years, after Charles I had gained the throne, a law of 1662 required teachers at Oxford and Cambridge to believe that they believed it wrong to resist the King, the Solemn League and Covenant, and the illegal oath which had no binding force.

Basic Traditions

To borrow from Mr. Dooley's famous about the Supreme Court, do we want professors "follow the illicion rule?" No doubt, the older generation finds comfortable to admonish the young in the of the Prophet Jeremiah:

"Stand ye in the ways, and see, and behold old paths, where is the good way, and therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."

Unfortunately, as Trotsky remarked, nobody who wants a restful life had better not to be born in the twentieth century.

Suppose that twenty-five years ago a college professor of Economics was assigned to his duty to hand down the traditions to his students, and nothing more, just finishing writing out all his lectures completed year in his course on Money and Finance. They are full of what many books of that time regarded as "certain laws of social and material affairs, as unchangeable as the law of gravitation." It is October 21 of the year of President Hoover. The stock crash is ten days away. What would he be doing to prepare his students for the which we now live, where neither political making any serious effort to balance the where both parties are seeking to guarantee farmers high prices for their crops, where mental regards the relief of unemployed sacred obligation, where the gold standard dwindled into an excuse for taking a lump of gold out of the ground in South Africa, and into the ground in Fort Knox?

Truly, as President Eisenhower of told his students, "In this life we don't what is around the corner." The future is just as surprising to us as our own future have been to Americans in 1929. The question whether the teacher shall make the dates of 1954 skilled in discussing possible changes and fully canvassing their advantages and disadvantages. Or shall he leave them with bandaged eyes through "the inevitable which lie ahead," equipped with nothing but their choice except a strong love for the tions among which they were born?

Core of Knowledge

The second reason for the current backward teachers is closely related to what just been saying. People are inclined to the multiplication table as characteristic education—something which is just as otherwise, which once learned stays with through life. When a professor expounds class ideas about politics or economics which these critics disagree, they think as bad as telling boys and girls that seven nine is sixty-one.

Of course there is a core of such and indubitable knowledge in education, but of the teacher's task consists in imparting for understanding what is still unknown or dealing with it wisely. The best kind of was what Mark Twain got as an apprentice in his "Life on the Mississippi." After learned all the shoals and points in the St. Louis to New Orleans, he found that them had changed. He had to learn them again, and better yet, he had to know how perpetually acquiring information through he could predict those changes.

Mistakes are easier to make in such than in the communication of an established of knowledge. Yet it is absurd to assume mistakes will warp the minds of students.

That is the third reason why citizens are scared about teachers. They think students believe what they hear in college. anxious folk do that when they were in themselves? They are like Mr. Dooley—ber when I was a little boy, but I don't know how I was a little boy." They have forgotten it was like to be young.

Undergraduates do not believe all the fessors tell them, even if it happens to be. A great many teachers of Economics in in my boyhood were for low tariffs, but who went out of their classrooms to be were soon protectionists.

A former Secretary of State told me he was in law school, that what worried education at Yale was that most of the mates were rapidly becoming just like fathers. The frequent fear of citizens that professors produce radical students is out by my experience.

The most fertile nursery of Socialism known was the classroom of Professor Nixon Carver, a conservative of the fiber. The reaction against his teaching the flourishing Harvard Socialist Club in 1910. One of its members, John Reed, in the walls of the Kremlin. Another, Lippmann. Boys and girls do not always like their teachers, nor do they go on thinking like themselves when Life wears us all down.

Biochemist Reported in Line for Nobel Prize

STOCKHOLM, Sweden (AP)—Dr. prize would be given to three Dr. Frederick Robbins, Vincent du Vigneaud of New Boston doctors for polio research. The Nobel Prize, amounting to \$53,000, was awarded in New York, Cornell University biochemist, is described by the Dr. Du Vigneaud, 53-year-old naturalized American, who was reported in the Stockholm newspaper Expressen as the likely winner of the Nobel Prize for research on the physiology, to be awarded Thursday night.

The three Boston polio experts were identified as Dr. John F. Mass, for research on was a possibility, however, the Enders, Dr. Thomas Weller and processes in human cells.