

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

The Educational Leader, 1937-1959

University Archives

10-1-1956

The Educational Leader, Vol. 20, No. 2

Kansas State Teachers College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader>

Recommended Citation

Kansas State Teachers College, "The Educational Leader, Vol. 20, No. 2" (1956). *The Educational Leader, 1937-1959*. 59.

<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader/59>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Educational Leader, 1937-1959 by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER



CONTENTS

Today's Colleges Plan for Tomorrow's World
Eugene E. Dawson

Great Issues Lectures, Series of 1956:

Foreword

In Defense of American Freedom
Alvin H. Proctor

The Most American War
Dudley Taylor Cornish

OCTOBER 1, 1956

VOLUME XX

NUMBER 2

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE • PITTSBURG

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

*Published in January, April, July and October by the
Office of Publications*

*Kansas State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas*

REBECCA PATTERSON • Editor

*Address all communications to The Educational Leader,
Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas.*

VOLUME XX • NUMBER 2

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

VOLUME XX • NUMBER 2

Today's Colleges Plan for Tomorrow's World

By EUGENE E. DAWSON

It is a stimulating and gratifying experience to be related over a period of time to a number of institutions of higher learning, schools that are so varied as to type, size, and geographical location; but still more important, to be associated with them at a time when they are grappling with the exceedingly complex and, at times, almost insolvable problems of contemporary education. In that remarkable book, *Teacher in America*, the author, Jacques Barzen, quotes the remark of the nineteenth century wit, Thomas Love Peacock, who said in essence that "he who talks about education is the bore of all bores for his subject is one with no beginning, middle nor end." This has undoubtedly been an apt description until very recent times. Of late, however, it is to be ranked with the liveliest of topics and wherever I have gone, both in and out of educational ranks, I have found this to be true. Moreover, there appears to be a sense of urgency in what people in and out of the context of education have to say about the subject these days. These conversations and activities almost remind one of Lewis Carroll's Red Queen, "We must run faster and faster just to stand still; indeed, we must run faster than we can." Consequently, many institutions one visits in these times inspire the observer with what they are attempting to do in meeting the contemporary challenges of higher education.

I suppose the three areas in which the great bulk of questions are being put, and they are not new questions in many cases, but posed with this sense of urgency to which I have referred, are:

1. Who should go to college?
2. What constitutes a college education?
3. What are the needed resources?

I don't know that responsible persons are coming up with many definitive answers, but it is at least wholesome to note the way in which they are putting questions and at least trying to cope with

them. In other words, it seems to me that the discussions which are being agitated represent wholesome tensions or constructive conflicts within the context of education. I say this even though I have been mindful of the heavy-handed opinion makers and the plethora of distorted concepts, and what I would describe as the occasional disregard of plain solid reality.

Take, for example, the first question—who should go to college? If my impressions serve me correctly, much of the dialectic has seemed to revolve around the questions relative to recruitment policies, admission policies, and scholarship programs.

As to the programs and policies of recruitment, I have noted that while some schools have unstructured and somewhat disordered activity, most of them seem to be refining their programs of recruitment in a planned and systematic manner. The better schools appear to be as concerned over recruitment as in the past but they are more selective in recruiting students and they realize that if they are to receive good students they must continue to seek them out. One of the schools with which I have been working has had a wide-spread reputation for the recruitment program and, among other features which I shall not take time to mention, they have within the last year designated a day for high-school juniors to visit the campus and another day for high-school seniors. The day for high-school seniors comes fairly early in the first semester because it is felt that many good students make earlier decisions as to where they are to go to school. Now that they have introduced the day for juniors, this phase of the program comes fairly late in the Spring semester because these students have more time to formulate their thinking as to where they are to go to school.

With respect to scholarship programs, a few of the schools with which I have been associated have relatively few scholarships to offer, but they are aware of this and are attempting to remedy this. Several of the schools have many scholarships to award. In fact, in some of the institutions, practically every other student holds a scholarship but these have materialized from state legislative appropriations for single-purpose institutions, namely teachers colleges. There is often a stipulation that the recipient must enter teaching and teach within the state for a period of two years or so. In those institutions where there are no large-scale scholarship grants, scholarships seem to be awarded on the basis of a student's scholarship record with heavy emphasis being given to the student's financial need.

It is in the category of admissions policy that much of the debate seems to be taking place these days. One way of putting it would be to say it is selective admissions versus "taking all comers." Three or four of the schools I have visited, mostly in the East, have had selective admissions procedures and wouldn't have it otherwise. I believe that it is reasonable to say that there is reason to be impressed over the students they obtain. Administrative officers and faculty members in such schools readily admit they have their problems; for example, in one of our schools which selects students carefully, a single-purpose institution, and one which has no tuition, occasionally a student has entered the institution, "because my parents said, 'why don't you give it a try, it won't cost you anything to speak of, and you might find yourself liking teaching'." Meanwhile, the student becomes frustrated and completely disturbed and withdraws from school. In other words, they have a number of drop-outs for this reason. Still, the institution feels that this is the lesser of the two evils. Some of the schools, because they are state institutions with a tradition for accepting all students, insist that they have a selective retention program in operation. This isn't always apparent to the observer.

My conversations and experiences in connection with this particular problem haven't brought forth any easy answers as far as I am concerned, but I am convinced that faced with the tremendous upsurge in student enrollment, it is a problem which we must face in a very realistic way and I am persuaded that going to college, of itself, no more assures that one is a scholar than going to a garage assures that one is a mechanic.

The second question, what constitutes a college education, is one which is being discussed with more fervor than ever before. All of you know very well the dichotomies in this connection. Here are some of them: general education versus specialization, liberal arts versus professional education, academic emphasis versus life adjustment, the academic versus the vocational approach, education as the cultivation of the individual versus the sociological theory of education, naturalistic pragmatism versus idealism, etc. This is not the time nor the place to enter upon a discussion of these dichotomies. Suffice to say, they seem to remain very real issues, but they are being considered and evaluated, and while the discussion is frequently animated, I have observed that, for the most part, they are being treated in climates of statesmanship and with more in the way of security being evidenced on the part of the partici-

pants. There is still a certain amount of scapegoating and "buck-passing" but I detect more in the way of institutional solidarity and cohesiveness and a growing concern for formulating philosophies of education that are somewhat more eclectic than before. Moreover, on the part of the better schools there appears to be something of the "team idea," where it isn't the "methods people" versus the "subject-matter people" or the personnel staff pitted against the academic group. There seems to be the realization that they are all working together for a common cause and that it must be this way or it is the student who suffers. In other words, there is no place for vested interests. Where institutions seem to be reasonably free of departmental and divisional rivalry, it appears that there is a general consensus to the effect that educating the student is such a complex and major assignment that it requires the genius of everyone, the pooled resources of everyone, working together, to accomplish the feat. It has been stimulating to note the diverse ways in which these objectives are being attempted, both in and out of the classroom.

The third area which is being given much attention, and necessarily so, is that of needed resources for higher education. One facet of this problem as we all know relates to plant facilities. Most of the colleges are at work on this problem. I would say that most of the activity is in the area of residence-hall construction although new classroom buildings are being constructed as well as student centers, etc. Most of the administrators will tell you that they are still running behind and don't feel that they will ever catch up. One of our schools, with four or five very large residence halls, plans to construct a new residence hall each year for the next fifteen years. With more than 5,000 students today, they expect to reach 10,000 in less than ten years. But with all the building that is under way, many educators seem to feel, and increasingly so, that the fetish of beautiful facilities is not the criterion of educational success; hence, when they speak in terms of needed resources they are concerning themselves with other important needs. For example, there is the need of recruiting additional staff members. This is one of the most talked-about problems on the present scene. Administrators will tell you that they are not encouraged as they examine the applications that are being submitted by our leading placement bureaus these days. One of the beclouding factors is that the large universities aren't releasing their promising graduate students. An educator told me last week that while he

realizes this is no real answer to the problem, he feels that a partial way to get at the problem would be for institutions such as ours to concentrate more attention on some of the very promising bachelor-degree candidates with the idea of grooming them for college teaching. He contends that you can always find at least a few in every senior class who have the aptitude to become college teachers and that to avoid too much inbreeding there should be developed a co-operative plan by which institutions would exchange such promising persons with opportunities being provided for graduate study. I believe the title they give these persons on this particular campus is that of "graduate instructor."

As one works with institutions, at the present time, he not only senses the urgency of recruiting new staff members, but also the responsibility of encountering the needs and problems of faculty members we now have. To an observer, on a good many campuses, one gains the impression that they are not only overloaded but that oftentimes they are loaded down with responsibilities that a non-professional might handle. Allow me to be more specific: I know of one departmental staff with sixteen members which has a part-time student secretary for the entire department. This may be an unusual example but I feel that if we could convince more of our legislators of the need for modern office equipment such as you find in most other businesses these days, and if there were more assistants available in grading papers and doing a certain amount of the "busy work" that, up to now, they have had to do while teaching classes that are larger than ever before, they would have more time for effective teaching and for sponsoring the organizations and functions which we are willing to recognize, at least on the verbal level, as being basic and significant in educating young people. I personally feel we are being remiss in our responsibilities in this vitally important area. Still further, and very definitely related to what I have just said, in my travels I have been reminded of the paucity of research opportunities afforded many of our very promising teachers. We say a good deal about encouraging scholarship from the intellectually adept student. I have found myself asking on more than one occasion what we should be doing about encouraging scholarly contributions from our able faculties. I know of one institution that has a budget of 100 dollars a year earmarked for research. This may be a bad example but I would hesitate to say that there are too many good examples. This matter of research becomes all the more important when we think in terms of the need for planning for the future.

At this juncture, I should like to make reference to three other reactions which I have obtained in my experiences of the past two years. First of all, it seems to me that in these fast-moving days, necessitating so very much in the way of readjustment, institutions need to engage in continuous efforts of reappraisal. I believe that nearly all of the more alert institutions are doing this. Institutional self-study programs are of value so long as they represent more than simply going through the motions. Institutions, like persons, may fall into the proverbial rut and become self-satisfied and complacent. Without exception, we have our soft spots. We need to inquire again and again into our objectives and how well we are implementing them. Are we realizing our potential? In this connection, I am impressed over the extent to which business and industry are currently inviting in management-analysis teams. This, I think, is good not only for business but for education. You may know that Professor Arnold and his staff in the Creative Behavior Laboratory at Massachusetts Institute of Technology are frequently consulted by companies who are interested in stimulating more creativity on the part of their research men and scientists. Perhaps we should be doing more of this in our colleges.

In the second place, it has been a growing conviction on my part that the better schools over the country endeavor to maintain proper climates of communication and it has been my growing feeling that this is imperative if an educational institution is to prosper. I am thinking here of the many facets to what might be described as the science and art of communicating. Within the framework of an educational institution I am thinking of the importance of maintaining clear channels of communication between administration and faculty, among administrative officers, administration and students, among faculty members, faculty and students, and among students. Moreover, there is the importance of proper communication between alumni and institution. Finally, there is the value of maintaining free lines of communication between parents of students and the institution. In this respect, I should like to say that I have been especially impressed over the ways in which some of the schools have endeavored to implement this idea by sponsoring annual Parent Days in which the parents are invited and urged to visit the campus and, while there, brief class periods are held for them, making it possible for parents to meet the instructors of students and to talk with their Deans and, in general, to become reasonably well oriented to the life of the school. This, I think, is good.

Finally, I have been reminded once again of the importance of a sense of personal responsibility which should be assumed by all members of an institution—administration, faculty and students alike. What I mean to say is that I have been reminded repeatedly that ours is more than a job—it is a job and a very difficult one—but it is more than a job. It is a vocation, and if we conscientiously settle for this, we shall find ourselves putting forth that “plus effort” which cannot but make an institution great but which more than that, will result in better-trained young citizens to face the exigencies of our modern era.

In conclusion, I should like to quote two people. The first statement is from the pen of Mortimer Smith who has this to say:

“It goes without saying that the difficulties inherent in trying to reach the heterogeneous mass of students in our public school with the values of genuine education are enormous. Getting an education is hard work, especially for the less facile student. The difficulties can only be met by teachers who are themselves the products of a broadening, humanizing, and liberalizing education, who feel strongly enough about the kind of training they received to want to transmit it to their students, and who possess the developed intelligence and ingenuity to devise the means of transmission.”

The final statement comes from Nathan Pusey who says:

“There are indeed places within our systems of public schools that with reason seem almost hopeless, but if we are to think constructively about education, we cannot be put off by them—nor can we concentrate attention on numbers or physical facilities alone, and losing ourselves in such considerations, refuse to face up to the fact that education is in the end something that takes place in individuals and is concerned with minds.”

Foreword

The Great Issues Lectures have been an annual event at Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, since the fall of 1948. The lectures given in the spring of 1956 marked the eighth in the series. During this period the series has brought to the campus such outstanding scholars as Dr. Edwin Witte, a nationally known economist, chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin; Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review*; Dr. Evelyn Millis Duvall, nationally known expert in the field of marriage and the family; and Dr. C. V. Easum, authority on German history.

Besides the visiting lecturers, it has been customary to have one or more speakers from the social science staff of the college. In the two lectures which follow, Dr. Alvin H. Proctor discusses the defense of American freedom and Dr. Dudley Taylor Cornish characterizes the Civil War as "the most American war."

In Defense of American Freedom

By ALVIN H. PROCTOR

It is a real pleasure to be here tonight to begin the 1955-'56 Great Issues Lectures series in which we try to deal with some of the significant problems and controversies which confront us today. To participate in this series is always a distinct challenge because in this as well as in the Great Books series, one joins the company of urbane, erudite, and honored men and women. If the two series have not provoked our audiences to thought and intellectual pleasure, it is not because of lack of profound subjects.

This ballroom has heard the voices of Bernard DeVoto, Henry Steele Commager, Ashley Montague, and Edwin Witte, as well as the wit and wisdom of doctors Pennington, Noble, Strawn, Welty, and Dr. "Samuel Johnson" Guardia.

They were strong voices and they dealt with significant, serious subjects. We propose in the Great Issues Series in 1956¹ to discuss a theme no less serious or vital—the theme of American Freedom. For many coincidental reasons we could not choose better.

Freedom is under external attack from Communist pressure, and almost daily we debate the policies, strategy, and cost of defense. Again, the rising crescendo of bitter dispute over desegregation and the parades of mobs through the campus of one of our universities focuses our attention on the meaning of freedom and the nature of the Constitution and the Union and reminds us that ivory towers cannot escape the crosscurrents of great issues of our day.

Moreover, the election of 1956 reflects in the deepest sense our concern with the future of freedom in the United States. The big issue is not really whether we "like Ike" or will he run, but as always whether we like democracy, and will it run; not whether the farmer is "pampered tyrant" but what should be the direction and nature of our economy. Thoughtful men and women throughout the land discuss the meaning of great economic forces and social trends in this "land of the free and home of the brave."

Let us begin with a simple, forthright statement as to the meaning of freedom, or its synonym, liberty. Let us not quibble over semantics. Let us not turn to that infamous device, the committee, to discuss what we mean, nor to the dry and unemotional dic-

1. This paper was given by Doctor Proctor in November, 1955, as part of the Great Issues series and several statements will reflect this difference in dates.

tionary. Remember instead the meaning of freedom as men knew its meaning when they manned the barricades in France, when they knelt on the north shore of the Concord river in 1775 to face the Redcoats, or when they listened to gaunt Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg or raised the flag at Iwo Jima.

Freedom means not only what such men read and speak and believe. It means the code by which they live—and die. It means the kind of daily life they want for themselves and are willing to concede to other men. When we speak of freedom we speak of something that never did exist apart from free men. There is no Olympus on which freedom dwells and from whence the gods dispense its blessings to mankind.

Freedom means a certain way that men and women can act and speak, think and live, hope and aspire to be. Completely free people live without restraint of any sort, although it is doubtful that even Adam was completely free.

By freedom we mean that quality in society and human conduct which enables people to think and live, act and react, with the least restraint from external pressures and direction. That society is freest which allows its individuals to be as far as possible self-directing and independent persons, and if a society claims to be free, “. . . the end and aim of society and the state ought to be the nurture and wide propagation of a certain kind of man—the independent and self-directing individual.”² The nurture of such persons must be the chief aim of its economic, political, and socio-cultural life. If I posit the question to you tonight—how free are *you*?—you know what I mean. Let us proceed therefore to discuss the defense of freedom.

First, I should like to comment upon the origin and growth of American freedom, noting parenthetically that those nations which have no evolutionary tradition of freedom have a hard row to hoe in these times. More importantly, we must outline the rise of forces and conditions which have altered the climate of freedom in the United States.

We begin with the fact that as a nation and a people we were born free. We began as Englishmen, leaving the homeland during that seventeenth century when the “rights of Englishmen” were being hammered out in the century-long contest between King and Parliament. Whatever the later impact of the frontier was

2. G. T. Robinson, “The Ideological Combat,” *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII (July, 1949), 531-2.

upon the colonies, and it must have been great, it was not decisive before 1776 in shaping our concepts of freedom.

We began on these shores with a heritage of English freedom—a heritage that only a few fortunate nations, a mere handful among the great family of sovereign states, can claim as significant and fundamental throughout their history. The English who landed at Jamestown, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay, and who founded the thirteen colonies were equally heirs of Magna Charta, the Petition of Rights, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the Bill of Rights of 1689. Freedom had her labor pains on both sides of the Atlantic in that great era from 1603 to 1783. This heritage has been a part of the spiritual and political bone and muscle of America, although not always used honorably and wisely. Nevertheless, it has been our "Western Star," as Stephen Vincent Benet wrote, and we have always been greatest when we act as free men should.

To this great heritage from England we added the contributions of free men who were born in America and who helped to separate the new world from the old. There was Ben Franklin who admonished us that they who give up liberty for a little safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. There was Washington, James Otis, Sam Adams, Tom Jefferson, aristocratic Alexander Hamilton, rat-smelling Patrick Henry—the list is long of those who made us a free nation and a nation of freedom.

They carried the torch of freedom for man while it burned relatively low in England in the eighteenth century. Was it because freedom's spirit was quiescent in England in the century before 1776 that men with a zeal for freedom could wrench themselves free from the monarchy? The poet said "there is a tide in the affairs of men" which must be taken at its height if affairs are to prosper. Does history warn us that twentieth century Americans can let freedom's spirit burn low at home only at their peril?

Having won the essentials of freedom, we had to cultivate and defend it; 1776 was more than a political revolution. It released a burst of creative energy that has not yet spent its force in America and might in our time be the catalyst for freedom through the globe. The uniqueness of American freedom not alone has been its geographic expansion from "sea to shining sea" and beyond, but also its application to economic and social life as well as political.

The century and a half which followed 1776 was one in which freedom was abroad in the land, a spirit blowing through the east-

ern forests and across the western prairies. It was an attitude found equally along the Oregon Trail and the Union Pacific; a practice of politics in the New England town meeting; the Lincoln-Douglas debates; or the Populist movement out of Kansas in the 1890's. We began as a nation of small tradesmen, small craftsmen, and small farmers who had a great measure of control over their individual destinies. Their politics and economics reflected that fact.

For more than a century, the American's chief concern was for protection against interference by others and by the state. Americans could and would fend for themselves and stood on their own feet as independent and self-directing individuals. They added the Bill of Rights as a negative defense against overriding governmental power and used the law as a protective device for police power only.

The century to 1900 was one in which the main task was to extend ourselves geographically on the one hand, and, on the other, to extend the suffrage and prerogatives of free men to those not yet within their scope. Until at least 1860, the three great characteristics of American life were decentralization, democracy, and individualism—and quite clearly individualism was the most significant.

The military defense of American freedom was comparatively simple, even though our national infancy began with a war with France and the War of 1812. The task was purely continental, and, through no virtue of our own, we had the greatest advantages for the task. The wide Atlantic, the friendly and stout wooden walls of the British fleet, a Europe sated with imperial ventures abroad, and our own readiness to fight were enough to minimize external threats at bargain prices.

Seldom has freedom had more auspicious circumstances for its birth and growth. Like England, as Sir Ernest Barker pointed out in his book *The National Character*, we had no large standing army to overawe free men or drain away our production and resources. The result of all this was an optimistic American belief and practice in individualism and freedom.

But in the middle of the last century we laid aside the machinery without which free men cannot avoid violence, hatred, and misery and decided to settle certain great problems with blood and iron. When we could no longer vote and talk, we fought a fratricidal war whose impact we feel acutely today. In doing so we unloosed two

trends which have never been reversed. One was tremendous concentration of power in the federal government, establishing precedents for the national use of power in times of crisis that have been repeated in World Wars I and II and, since 1930, to meet the great depression. The other trend was a tremendous quantitative expansion in our economic production followed by the inexorable urbanization of the nation.

"Measured in terms of the old American philosophy, by far the most important change that has taken place in American life since the 1860's is not the vast increase in the output of goods (with the accompanying rise in the standard of living) but the shrinkage of individual self-direction in the productive process."³ We began an unprecedented expansion of business and industry and soon entered the era of national and international industry and commerce. The new industrial giants utilized disciplined masses of factory workers as machine tenders for the new American civilization. Urbanized and factory-ized, it was inevitable that the worker began to unionize. And in time, Big Government was to appear as the logical offset to Big Enterprise and Big Labor.

The early economic and social climate so favorable to the independent and self-directing man began to shrink for a majority of our citizens. Stirring devotional words of freedom remained in our vocabulary and were repeated in endless political campaigns and in labor-management conflicts, but it cannot be denied that economic and social individualism suffered a very fundamental loss. Small-scale enterprise, even small-scale farming, were subjected to heavy pressure by large enterprise and monopolistic competition that made small enterprise a fading way of life. The dominant trend from 1860 was toward discipline, organization, and dependence to such a marked degree that as Peter Drucker points out in *The New Society*, one can no longer produce (even teach) unless he has access to an organization. The economy became collectivized—partially private and partially governmental—and, in our time, began to depend on a great investment in military production, military science, and even military manpower for its continued prosperity.

In the face of such developments, one may ask whether America can maintain the climate of freedom in which she was born and by which she so long flourished and prospered? The task of education is to teach our youth the origin and meaning of American freedom;

3. Robinson, *loc. cit.*, 527.

to teach them to grapple its meaning to their souls with hoops of steel; and to understand that freedom is for the future as well as the past, but only if we clearly understand its origin and its new conditions.

This is the heritage and this is the record. Now let us turn to my second point: the defense of freedom against external attack; the defense of freedom in a world of sovereign states who have yet nearly an unlimited right to maintain whatever military force they wish and to use it when and how they wish, subject only to the practical considerations of strategy and whatever moral restraint they may possess.

The deepest significance of the two world wars, the dozen major ordinary wars, and the revolutions which have swept this century, as well as the Cold War, is missed by those super patriots who denounce as appeasement and weakness all attempts to seek new solutions to a very old problem.

The problem of the defense of freedom is in the fullest sense a single one for both nations and individuals. It is the problem of how to permit and encourage the fullest development of the independent and self-directing person and nation without permitting them to over-ride the greatest needs of the larger whole.

The harmonious relationship of the individual to a larger society has always been a question and a task—whether the area involved is the small town, the state, the nation, or as today, the wide, wide world. How to harmonize national sovereignty with world neighbors is a crucial question for democratic society on which the continued existence of democracy and freedom may depend. What was true of Mr. Lincoln's divided house may now be true for this divided world.

We must begin to analyze the problem by accepting certain self-evident truths: First, the United States has no inalienable right to survival in airborne and missile-borne nuclear war nor to victory if war should come. Second, American power is not unlimited. "Unlike God, the United States cannot prevent every sparrow from falling to the ground. It must, therefore, choose its sparrows with care."⁴ To put it bluntly, we cannot defend freedom alone but must have friends and allies, and, to continue my metaphor, I suspect that we must flock with birds of the same freedom feather if we are to secure much strength from those allies.

I submit that only a Secretary of State out of Alice's Wonderland

4. David C. Williams, "Cold War Capital," *The Twentieth Century*, CXLIX (April, 1951), 268.

would seriously dream of unleashing Chiang Kai-chek, that pathetic and disowned transient now on Formosa. Nor should any American place much reliance on Franco of Spain, that uncomfortable fascist bedfellow who was added to our purchases by Mr. Eisenhower to keep company with that other "kept" ally given us by Mr. Truman, Tito of Yugoslavia. These allies prove only that politics does make strange bedfellows; not that undemocratic allies add to one's strength.

The final self-evident truth is that the defense of American freedom will in this age of urban-scientific-technological defense have a high price tag. Few of you may doubt this, but what about Congress which has forced Mr. Eisenhower to curtail the funds to be used in his overseas, nonmilitary defense strategy—that twentieth century strategy so intelligently realized as indispensable and unavoidable by President Truman, General Marshall, and Secretary Acheson. I doubt that it was a cash register which John Donne and Ernest Hemingway heard tolling!

Freedom has not been weakened by heavy spending overseas nor by the sixty-eight million dollars which we give the United Nations annually. To those who argue that individual initiative will be destroyed by high taxes and the use of our economic strength as part of foreign policy, I would reply, as I list the new billion-dollar corporations and envy the new crop of millionaires, that the preservation of life and liberty is sufficient incentive and sufficient justification.

The task of defending freedom in a fearful, anxious, and even dangerous world is not, however, primarily an economic problem. One cannot buy freedom, not even freedom from attack in a world of armed, sovereign states. It is also questionable whether freedom and democracy within this and other nations can withstand the assaults of continuing hot and cold wars.

If we are so wedded to the past and to maintenance of the *status quo* that we cannot learn from conditions of the present, we will be unable to take advantage of the future. If we are so afflicted with hatred of Communist Imperialism that our only answer to her power is more power, our only reply to her materialism is greater materialism, our only reply to her subversion and naked power is greater coercion—then we cannot fail to help destroy freedom. Washington warned in his Farewell Address that "The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave."

We need new perspectives, wider vision, and higher idealism. In the American way, we need to try something new. The word "new" runs through our history like a great motif of freedom's song. "From the beginning, Americans have known that there were new worlds to conquer, new truths to be discovered. Every effort to confine Americanism to a single pattern, to constrain it to a single formula, is disloyalty to everything that is valid in Americanism."⁵

Since 1945 we have made not merely national policy but world history by great new inventions. The greatest was not the atom bomb nor Salk vaccine, but the United Nations, Point 4, the Marshall Plan, NATO, and other great inventions in international relations, all designed to nurture and protect independent and self-directing nations. With sound instinct, President Harry S. Truman realized that the pages of recent history had "shown him" and every other Missourian that free men everywhere must lift their loyalties to new heights. With a grasp of realities, President Eisenhower led us further down the path toward international freedom under law with his renewed pledge to the United Nations and his unprecedented plan for aerial inspection of Russian and American military installations.

The history of America has been the history of military, economic, and political fences pushed farther and farther away from the colonial seaboard Englishmen. We have practiced and preached a destiny of expanding neighborhoods. The task of American education is to create new perspectives, deeper understanding, and more inclusive patriotism for the whole human race than we have exhibited in the past. The poet said that "once to every man and nation comes a moment to decide . . ." Perhaps the future will record that it was America that led the way out of the wilderness and jungle of supercharged and deadly nationalism to greater loyalties and wider citizenship.

The most difficult task and perhaps the most significant threat to American freedom is not that which we face abroad, however. In my opinion the defense of freedom may prove to be most difficult within the borders of the United States and this precisely because it involves every one of us every day and every year.

This threat to freedom is the apparent tendency of urban-industrial society to penalize individualism—to collectivize, standardize, and anesthetize man; to dull the sharp edge of individualism in

⁵. Henry Steele Commager, "Who Is Loyal to America?" *Harpers*, September, 1947, p. 199.

favor of social conformity and anthill life. It is the apparent tendency of modern society to produce not music makers but juke box devotees, not athletes but spectator sports, not cracker-barrel "politickers" but column absorbers; in short, to reduce individual man to socialized man, faceless, anonymous, docile.

The encroachments upon freedom at home are most dangerous because they are self-imposed. They are accepted because they are accompanied by the bribes of creature comfort, the innocuous-appearing carrot with which such encroachments are always presented. Today we accept legal, political, and psychological encroachments upon our freedom that would have made the minute man leave his plow and take up his musket. Such restrictions have been so gradually imposed that the number and extent goes unnoticed by the average person. Even as I speak, some will say that this is the timid worry of an ivory-towered professor. But let the record speak.

The most insidious pressure upon free men is derived directly from the Cold War. Historians have long pointed out that in war one of the first casualties is free public opinion, individual dissent, the Bill of Rights, and due process. What then if war becomes total, or if Cold War becomes continuous, uncompromising, fought on wide fronts, and with no quarter?

Looking ahead almost prophetically, Alexander Hamilton warned us in the *Federalist No. 8*, even before we were a nation, that "Safety from external danger is the most powerful director of national conduct. Even the ardent love of liberty will after a time give way to its dictates," he said. "The violent destruction of life and property incident to war, the continual effort and alarm attendant on a state of continual danger, will compel nations the most attached to liberty to resort for repose and security to institutions which have a tendency to destroy their civil and political rights. To be more safe, they at length become more willing to run the risk of being less free."⁶

Throughout the nineteenth century we were safer from external aggression than almost any other nation of equal or greater importance, and the consequences for free men were enormous. Low taxes, no conscription, an almost forgotten army, a highly productive economy devoted to raising the civilian standard of living, a civilian psychology—these were the fruits of our good fortune, and freedom could be proclaimed throughout the land. We, of

6. The Modern Library Edition (New York, 1937), 42.

course, assumed that this was the product of American genius and virtue.

But recently political and social scientists have noted that somehow this virtue and genius no longer produced these optimum conditions. A nation that is at war, or that lives in constant apprehension of war, does not provide a very satisfactory environment for tolerating differences of opinion, discussion, and dissent. Concern with security matter, fear of disloyal persons, the demands for swift action in Korea, shipments of tanks this week to Saudi Arabia—these things are not conducive to free and open debate, protection of individual liberty, and careful deliberation.

The Cold War as a restrictive force against freedom is all too often aided and abetted by conflict within the nation over grave social and economic issues within the social and economic fabric of the nation. Powerful interests have clashed head-on to preserve or to change the *status quo* and they have utilized the yet little-understood forces of mass-media persuasion and coercion. The average citizen has all too often become ensnared in a barrage of clichés about “the American Way” which leaves him unsure of any thing except that his loyalty is at stake and that if he chooses the “wrong side” he and his descendants may become a tainted file in the cabinets of the FBI.

In the United States this has not been a century of easy progress. We have had conflicts over the Negro, the South, the Catholic, the Protestant, that “pampered tyrant” the farmer, that bolshevik “the union organizer,” economic royalists, and Texas vs. California. It has been a vitriolic century, a bitter one in many ways. For example, the Democrats were tarred with the stated or implied charge of twenty years of treason or stupidity, and the Republicans for long were successfully charged with intentionally or stupidly having caused the depression.

You may reply that such charges have always been made, that America had a violent election in 1840, or the even more violent campaign of 1860; that it sustained freedom in spite of the polemical and bitter campaigns by Mark Hanna and Bryan, or angry anti-Catholicism in 1928. But I would reply that we have developed new weapons and new techniques, not only to inform the nation but also to divide it, to propagandize it, to advertise it, to sloganize it, to shut off or to pollute the sources of information which a free people must have. The economic stakes seem to be high, the issues are more inflamed, and out of all of this has come the greatest danger of all—the demand for conformity and uni-

formity. Mass man in the industrial sense bids fair to become mass man politically and intellectually and here precisely is the greatest threat to freedom in this century.

"What is the new loyalty?" Henry Steele Commager asks. "It is, above all, conformity. It is the uncritical and unquestioning acceptance of America as it is—the political institution, the social relationships, the economic practices."⁷ Another declared "The miasma of thought control that is now spreading over this country is the greatest menace to the United States since Hitler."⁸ Most threatening perhaps are those superpatriots who seek to define patriotism for us all. They remind me of that old German proverb, "You will be my brother or I will beat you over the head."

It becomes increasingly difficult for the individual as such, especially if he is neither rich nor in a powerful position, to make his individualism mean much. The individual, as Peter Drucker said, must have access to an organization if he is to produce anything—shoes, cars, drama, opinions, education. For most people this means becoming a cog in the machine—a transmission cog, not a power cog, and there is a vast difference.

Nineteenth century individualism no longer predominates. It is not fashionable to be a rebel nor considered wise for youth to be reformers. We are no longer in most areas of society independent and self-directing individuals. We must conform to the policies of the organization, whether it is the A. M. A., the Chamber of Commerce, the CIO, NBC, CBS, N. E. A., or what not. It is increasingly difficult to find such a thing as local opinion, original individual belief, and individual action.

We are fed our news by Frank Blair on the Garroway show, who telecasts to the nation with three or four different clock times showing although he speaks to the entire nation at the same moment. We learn what to think from our favorite columnist who is syndicated via A.P., U.P., P.U., or some other "mass media" as my friends like to call it. We all buy Revlon simultaneously, so much so that they can give away a full professor's salary one hundred times over every week to some dunderhead who can identify the "Rock and Roll Waltz," but never heard of Bach. No doubt, in a few weeks, 160,000,000 of us will wait breathlessly at the same moment for Ike to say "I will," or "I won't," relieving us again of the necessity of choosing a candidate.

7. Henry Steele Commager, "Who Is Loyal to America?" *Harpers*, September, 1947, 195.

8. Robert Hutchins, *N. E. A. News*, VII, February 27, 1953.

There is something frightening in the thought of the power of these great mass media of communication and of their impact upon individualism, especially when one thinks of the forces now in conflict or when one remembers how inaccessible these great scientific devices are to you and me for the expression of our opinions. If we take the wrong turn, if we trust the wrong man as the Germans did under Hitler, the Italians under Mussolini, or the Spanish under Franco, we may be closer than we think to Orwell's "Big Brother."

Whether or not we take the wrong turn will depend upon what we do to the individual—whether we nurture him or suppress him. Which leads me to ask whether "We the people" trust ourselves or whether our leaders trust us as Abe Lincoln said they must? Consider, for example, the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits more than two terms for a President.

Was this amendment really passed because of fear of F. D. R.? Not at all. He was already mouldering in his grave. It was really passed because the representatives of the people no longer trusted the people to choose wisely the man who would govern them. It was not even submitted to the people in a great debate and a direct vote. It was passed by legislatures chosen for other reasons or no reason. It was passed by a process which gave it the least publicity, the least discussion, and which preyed upon fears of dictatorship engendered by the war. One might wryly add that we have heard hardly any attack lately on the "indispensable man."

Wendell Phillips, noted abolitionist, replied to censorship of speech with the ringing statement, "Let us always remember that he does not really believe his own opinion who does not give free scope to his opponent. . . . he who stifles free discussion, secretly doubts what he professes to believe is really true."⁹ Do those who restricted the free choice of the people with the twenty-second amendment really believe in "the consent of the governed"? John Stuart Mill avowed that "A state which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in their hands . . . will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."¹⁰

But there are many other examples of ways in which the independent and self-directing person finds his independence curbed

9. Schlesinger, Arthur M., *The American As Reformer* (Cambridge, 1950), 96.

10. Cited by Henry Steele Commager, "Is Freedom Really Necessary?" *Saturday Review*, February 21, 1953, p. 12.

and his self-direction turned over to those not responsible to democratic society. There is the use of military men in governmental positions traditionally civilian. There is the growth of secrecy in the conduct of government business which finds even the state of Kansas trying to conceal vital statistics. There are great patriotic organizations defining what is patriotic policy and patriotic thought. There is the subtle defamation of the fifth amendment until a criminal might prefer to confess his crime without protest rather than ancient liberty now viewed suspiciously by the descendants of Magna Charta and Bill of Rights.

There are the subtle pressures on the schools to avoid controversial subjects, controversial ideas in textbooks, and inquiring teachers. There is the secrecy with which atomic energy is foolishly veiled so that, as a noted scientist said in this week's *New York Times*, every atomic discovery is immediately assumed to have been "born secret and classified." There is the unconcealed pressure upon young men and women to watch out for their futures long before they reach them, taking great care not to join this and that lest at some future time they may be tainted with radicalism.

If democracy wants to survive, if the land of the brave wants also to be the land of the free, it must nurture the independent and self-directing individual. Each must be free to make up his own mind, to make his own choices, to follow his own destiny as far as this is possible—free both from coercion and overriding persuasion. Man's opinions and decisions are not breakfast food or merchandise, to be marketed by the slickest team of "social engineers" in California or somewhere else. Politics is not an advertising game, to be won by the best-heeled outfit or the one with the biggest names on the door. If it is, then democratic politics is finished.

How then, shall we defend freedom? Where can the strong currents of conformity and uniformity best be countered? Where must we make our stand if we are to nurture the independent and self-directing man, the free man?

One answer is, I think, in the colleges and universities, for the public schools are too directly under public pressures and without the ancient traditions of freedom. If society is to remain free, it must possess a place dedicated as a free market place for ideas; a place where youth is free to test any and every idea and institution, to test them without restraint and without fear of present consequences or apprehension about the future.

Men are not born as advocates of freedom but if lucky may be

born into a free society. They must learn to love freedom and to live as free men by an apprenticeship in society at large and in schools and colleges where tradition, precept, and example constantly stress the love and practice of freedom. The imperative role of the colleges is to furnish this free climate and environment.

The first half of a vital partnership is the faculty, which must not be made up of underpaid, overworked, and timorous Casper Milque-toasts. The men who teach freedom to American youth must be highly qualified experts in Americanism and humanism. They must be well rewarded with profit rewards and incentives which we claim for the rest of American society. They must be free to concentrate upon their main business which is in the classroom and be rewarded for it.

Do we believe like President James Conant of Harvard that "We must have our share of thoughtful rebels in our faculties. It will not suffice," he said, "if each college or university has its own brand of doctrine. The conflicting views must be brought in as close contact as possible; only thus can all sides be presented to the student or the true meaning of the phrase 'free inquiry' be made evident."¹¹

If we begin with such teachers, then we can turn to the main task of educating youth to be independent and self-directing individuals. This means that the student press must be free as every newspaper should be; that individual student success is rewarded and failure penalized; that dissent is encouraged; that differences are accepted as normal. To the students our colleges must exemplify "the rule of reason, freedom of the mind, and freedom of conscience."¹² Like Jefferson, we must encourage all our campus rebels to stand among us as monuments to the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Even if we object to the wastage involved in a basketball holiday, I think we must yet hail every example of student initiative as pure gain. Like Robert Ingersoll, we must see "something splendid in the man who will not always obey."¹³ Or like that college president turned United States President, we must believe that "every man should have the privilege unmolested and uncriticized, to utter the real convictions of his mind. There are too few growlers and kickers among us," he said. "We have forgotten the very principle of

11. Wedgwood, Josiah C. & Allan Nevins, *Forever Freedom* (New York, 1940), 178-9.

12. Agnes Meyer to the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, February 17, 1953.

13. Wedgwood and Nevins, *op. cit.*, 88-9.

our origin, if we have forgotten how to object, how to resist, how to agitate, how to pull down and build up, even to the extent of revolutionary practices."¹⁴

Are we inclined to imitate too closely the robot society outside the campus? Do we protect and coddle, guide and direct, squeeze and shape our students too much, turning them all out in one docile mold? Do we really value and stimulate the individual who wants to be independent and even different; or is our attitude better described by that pathetic little phrase on the public school "progress" card—"he co-operates well"?

Should we not at least periodically redebate such things and methods as the committee system, life adjustment, the textbook mentality, the new strait jacket of rigid and narrowly prescribed general education, the student planning hour, objective test (we're teaching human beings, not objects), compulsory class attendance—I'm sure that you must have your own list of these things!

The secret of freedom is that it must ever be born again, that *freedom is a kind of person*, not an abstraction. It must be taught in every generation to every boy and girl in a free land. It must be renewed in us all from time to time. Like the mythical giant whose strength increased each time he touched earth, so does freedom grow with use. In season and out, on large issues and small, we must act and think like free men. This is the destiny of the colleges and of all Americans.

14. *Ibid.*, 178.

The Most American War

By DUDLEY TAYLOR CORNISH

A full generation after Appomattox, the historian James Ford Rhodes asserted that the Civil War period "was an era big with fate for our country, and for the American [it] must remain fraught with the same interest that the war of the Peloponnesus had for the ancient Greek, or the struggle between the Cavalier and the Puritan has for their descendants" in England.¹ Subsequent events support Rhodes' opinion; the evidence is overwhelming, especially in recent times. In the past decade, Civil War Roundtables have sprung up all across the land, at which Americans from all walks of life meet to discuss various aspects of the war. Just a year ago last month a magazine devoted to the Civil War exclusively was published for the first time, and it is going ahead with substantial success. Last July came another logical development: the inauguration of the Civil War Book Club to help the interested reader find his way through the growing maze of Civil War books. Here is final evidence of what has been said many times over: More books have come out of the American Civil War than out of any other war in history. As Harvey Breit of the *New York Times* pointed out last summer, "The rage to relive the battles of that bloody conflict goes on unabated, and there are more professional and amateur historians of those famed attacks and counter-attacks than there are machines at IBM or men who wear grey flannel suits."²

More men have made careers of the American Civil War than of any similar period in our national history. McKinlay Kantor, for example, only last year crowned his long and distinguished writing career with the Pulitzer Prize novel *Andersonville*. A year earlier Bruce Catton won the Pulitzer Prize in history with *A Stillness at Appomattox*, the third volume in his trilogy on the Army of the Potomac. At frequent intervals Allan Nevins of Columbia publishes another two volumes in his monumental history of the conflict on which he has already been at work for over ten years. Douglas Southall Freeman is dead, but he left behind him four volumes of Lee and three more on his lieutenants. Hardly a month goes

1. *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the McKinley-Bryan Campaign of 1896*, 8 vols. (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1920), I, 1.

2. "In and Out of Books," *The New York Times Book Review*, July 31, 1955, 8.

by, indeed hardly a week, without another biography of another Civil War general or politician or both. Far from drying up, the stream of Civil War books seems to flow with renewed vigor, especially as the centennial anniversary of the war draws near. The wonder is not so much that books continue to be written but that people continue to bother to read them.

What is there about the Civil War that has so great a fascination for Americans? What is there about this war that makes it a Great Issue ninety-one years after its ending? There are, of course, many answers to these questions. I shall try to give several, and I shall give my own.

In a sense, it is almost embarrassing that I should be lecturing tonight on the Civil War. Ten years ago it would have been impossible. Even eight years ago I should have been reluctant to admit the possibility. I recall very clearly having asked my advisor in graduate school if doing a thesis in the Civil War would not brand me as one more Civil War historian. He admitted that that would probably be the case. Unhappily, I went on with the thesis subject already selected; in a sense, I became a Civil War historian against my will. For the Civil War, ten years ago, even eight, had no real attraction for me. I was then pretty well convinced that the War was highly overrated, that there was nothing new about it, that all the good books on it had already been written, all the rich veins long since mined clean.

For me the Revolution was the most important American war. But then I was only a graduate student who had still to learn that wherever American historians gather together, generally speaking, any reference to The War is a reference to the Civil War. With considerable reluctance I have come to recognize the reasons for that; even more reluctantly I have come to see that the reasons are valid. Here is THE War, the Most American War. It puts the rest of our American wars in the shade. Little skirmishes like the Mexican and Spanish wars are as nothing by comparison. Only the Revolution approaches it in scope and significance. World War I is eclipsed by World War II. And it will be decades, perhaps even generations, before World War II wins anything like the acceptance the Civil War had automatically from the start.

For the Civil War is first of all, all ours. We share it with no one else. It was fought by Americans on both sides. But that is obvious; there are other more compelling reasons for the hold of this war on American minds and hearts. In a sense, we can still

touch this war; we can still reach back across the three generations since Appomattox and touch the war itself personally. Only last week a member of the faculty was telling me that he remembered a Negro in his home town who was a Civil War veteran. The professor had heard about the war firsthand from an American who had helped win his freedom in that war. Last fall a friend of mine who was reading *Andersonville* told me that in two days she had met three people here in Pittsburg with near relatives who had been prisoners in Andersonville. They could reach back to the war; they had heard about it from men who had "seen the elephant" themselves. The Grand Army of the Republic has dwindled to one lone survivor; less than a handful of hard-bitten Johnny Rebs remain, still too tough to die. But the war shows no signs of fading away with the old soldiers. On the contrary, it seems to come into sharper, clearer focus.

At first the war was of major importance only to the men who had fought it. At veterans' reunions, North and South, blue and grey, they refought its battles, brushes, campaigns, and skirmishes. But as the old soldiers grew older, their numbers diminished, their hearing failed, their tales were told less often. Their children and their children's children took up the story, but not with the same spirit. The men who had fought the war had been, as Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., expressed it, "touched with fire." No one else could feel quite the same fire; no one else could see the war, understand it, with quite the same intensity. But more than the sentimental reminiscences of the veterans remained.

As the years piled up between, wounds gradually healed, pain lessened, passions cooled, and perspectives slowly grew. The deeper significances of the war began to emerge. It was more than the supreme experience in the lives of the men who had died in it or had somehow survived it. It has taken on the appearance and the meaning of the supreme experience of our entire national history. Here is the Great Divide of American national development. Here in four years is the line separating the old halcyon days of the federal union of the agrarian democrats from the new, bustling, pushing, national union of the industrial tycoons. It did not come about overnight; it took a little longer than those four years between Sumter and Appomattox. But it was The War that made the big change come about faster, more abruptly. The war was fought by two parts of a nation of farmers, but the victorious part became the head and front of an industrial nation. The war

was fought by volunteer officers and privates from these antagonistic sections, but when the war was over the men were different, the sections were different, and warfare itself had changed. The war was fought over railroads with half a dozen and more different gauges, but when the war was over the standard American gauge was four feet, eight and a half inches. The war was begun by volunteers in half a hundred bright and varied uniforms, but when the war was over the scarlet Zouave pantaloons, the Bedouin caps, the Havelocks, and all the other fancy frills were lost, together with the confusing variety of calibre in the original armament of the volunteer regiments.

The war is the Great Divide in other respects. It remains the last of the old romantic wars; there was still time when the war was young for occasional niceties, courtesies, and chivalrous touches. But this was also the first of the modern wars, the first total war in the sense that the entire national economy was involved, total also in the Sherman-in-Georgia, Sheridan-in-the-Valley, and Grant-before-Richmond sense. There is something symbolic in Grant's celebration of Sheridan's victory at Cedar Creek in the fall of 1864: The Army of the Potomac fired a salute of one hundred guns in honor of Little Phil, but the salute was fired from shotted guns carefully trained on the beleagured city of Petersburg.³

The older, nicer days when war had been a game for gentlemen got lost somewhere between Bull Run and Cedar Creek. Sherman and Sheridan, Grant and Thomas, all understood that victory was more than defeating enemy armies in the field; they understood that final victory would come when the enemy's ability to continue the war had been crushed. For the student of military tactics, strategy, and logistics, the Civil War is a vast laboratory. There are the infinitely complex details of the mobilization of the nation, indeed of two nations, for war. There are bevvies of campaigns to be replanned and refought, analyzed and argued—and with no sharpshooters, no rebel yell, no artillery fire, no danger of Andersonville or Rock Island or Auburn or Point Lookout. But these are for the specialists in military science; these, if anything can be, are somewhat outside the field of the social sciences.

Any civil war must by its very nature be the object of more than military interest. This is peculiarly true of *our* Civil War. American military history, by the very nature of our society and the organization of our government and our army, is more nearly

3. Richard O'Connor, *Sheridan the Inevitable* (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1953), 232.

social and political history than military analysis. For the social scientist, the American civil war must be infinitely various in the aspects it offers for examination. For the economist and the student of economic development, for example, there are the problems of economic mobilization and production for war, the shift from a peacetime to a war economy, the financial problems solved for the most part by Jay Cooke of New York for good patriotic reasons and something better than ten percent. There is the first income tax, and there are the beginnings of the first really protective tariffs. There are the role of the railroads in Union victory and the consequences for the national economy of railroad reorganization and standardization during and after the war. There is the role of the farmer when the bottom fell out of the market at the end of the war. There are the twin developments of industrialization and urbanization. There is the enormous impetus of the war to the economy: to the national organization of business, of industry, of businessmen, and of workingmen. There are the bounty brokers and the shoddy aristocracy, making their hundreds and thousands in bodies for the recruiters and in overcoats that melted in the rain and shoes that wore through in less than a mile. There are all the inventions that helped win the war, or might have had they been used: everything from canned foods to repeating weapons to the combination rifle and coffee mill, the mill set into the stock for ease of operation, heightened morale, and increased military and culinary efficiency.

For the political scientist the Civil War must always stand out as the one great failure of our machinery of self-government. As compromise is the great American solvent, so the war is the one great occasion when compromise failed. The war came about because of political failure. The war became necessary to prove that there could be no successful appeal from ballots to bullets. To the student of political behavior on the national level, the war will always be illuminating for its struggles between president and congress, for the way in which Lincoln's understanding of the presidency grew—and for the way in which he grew with that understanding. The war also affords a full sheaf of cases in state as well as national politics, in the bargainings of governors and the struggles of senators and congressmen to make political hay while the sun of Mars was shining. And the war must always be the end of the line for the States' Rights cause, the valley of the shadow for the precious sovereign states and all their anachronistic preten-

sions to independence. For on the shattered ruins of the states there arose a new national union, fit theater for the activities of the new national economy that ignored the petty boundaries of states, a national structure never since seriously threatened by the presumptions of governors and legislators.

For the legal mind, also, the war presents a variety of questions. Right and justice for the common man, the dissenter, the field soldier, for the critical editor, were often in short supply, North as well as South. There is the old question of security, the old problem of national security as opposed to individual liberty. There are the deeper questions of treason and secession, of war against the State, the ultimate subversion. There are the constitutional problems of the nature of the Union and the right of revolution. There are the philosophical questions of the organization of society, the social contract and who is bound by it. And there are the lesser questions which nag the more: How do you punish a whole people even after they have written and published their own indictment and found themselves guilty by failing in trial by combat? Do you punish them? Can you? Ought you? Does the law go far enough? Can men with hate in their hearts and blood on their hands make good decent, honest, just law?

For the sociologist, the social pathologist, the student of social organization and disintegration, the Civil War has the most to offer. This is a war fought not for crystal clear economic or political causes—if ever a war was. Here is a war the roots of which run into the intricate and involved questions of *mores*, taboos, stereotypes, and into the hard question that Lincoln's generation tried to answer: Can a nation exist half slave and half free? Are democracy and the proud boasts of our conception compatible with human slavery? What would the war do to slavery? What *did* the war do to the peculiar institution and to the slave culture of the South? Here is the richest field of all for the social scientist. Given freedom, what would the slave do? Would he behave according to the stereotype, the nightmare stereotype of the Southern mind, born of the guilt of the master? Would the slave turn on the master, murder, plunder, pillage in wild excess? Or would the "African" prove capable of American civilization and accept its responsibilities with its rights? What unspoken hatreds and deep-seated phobias were spawned by the war? And what is their foundation in fact, beyond the fantastic shadows of prejudice and stereotype? It is in this area more than any other that the Civil War becomes or rather remains

a Great Issue. It is as close to us tonight as this morning's news from Alabama.⁴ It is closer. We do not have to go to the Deep South to find injustice, blind prejudice, the denial of democracy and even of Christianity.

Just as January 1, 1863, the day on which the Emancipation Proclamation went into effect, must remain the first day of the first year of the new era for American Negroes, so the war must remain the gateway through which they marched to freedom and larger participation in American life. Here is the primary social significance of the Civil War. The first casualty of the war was human slavery. The first victor in the war was the slave. As a soldier in the Union Army and a sailor in the Union Navy the slave had a share in winning freedom for himself and for his family and friends. That fact went far to recommend citizenship for the freedman, to recommend not only the thirteenth but also the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the federal Constitution. Had the American Negro remained only a passive spectator during the war, his freedom might have been won for him and handed to him. Then he might have remained in a kind of social and political limbo, outside of slavery and at the same time outside of the white society around him. But because he did fight, 200,000 strong, and die, 70,000 times, in the war for the Union and for his freedom, the American Negro had a right, in the opinion of many of his white contemporaries, to a larger share in the America that came out of the war.

The war had and has significance for more than us alone. Before the family of nations the war was, as Lincoln correctly read it, the supreme test "whether this nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated [could] long endure." This civil war was no palace revolution, no frontier uprising, but a major contest to decide issues of importance far beyond the theaters of war. The outcome of Sherman's Atlanta campaign was watched as anxiously from London and Paris as it was from Washington and Richmond. The workingmen of Manchester were as involved in the final decision of the grim fighting south of Richmond in the closing days of the war as were the mill hands of New England and the farmers of the new west. And when Lee surrendered to Grant, the victory did not belong to Grant alone, or to Mr. Lincoln's government, or to the Union, the North, or even to America alone. The victory was

4. Although this lecture had been in preparation for weeks before April 11, as it happened, the news from Alabama that morning was of the abortive attempt to mob the Negro singer Nat King Cole in Montgomery.

hailed around the world, by the liberals of England and France as well as by Theodore Weld, Garret Smith, Frederick Douglass, and the abolitionists. The world significance was this: The American experiment in popular government, majority rule with minority rights considered and protected, had been vindicated, had survived the ordeal of four years of war. In effect, the home of the brave had finally become the land of the free. There was something symbolic in the presence of a battalion of United States Colored Troops among the guards at Lincoln's second inaugural and of a regiment of them in his funeral procession.⁵ They had been slaves; they had won the right to bear arms and to march proudly, heads erect, in the uniform of the nation that had recognized their manhood.

I have been speaking of meanings and significances, of symbols and stereotypes, using the professional language of the social science professor. The Civil War is more than that. To understand why this war has continued for three generations to fascinate great and increasing numbers of Americans, I think we have to look with less sophisticated eyes at the war and at the men who fought it. The nation that fought this war was essentially a youthful, naive, unsophisticated nation. The youthful energies of the whole nation were engaged in this war. There was something fresh and vital in the American character then, and this was demonstrated by both the North and the South, especially in the early days of the war, before the bloom had been rubbed off at Bull Run and Ball's Bluff and Shiloh Church. The war was a Cause, a Crusade, on both sides, and there was on both sides a crusading ardor. We took the war seriously, but we did not always take ourselves seriously.

We could laugh at ourselves, and we often did. Indeed, there was a different feeling to American humor then; it was not scornful or bitter or very sarcastic; it lacked the sophisticated brilliant brittleness of *The New Yorker*. Rather was our humor, broad, generally good-natured, amusing because it was amused. We Americans, even as we waged war to preserve the Union or to establish Southern Independence, could still laugh at ourselves. There were the Union soldiers in Tennessee to whom the first shelter or "dog" tents were issued. Dog tents indeed, grumbled the men, and when the commanding general rode through to inspect their new shelters, they stayed in their kennels and barked. There were few cruel

5. Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln; the War Years*, 4 vols. (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939), IV, 86, 392.

jokes; exceptions usually clustered around Lincoln, "the ape-buffoon of the prairies," and Jeff Davis who would be hanged to a sour-apple tree, and various unpopular generals and politicians. Occasionally wartime humor took on a sardonic note as, for example, after Chancellorsville, the battle in which the Confederates drove back Union forces under Hooker at the cost of Stonewall Jackson. Confederate pickets, jibing Union troops across the Rappahannock, called out, "Where's Joe Hooker now?" The Union troops, not happy to be reminded that their general had failed them in the crisis and that they had been driven back again, called back across the river, "He's gone to Stonewall Jackson's funeral."⁶

These are uncomplicated things, unsophisticated, unacademic, plain and large, typical of the men who made up the armies who fought the war. Their broad common humanity helps explain why men and women still find the war full of warm human interest. It was full of lighthearted humaneness, too, particularly in the earlier stages before the bitterness of lengthening casualty lists and destruction of lives and property had eaten in. As late as the Peninsular Campaign in the summer of 1862, Confederate General John Bell Hood and some of his officers went to Libby Prison in Richmond to see some of their old Regular Army friends whom they had captured at Gaines Mills during the Seven Days. During the operations around Chattanooga in 1863, U. S. Grant received even more courteous treatment. He was inspecting pickets and had just left a Union post where the guard had been turned out to honor him. As he rode along a stream marking the line between Union and Confederate territory, he heard the command "Turn out the guard for the commanding general" from the *other* side, and a rebel guard fell into ranks, faced about, and presented arms to General Grant. He acknowledged their salute and rode on.⁷ This is no way to fight a war, you say. Recall that this is the American Civil War.

A whole catalogue might be compiled of picket anecdotes alone. There seems to have been widespread agreement on both sides that shooting pickets was unnecessary and even un-American. More usual was the practice of visiting informally back and forth, swapping Yankee coffee for rebel tobacco, even devising systems of rafts and ropes to ferry commodities across streams between the lines. On a more elegant scale, there were occasional band con-

6. Bruce Catton, *Glory Road; the Bloody Route from Fredericksburg to Gettysburg* (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1952), 235.

7. *Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant*, 2 vols. (New York, The Century Company, 1895), I, 509-10.

certs across the lines, particularly in the Virginia theater. Bands of Northern and Southern regiments would serenade each other, usually at night during lulls in the fighting or between active campaigns.

There was a freshness and individuality about that war no longer very characteristic, probably no longer possible, in the mass and impersonal warfare of today. Individuals, privates and officers, were ruggedly individualistic in the Civil War. Generals particularly seem almost to have specialized in being different. While you might at first expect that sort of nonconformity among the militia generals, political appointees like "Beast" Butler or "Never Positive" Banks, the regulars from West Point seem to have outdone the amateurs. George B. McClellan, looking every inch the professional soldier, delighted in galloping up and down the lines of his precious Army of the Potomac, with the cheers of the men ringing in his ears and his staff racing madly to keep up with him. McClellan seems to have derived much satisfaction from the cheers of his troops, and those troops seem actually to have meant the cheers.⁸

Another West Pointer, General Israel Richardson, seems to have been the exact opposite of McClellan: He lounged around in battered straw hat and disreputable uniform and was even mistaken for a farmer who had strayed into camp or a teamster hanging around headquarters. Once a couple of privates, recruits, asked him where they might find General Richardson, and he helpfully said, "I guess I can tell you. Sometimes they call *me* General Richardson—and other times they call me Greasy Dick."⁹

Colonel Francis Barlow was a New York lawyer famous for his toughness and his informal dress. He ended the problem of stragglers in the 61st New York Infantry by detailing one company to follow his marching column in skirmish line with fixed bayonets. He was usually identified by a brightly checkered flannel shirt under his unbuttoned uniform coat. He was described as looking like "a highly independent mounted newsboy." Little Phil Sheridan, five feet six in his boots, also made a substantial name for himself as individual. Instead of wearing the regulation forage cap, he usually carried a sort of pork-pie affair, chiefly because his head was far too big to wear anything regulation. Most pictures of Sheridan show him with his hat in one hand, which gives him a dashing ap-

8. Bruce Catton, *Mr. Lincoln's Army* (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1954), 55 *et seq.*

9. *Ibid.*, 210-11.

pearance.¹⁰ If he could have found a hat that would fit and stay on, there would probably have been a lot of rather ordinary pictures of him.

Of course there were more than officers in the armies who fought the war. But before turning to the men who made the base on which the whole war stood, I should like to point out a few more significant facts about officers and especially about general officers. In the Civil War, officers actually led their men. Sheridan at Cedar Creek actually stemmed the tide of defeat and reorganized his army, turned it around in midflight, and led it back to give Jubal Early a crushing defeat. And Sheridan personally did this, carrying his own battleflag as a sign to his men, all of whom knew him by sight, that he was there with them.¹¹ George Thomas, another general popular with his troops, had little flair for the theatrical; his reputation rested solidly on his ability to take and hold a position. He was the Rock of Chickamauga; in the closing months of the war he won a new nickname, the Sledge of Nashville. Thomas took his job seriously, and before important engagements he always changed to his best dress uniform, cleanest gloves, most brilliant sash. He was convinced that generals ought to be seen by their men during battle, and his men never had to look behind the lines for Old Pap Thomas. The men who made up the armies of Thomas and Sheridan and Grant and Hood were far more important than the generals. It is just that there is more material on the generals; they stand out more clearly and distinctly, Sheridan with pork-pie in hand, Lee the patriarch on Traveler, Thomas in best blue uniform and white gloves, one-legged John Hood strapped in his saddle, Grant unblinking over his black cigar, not scaring "worth a damn."

But the masses of enlisted men who carried the burden of the war were the real heroes. Early in the first days of the war, practically everybody seems to have wanted to join the army, North as well as South. All ages and conditions managed to enlist. Medical examinations were rather casual, so casual indeed that some four hundred women got into the Union Army disguised as men in the first year of the war.¹² As the war went on and the medical department was reorganized, physical requirements were tightened up and thousands were sent home. Only the tough young men

10. *Ibid.*, 209-10; O'Connor, *Sheridan*, 20.

11. O'Connor, *Sheridan*, 226 *et seq.*

12. George Worthington Adams, *Doctors in Blue; The Medical History of the Union Army in the Civil War* (New York, Henry Schuman, 1952), 13.

remained. The war was fought by comparatively young men on both sides. The bearded faces in the steel engravings and Brady photographs are somewhat misleading, as are the nicknames of some of the generals: Old Pap, Old Tom, Old Jack, for example, who had been given those identical nicknames as cadets in their teens.

These young armies were filled with spirit and exuberance in the first months of the war, during the picture-book stages of the conflict. They enlisted in droves and marched off cheering and singing. They were singing armies, singing "Lorena" and "The Bonny Blue Flag" and "John Brown's Body." Julia Ward Howe heard the 12th Massachusetts singing the John Brown song and was moved to write "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." In the confusion of the early months of the war, some Union bands frequently played a catchy tune called "Dixie." In the last years of the war, the songs became more somber in tone: It was then that songs like "When This Cruel War is Over," "Just Before the Battle, Mother," and "Tenting Tonight" became popular.¹³

The first volunteers, whether country boys or city slickers, had a fine patriotic glow about them. They dressed in all kinds of fantastic uniforms, aping contemporary European military fashions; they marched off singing while the girls kissed them, threw flowers after them, and cried real tears. Southerners were just as romantic, perhaps a little more so. They began the war with the firm conviction that one Confederate could lick any ten Yankees, or anyway eight, or six, or four—until, finally, there were just too many Yankees. Not only were the Southerners more romantically inclined; their army was more loosely organized, their field commanders apt to be more independent than their Union counterparts. On this point it is pretty obvious that what killed the Confederacy is the same thing that created it in the first place: States' Rights. Too many loyal Southerners were first of all loyal Texans, loyal Georgians, loyal Mississippians, disinclined to heed orders from the Jeff Davis dictatorship in Richmond. If you belonged to an independent cavalry company from Marshall, Texas, then you would take your orders from your Captain Richardson, commanding your company. And you would simply refuse to recognize as binding on you

13. For a comprehensive selection of Civil War songs, see Henry Steele Commager, ed., *The Blue and the Gray; the Story of the Civil War as Told by Participants*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1950), Chapter XVI, "Songs the Soldiers Sang," I, 561-88.

orders from any other authority.¹⁴ This, too, is no way to fight a war.

While the South is usually recognized as having been more militaristic in tendency and tradition, the war record indicates that Union armies were better disciplined and managed in the field. The mere organization of paper work and the handling of reports in the Union Army was vastly superior to the Confederate system or lack of system, with rather significant results for Confederate arms. Generally speaking, Union staff work was also far superior to Confederate, although staff work was in a rudimentary stage of development during the Civil War. The Confederacy seems to have been blessed with superior individual commanders, intrepid in imagination and initiative, but they turned out to be anything but unmixed blessings.¹⁵

There was still room for individuality, certainly, but only on a limited scale and preferably in the lower echelons or at the very top. The troops themselves hardened into battle worms and, in the North especially, into well-tempered pieces of military machinery against which the finest individuality of the South dashed itself in vain and to pieces. These troops sang and fought and cried and cursed and deserted and reenlisted and were wounded and yet fought on. They fought on and endured what from the descriptions most have been almost beyond endurance. The wonder of Andersonville is not so much that there were survivors as that the fifty thousand Union prisoners there did not accept, wholesale, Confederate offers of fair treatment and decent rations if they would take the oath to support the Confederacy. Some 14,000 died in Andersonville rather than accept those terms. According to the letters they wrote and the pitiful diaries they kept, they loved their country.

General Nathaniel P. Banks once attempted to stop a mob of his men headed for the rear with the question, "Boys, don't you love your country?" Can you imagine any general using that approach today? One answer is recorded: A private in the 3rd Wisconsin is supposed to have replied to Banks, "Yes, and I'm

14. See *Fourteen Hundred and 91 Days in the Confederate Army: A Journal Kept by W. W. Heartsill for Four Years, One Month, and One Day; or Camp Life, Day by Day, of the W. P. Lane Rangers from April 19, 1861 to May 20, 1865*, edited by Bell Irvin Wiley (Jackson, Tennessee, McCowat-Mercer Press, 1954).

15. Consider the difficulties arising from Stonewall Jackson's failure to take his own brigade commanders into his confidence in planning his campaigns, and from the extreme independence of Nathan Bedford Forrest who, in the interest of his own command, refused to transfer needed supplies to other Confederate forces. There is room for a thorough analysis of Confederate individualism and its military costs.

trying to get back to it as fast as I can.”¹⁶ Now, there is a recognizable American soldier.

That is one of the clues to the fascination of the Civil War—recognition, or identification. Over and over again, we recognize, we identify, peculiarly American traits and behavior: the humor, the gripes, the extracurricular activities. We recognize baseball, the most popular single game of the war. We recognize also sundry games played with cards, almost as popular as baseball, especially after payday. We recognize the boredom that is the constant in the soldier's equation, the stupidity of some orders, the blindness or absence of direction habitual at the company level in any war. Typical of the frustrations of company officers and private soldiers caught in the blind wheel of war is this entry in the “Record of Events” section of a company muster roll: “The Company was in the charge on the 30th of July, in which we were repulsed for some reason.”¹⁷ The significance of the entry is clearer when it is known that the charge on the 30th was the great fiasco of the Petersburg Crater, certainly the most important engagement of the war for the regiment of which this company was a part.

History is to the nation what memory is to the individual.

In our national memory the Civil War must for a long time to come occupy a central position. Practically everything that occurred before 1861 seems in retrospect to have been preliminary or preparatory. Practically everything that has occurred since seems to have been a consequence, direct or indirect, of that great period of national travail. The war came about not so much through the working out of blind and cosmic forces but rather through human weakness and frailty and passion. Victory was not won through the operation of fate, the chance roll of the dice of the gods, but because of human planning and activity, human bravery and intelligence applied to the concrete and specific problems which made up the war. The story of the war is then a human story; the losses were human, the glories and victories human, too. All this is by way of restating that the Civil War will continue to have great human interest to Americans in particular, to students of human behavior generally.

As James Ford Rhodes correctly predicted more than half a cen-

16. Catton, *Mr. Lincoln's Army*, 174.

17. Muster Rolls, Company E, 30th Regiment United States Colored Troops, July-August, 1864, Regimental Records, War Records Division, National Archives, Washington, D. C.

tury ago, the war is the central pivot of our national experience. It is our Iliad, our Thermopylae. In our American glossary of terms there will always be only one Corn Field, one Crater, one Stone Wall. The consequences of this war are with us today and will remain with us. Individuals may, if they please, ignore the existence of this war. That will not alter the fact that the war did exist. Some individuals cannot ignore that fact.

Every candidate for the presidential nomination must keep the war in mind this year. Every senator and congressman must remember the war and try to discover the permanent lessons it taught. Every Supreme Court justice must try to understand and clarify those lessons. No one can turn back the clock of history.

Over against the heritage of hate that flowed from the war, Americans must place the heritage of a broadened democracy, of a union preserved from disruption, of a national destiny clarified and refined by the fires of war and brought into clearer focus by the suffering and passion that fed those fires. For us today the language of Lincoln has real meaning because there was a war, out of the destruction and carnage and misery of which came a new birth of freedom for all Americans. This significance of our Civil War can never be repeated too often or appreciated enough. This significance has meaning today not only for Americans but for all men everywhere.