landslide vote after utterly disdaining
the medium and stamping the
state. Happy Chandler's victory in
Kentucky was largely sans TV.
These instances may serve to plant
the seed of doubt in the minds of
Republican schemes, some of whom
have felt that the President could
run successfully merely by standing
in front of a camera.

Stevenson had little to lose but
he lost it. He did not officially enter
the primary, did not give his bless-
ing to the slate entered on his behalf
and did not visit the state. If he had
taken as many as four of the dele-
gates, his supporters could have
claimed victory. He did accumulate
about 4,000 write-in votes, but his
state of delegates, including some
supposed powers in the state, was
swamped. It was an unexpectedly
poor showing.

On the Republican side it was all
Eisenhower, Peace and Prosperity,
although this state is no cornucopia.
The big news, of course, was the
unprecedented number of write-ins
for Vice-President Nixon. This spont-
aneous demonstration of popular
support was obviously a reaction to
reports that he was to be dropped
from the ticket.

IT WAS rumored here that there
was a deal on to ditch Nixon and
replace him with Massachusetts
Governor Christian Herter. Impli-
cated, according to the rumor, were
former New York Governor Dewey
and the omnipotent Sherman Adams.
If Herter had scored a write-in vic-
tory, that would have ended things
for Nixon—Checkers, St. Patrick's
Day and the Respectable Republi-
can Cloth Coat notwithstanding.
But the boy wonder of American
politics again demonstrated, con-
clusively, his amazing knack of turn-
ing adversity to advantage. There is
no doubt that many New Hampshire
voters thought he was being picked
on. There was considerable opinion
that the party, if not the President,
was being publicly ungrateful for
his considerable partisan services,
in addition there was Governor
Lane Dwinell, a strong Nixon sup-
porter.

The Nixon write-ins seem to have
stirred the President from his watch-
and-wait policy. He told his press
conference last week that he would
be delighted to have the Vice-Presi-
dent as a running mate again.

Other conclusions to be drawn
from this important primary: Con-
trary to expectations, Senator Ke-
fauver may give Adlai Stevenson a
real run for his money. A strong
showing by Kefauver in this week's
Minnesota primary, plus Kefauver
victories in either California or
Florida, might seal Mr. Stevenson's
democratic doom. It also looks as
though liberals and segments of the
Eastern press have again succeeded
in making a martyr out of Richard
Milhous Nixon. There is just the
bare, unpalatable possibility that this
Epworth League Machiavelli may
turn out in 1956, as he did in 1952,
to be a definite asset to the Repub-
lican ticket.

---

MISSISSIPPI REBEL

On a Texas Campus .. by William W. Morris

THE CURRENT controversy be-
 tween my newspaper, the Daily
Texan, and the University of Texas
Board of Regents goes much deeper
than one might believe. This news-
paper has always been one of the
nation's finest college dailies; its ed-
torial prerogative has always been
something to be admired; and in
times of stress for the university it
has risen to heights that would do
credit to the mature profession. The
controversy transcends the locale. It
represents a typical intrusion of
state politics into education. It un-
derscores the coercion exercised by
economic interests whose endeavors
to mold conformity and stifle dissent
are rather prominent in our country
today. And it calls attention to one
of the less noble of our American
traditions: the tradition of a "kept"
college press, badgered by state leg-
islatures, college administrators and
students themselves, and all but ig-
ored by professional journalism.

It was six weeks ago that the uni-
versity regents, appointees of Gov-
ernor Allan Shivers, announced they
were tightening up on Daily Texan
editorial policy. Obviously they had
been highly disturbed by certain-as-
pects of the Texan's categorical de-
defense of student press freedom and
its editorial comments on "contro-
versial" state and national issues.
The Texan had gone on record
against the Shivers administration.
It had deplored scandals which had
rocked Texas in past months. It had
asked that the state's oil and gas
interests pay more taxes. It had sought
intelligence, good will and enlight-
ened gradualism in the university's
desegregation problem, and had lauded
Texans for their moderate but tolerant approach to integra-
tion. It had stood firmly against the
Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill,
one of the few Texas papers to do
so. In short, it had committed the
crime of being vigorous and out-
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spoken, naively idealistic and exuberantly but not radically liberal in a predominantly conservative state.

Many times previously members of the board of regents had shown their disapproval of the paper's policies. Prior to the executive session in which they unanimously drafted the censorship edict, they advertised—perhaps far more than they intended—their political and economic allegiances. At an official meeting with student body representatives, they angered some of the campus' outstanding young leaders, including the student president and vice-president, by asserting that the Daily Texan should not discuss controversial state and national topics, by announcing that college students were not interested in such topics, by saying that the Texan had gone far astray in criticizing the Harris-Fulbright bill and by accusing the editor of being a "mouthpiece," supposedly for Texas liberals.

Describing their censorship edict as based on legal considerations rather than principle, they cited the rider on state appropriation bills, which says no state money "shall be used for influencing the outcome of any election, or the passage or defeat of any legislative measure." Advancing a step further, they announced that "editorial preoccupation with state and national political controversy" would also be prohibited.

The edict was promptly tested. Two highly critical editorials outlining the implications of the order were submitted to the editorial director and the acting dean of the School of Journalism, the regents' delegated representatives. A guest editorial from the New York Times attacking the Harris-Fulbright bill was also submitted, as were several paragraphs by Thomas Jefferson on press freedom, written under the guise of a personal column. All were rejected. The editor then called a meeting of the student-dominated Texas Student Publications board of directors, quasi-publishers of the Daily Texan. The students approved the editorials, and they were printed in the next day's paper. The controversy was underway.

IN THE days that followed, the Texan editorialized vehemently against the move to suppress. The student body, for the most part, was sympathetic. Roland Dahlin, the student president and an advocate of campus press freedom, helped organize the resistance. He authorized a brilliant young law student, William Wright, to represent the students legally. Wright, confronting with some of Texas' most respected attorneys and legal scholars, refuted the applicability of the appropriations rider by pointing up the Texan's financial independence (its funds are derived from two sources: student activity fees and advertising). He said the regents' interpretation of the rider had "terrifying implications" and reasoned it could be used just as logically, or illogically, to stifle legitimate comment among students, faculty and quasi-independent corporations housed on the campus: the Ex-Students' Association, the Texas Law Review and others.

The student legislature by a 25 to 1 vote, passed a free-press resolution. Later the Texas Intercollegiate Students' Association, representing most of the state's colleges and universities, approved a similar resolution. Campus organizations, including the Young Democrats and the Young Republicans, lined up with the Texan. On the other hand, the faculty—publicly at least—kept silent.

Certain regents fought back. Claude Vyles, a ranchman and oil operator, told the Austin American, "We feel the Daily Texan has gone out of bounds in discussing the Harris-Fulbright bill when 66 per cent of Texas money comes from oil and gas." He also said, "We are just trying to hold [the editor] to a college yell."

J. Frank Dobie, the Texas historian and folklorist, attacked the regents: "They are as much concerned with free educational enterprise as a razorback sow would be with Keats's 'Ode to a Grecian Urn.'" The Texas Observer, a courageous liberal weekly edited by former Texan editor and Oxford-educated Ronnie Dugger, forged a major editorial campaign in our behalf. The New York Post, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Denver Post, the Raleigh News and Observer and the Fort Worth Star-Telegram editorialized favorably. But the Dallas News, Texas' most articulate newspaper, criticized the Texan's stand, as did the magazine Editor and Publisher. Some twenty-five college papers sided with us, two were critical. The staff of the Texan (Managing Editor Carl Burgen wrote, "I stand with the editor") resisted censorship; many said they would walk out if the editors were fired.

AT THE moment the situation is quiescent. President Logan Wilson, a capable administrator caught in the crossfire, has shuttled the issue off to the Texas Student Publications board, which recently upheld the Daily Texan's right to discuss state and national issues. A more substantial "reclamation" of Daily Texan editorial freedoms will be prepared for the regents' consideration at their April meeting. At the moment the intentions of the board are rather dubious. There are only three journalism professors on the eleven-member body, and they are caught in the same crosscurrent. If the board does believe in student press freedom, and I am certain its members do, they nonetheless are beginning to look with much distavor upon the individual prerogatives of an editor. There seems to be a trend toward a collectivism in thought and policy, in which the editors may be stripped of their rights on controversial topics and the board itself will frequently edit, subdue or censor. Up until now the board has officially possessed that power, but has never used it. I fear strongly that the individualism of future editors (they are elected yearly by popular vote of the student body) may be the price paid for our defiance of the regents. As the North Carolina Daily Tar Heel, one of the few free college papers, has editorialized:
"The Daily Texan summoned its legal and philosophical resources and claimed uneasy victory over the regents. . . . But it was a Pyrrhic victory, almost.""If the victory is Pyrrhic, it is still victory. The Texan is still a student newspaper, and free conscience at this university has at least won for itself a stay of execution.

THE Texan case is nothing new to college journalism. Today the trend on American campuses is toward absolute censorship of college papers. This seems particularly true in state universities, where the power of the legislative purse string can be used to silence legitimate comment. The preponderance of censored college papers is an affront to the dignity of the nation. The "kept" ones pour into our office from all corner of the land, speaking their shameful, tongueless idiom. They hide their shame by imploring students to turn over a new leaf at the start of a semester, give blood to a blood drive, support the football team, use their leisure more wisely, collect wood for a bonfire. They are by all rights dead, victims of an educational hypocrisy worse than treason, and their meaningless editorials tear young men's guts with a frustration they cannot express.

Such seems to be the temper of the times. The First Amendment, of course, does not apply to college journalism. Institutional governing boards are autonomous, as the recent Lucy expulsion at the University of Alabama illustrates. These boards are hypersensitive to criticism from state politicians and moneyed interests. To appease legislatures, the easiest way is to suppress. Ergo, censorship; and ergo the relative few campus voices that still speak bravely. These are centered in the Ivy League, where the absolute freedom of papers like the Harvard Crimson and the Cornell Sun is taken for granted.

The current plight of college journalism can, in turn, be integrated into an even broader whole. Throughout the land, the threat to constitutional liberties is greater than ever, simply because conformity has never been so completely sanctioned economically, legally and morally. Most American educational institutions seem to have surrendered to these official and unofficial pressures. I have lived with this stifling conformity on my own campus, and I have been frightened by it. The desire here to side with the majority has never been more manifest. One sees it everywhere: in the classroom, the coffee session, the committee meeting, the Greek lodge. The great goal at my university today is an easy and profitable job, two cars, a pretty wife, three children (two boys and a girl), two weeks' vacation with pay, and a 21-inch-plus TV with at least six snow-free channels. As a consequence we are turning out accomplished nonentities, faultless and safe and more than able to please the corporation or the boss; but we are failing to turn out individuals competent and willing to test new ideas and sometimes criticize old ones. Yet it was such as these who made America.

MY generation has been labeled the "silent" one, which indeed I think it is. But the generation which came before us was the lost one, until it found itself; unhappily it too has suddenly become quite silent. I am rather ashamed of our silence, and sometimes I regret we have never been lost, because we are so smugly certain of our crass goals.

A silent press is the manifestation of a silent age, and I have no other honest choice than to set the newspaper that is briefly mine against the tenuous fabric of national, institutional and personal conformity. The sporadic reactions, as seen in my fellow students' defense of press freedom, provide a foundation of hope. I believe that on the campuses of our universities and colleges, traditional guardians of our basic liberties, must be found the solution to the dilemma that faces the American man as he moves closer and closer toward collective, security and farther from individual responsibility to himself, his nation and his God.

JAMMING THE AIRWAYS

Britain on the Spot . . . by Saul Carson

United Nations, N. Y.

IF THE GREEKS and Cypriotes were angry last week when Great Britain announced it would resort to "experimental" jamming to drown out the "dreadful effects" of Radio Athens broadcasts beamed to Cyprus, hackles also arose elsewhere. Washington, long the champion of anti-jamming resolutions, must have

SAUL CARSON, veteran U. N. correspondent, has written extensively for and about radio.

squirmed. Those Russians who have recently rediscovered their sense of humor must have doubled up with laughter. British spokesmen who so often condemned Russia's "considered interference with radio signals" in debates and talkfests here must have been looking for holes to crawl into. And U. N. correspondents were absolutely incredulous, as they refreshed their memories, by reference to U. N. archives, to Britain's past pious characterization of jamming as a "flagrant violation of the principles of freedom of information."

Jamming is the broadcast of noises for the purpose of drowning out other broadcasts. When the Nazis invaded Albania in 1939, the Albanians transmitted over their radio stations frantic appeals for help. But these calls never got through because Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister, had anticipated such an international SOS. He had arranged for a large number of radio transmitters to blanket Albania's cries, feeding into his transmitters such sounds as
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