compliance with the order even during the years of litigation. And so it is not fantastic to expect the federal government to use both its police powers and its subsidies to disorganize Southern life for at least fifty years.

A second alternative is to resort to the use of violence—the Ku Klux Klan way. "Citizens councils"—which are groups formed for the specific purpose of resisting the enforcement of the Supreme Court decision—have already appeared in the South. In the backward areas where so many isolated white parents must be ordered to send their children to predominantly Negro schools, orators are beginning to thump the tubs about "fighting to the last man." The fiery cross is not far behind.

For a picture of what such a movement can result in, one need only refer to the novel *Gone With the Wind*. That is, if a real attempt is made to enforce the Supreme Court decision in these areas.

One who knows the South would hardly expect the Governor of any state to send militia to enforce racial integration in the schools. His political life would be at stake. Furthermore, it is highly questionable whether members of the militia, or any other police force, would do more than make a gesture at enforcement.

That would throw the burden of enforcement on the federal government. The arrival of "outsiders" would simply trigger the already volatile passions. And one can already hear the Civil War boast that "One Southerner can lick two Yankees." Imagine what would happen to the Negroes in these sections if they cooperated with the federal agents; or even if they didn't.

But it is doubtful whether the federal government would ever consent to put its force behind the Supreme Court decision. Politicians are not completely ignorant of history.

The third course open for the Southerner is that of abolishing public schools. Refuge to this escape has already taken place.

In a number of Southern states the legal steps necessary for the separation of the school from the state government have been made. If and when it seems that the federal government does implement the Supreme Court decision, the legislatures in these states can, by a simple majority vote, go out of the education business.

Prince Edward County, Virginia—which was one of the defendants in the court action resulting in the Anti-Segregation Decision—has disapproved the proposed budget for the operation of its schools for 1955-56. Obviously, without money there won't be any public schools. Under the state law the county is required to collect fifty cents for each dollar of assessed valuation for school purposes. The total amount from this tax, it has been estimated, would do no more than pay for the upkeep of the school buildings. There will be nothing for teachers in either white or Negro schools.

Other counties in Virginia are preparing to follow the lead taken by Prince Edward County. The Prince Edward Educational Corporation, a purely private group, has set out to raise a fund of $200,000 to pay white teachers' salaries only. It seems that the people of Prince Edward County will see to it that their children are not educationally neglected. Of course, the Negro children will suffer. But that is the consequence that the "uplifters" should have anticipated.

It is possible, of course, that the pseudo-liberals will try to circumvent such a move by urging the federal government to invade the states and set up federally-controlled schools. This brings up a new constitutional fight, for until the Constitution is changed by further far-fetched interpretation, the business of education is a state matter. (Besides, would the Southerner send his child to an integrated school run by Washington?)

Putting that legal question aside, the South would be doing the nation a favor by demonstrating the superiority of private over public schooling, now that the "progressives" have completely distorted the concept of education. There will always be schools in the South—for white children, at any rate—simply because the Southerner is a civilized human being, the pseudo-liberal to the contrary notwithstanding. He is civilized enough to cling to his right to be "wrong"—without which there are no rights.

Even He Said So

It is the private institutions that set traditions, the standards of academic freedom in America. And because the private institutions do set and maintain these standards, we of the public institutions also enjoy the benefits of such freedom. If private institutions were ever to disappear, the politicians would take over the universities, and there would then be neither educational freedom nor any other kind.

MILTON EISENHOWER, President, Pennsylvania State University, in an address before the Annual Meeting of the Land-Grant Colleges, November 13, 1953

A Reviewer's Notebook

By JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

John T. Flynn's *The Decline of the American Republic* (New York: Devin-Adair, $3) is something in the nature of a last will and testament to the young. In saying this, I am aware that I run the risk of conjuring up two highly erroneous images. The first mistake would be to picture Mr. Flynn as an extremely aged gaffer, with at least one foot in the grave. The second mistake would be to visualize the "young" as downy-cheeked youths just out of their 'teens.

Just for the sake of the record, it isn't that way at all. The "young" to whom Mr. Flynn is addressing his highly edifying sermon include practically everybody under the age of forty-five. And Mr. Flynn himself, though no spring chicken, is still in the full plenitude of his powers. The reason why this is a "last will and testament" is not that Mr. Flynn is old, but that time, in America, is fast running out on the chances to restore the old Republic of our fathers. And the reason why everyone under forty-five is "young" in Mr. Flynn's estimation is that 1930 marked a moral, social, political and economic chasm between the generations. If you attained voting age in the twenties, you still remember the free America That Was. If, on the other hand, you came to your majority a little bit later, the old Republic can be no more than a distant childhood memory to you, vague as a medieval arras on an old castle wall.

The problem, as Mr. Flynn conceives it, is how to turn that dreamy medieval arras into a glowing, vital, realistic panorama of something that was infinitely superior to the bastardized semi-collectivist order under which we now struggle to exist. The "young"—meaning practically everybody under forty-five—have had their moral and political senses blunted. True, the outward forms of American life are still free. The Constitution still prohibits such things as involuntary servitude, cruel and unusual punishments, and deprivation of life, liberty or property without due process of law. But, as Mr. Flynn points out, the Constitution has been sapped by subjection to a trial by modern semantics that has changed the meanings of all the great words.

Involuntary servitude may be prohibited, but that will not gain you an inch with any judge or court in the land if you object to the drafting of a son into the peacetime military forces of the moment. You may have a right to your "property," but your income—or the largest part of it—may be taken by politicians and bestowed without your consent on the minions of Nehru or the coffee growers of Brazil. You may have trouble paying your own insurance, but the State will not permit you to forget the "social insurance" of even a part-time cleaning woman or maid. If you are a shopkeeper you may think you have the right to cut prices on goods that move slowly off your shelves, but if you do this under certain circumstances and in certain places you may be liable for breaking the laws of "fair trade." And if you are destitute in your old age—or forced to live on the inflated pittance of a "social security" for which the government is compelled to tax your children in order to pay it at all—you will get nowhere if you argue that a "cruel and unusual punishment" has been visited upon you in the years when you might have been saving.

So the great words, as Mr. Flynn cogently argues, mean nothing any more. They have been blurred, blunted, fuzzed and otherwise transformed into mere globs of sound that can be used to justify anything, even their obvious opposites. Commerce between the states may mean regulating from Washington the pay and hours of an elevator operator whose workaday travels are almost entirely perpendicular on Manhattan Island. Or this same interstate commerce may mean that you can't raise grain on a ten-acre farm in the backwoods to feed to chickens on that very same farm. What is more, a majority of some very learned justices of the Supreme Court—men who have spent four years in college and three years in law school, where they presumably learned to read the dictionary—have given just this Alice-in-Wonderland twist to the commerce clause of the Constitution. As for the general welfare clause, that means anything that 51 per cent of the voting population may prescribe, even if it is as remote from "generality" or "welfare" as Korea is from Timbuktu.

So don't tell Mr. Flynn that the old Republic stands. They laughed at that crusty old curmudgeon, Mr. Justice McReynolds, when he said, "The Constitution is gone," but McReynolds, for all his shortcomings, had the honesty to respect the dictionary.

In outlining for the "young"—or those under forty-five—just what has happened to the old Republic since 1930, Mr. Flynn sometimes makes the mistake of underestimating certain overseas enemies of the United States. Mr. Flynn may be fundamentally right in assuming that Germany could never have put Nazi commandos ashore on Staten Island or the eastern shore of Maryland, but it is entirely arguable that something had to be done in 1941 to get Hitler off the front pages and to allow the emotions of a distraught world to settle down. The same