with the hope of being made over, redirected. . . . The daughter of a conservative lawyer, doctor, banker or businessman will have chosen Vassar in all probability with the idea of transcending her background. And if she herself is not conscious of such plans for herself, her teachers have them for her.

Here is a precious testimonial to our educators and to their interpretation of "academic freedom." For all their caterwaulings about "letting a student make up his own mind" our colleges *do* promote an orthodoxy, and one to their liking.

Now, by what legerdemain do the professors obtain the right to implant seeds of their own choice? And why do they look upon criticism of their estate as a minor blasphemy? It was never, in our country, an unworthy act to reproach autocrats. Not until recently. Nor was it unacceptable for individuals to support that in which they believed—no matter on whose domain they trespassed. Until recently. But modern educators, as they go about their business of shaping student attitudes, have been able to make of themselves a unique, inviolable sect. As for the common laymen with no especial privilege—just bury them with ridicule for their refusal to accept passively an ideology which is inimical to a free people.

Foreign Trends

Europe Discounts the UN

If lack of faith in the prospects, even the plausibility, of the UN be a hallmark of isolationism, Europe seems universally struck by that political counterpart of leprosy. Any American whom a sentimental metropolitan press has conditioned for unquestioning reverence toward the UN would have felt exposed to stark blasphemy had he, in recent weeks, heard Europeans talk of that organization. It sounded positively like a post mortem, though not exactly like a lament. At the moment, the Europeans seem to have little doubt that the UN is dead—a general, if perhaps hasty, assumption which leaves them much less shocked than, say, the busy rumors of forthcoming cuts in American doles to Europe.

The articulate and politically relevant circles (which alone, of course, can be meant by that sweeping generality, "the Europeans") tended to take Mr. Trygve Lie's resignation as Secretary General for the official announcement of the UN's decease. "Does that mean that the United Nations as an effective force in the world is doomed?" asked, for example, the impeccably prudent London *Spectator;* and answered its rhetorical question, as behooves a well-mannered British journal of opinion, with a politely conditional "It may have to be admitted in the end." The point is that no one in Europe would take exception to what, in the chilled British climate of public debate, was tantamount to a complete dismissal of UN's life expectancy.

In all fairness to the Europeans, they have never gone for the irrational adoration of the UN, so fashionable (and arrogantly intolerant) in this country. Few Europeans have ever called the UN "the last best hope of mankind," or pronounced man "obsolete" unless he accepted the gospel according to Lie. For Europeans, the UN was from the start nothing more than an interesting second try at a League of Nations—certainly not the kind of redeeming sunrise the high-strung school of American UN propagandists made it out to be. And a success of that second try would have rather astonished Europeans who, contrary to some romantic Americans, were not at all surprised by the pitiable debacle of the original League: it is against the European grain, not to speak of European experience, to expect the preservation of peace from moralistic schemes rather than the amassment of persuasive force.

For the moment, at any rate, the consensus among informed Europeans seems to be that the UN must be written off for all practical purposes of international action—and that not much will be lost by doing so. Again contrary to starry-eyed American editorial writers, politically trained Europeans fail to notice any mystic element in a conglomeration of hired politicians who, one and all, must obey binding orders from their respective capitals. Consequently, the apparent petrifaction of the UN is accepted in Europe as a perfectly natural corollary of the dominant fact of our era—the irreconcilable conflict between the Soviet Empire and the United States.

There is only one note of genuine regret in the European post mortems, and this note will be even more offensive to American ears than Europe's unsentimental dismissal of the UN. For the last few years (and the readers of the "internationalist" U. S. press have been kept carefully uninformed about this fact), the European chancelleries have appreciated the UN as an instrument to contain, not the Soviets, but the U. S. The governments of the Old World, and of Asia no less, have learned to employ the UN against what they call "American rashness"—that is, the American inclination to translate ideas into action. Notoriously adept at balancing acts, the Foreign Offices of the Old World took all possible advantage of a preposterously fictitious set-up in which Luxembourg, say, swung as much voting power as the U. S. The Soviet Union, of course, did not give a hoot about such funny pretensions. But Achesonian America remained for several critical years impressed by the UN's surrealistic mathematics, and even paid the bill for Europe's diplomatic lark. Now that the UN seems more or less demolished, at least in Europe's current estimation, knowing Europeans honestly lament the end of the free ride.

And from here on they expect the revival of old-fashioned alliances. Off the record, European statesmen leave no doubt that this change will, if anything, tie their countries more firmly to the U. S. than any fictitious world organization. But there is at the moment some moving nostalgia in European Foreign Offices for the bountiful opportunities of the formalized UN minuet. Yet the ball seems to be over and Europeans, always realists, are getting ready for sober business. CANDIDE

The Right to Be Conservative

By J. DONALD ADAMS

The independence of spirit which was our strength, says a distinguished critic, has been supplanted by the weakness of conformity with prevailing opinion.

In the gray granite city of Aberdeen there is carved in stone over a door of Marischal College this motto from the founder of that ancient seat of learning:

THEY SAYE
QUHAT SAYE THEY?
LET THEM SAYE!

It is a good maxim—for education, for life; and one which we Americans more than any other people, perhaps, stand in need to profit by. For much too long a time we have been beset by fear of what "they" will or might say. The state slaves of the totalitarian countries also live in fear of what "they" will say, but "they" in their case means very definitely the party leaders who rule their lives and thoughts. In our case "they" is a shadowy bogeyman, or, more concretely, Mr. and Mrs. Brown, who may look down their noses at us from next door.

This unhappy attitude has not always been true of us. In large measure this country was settled and developed by men who held passionate beliefs and convictions which other men in places of *outer* authority said they must not hold; those who came here chose to act in obedience to an *inner* authority.

That was their strength. But the strength has dwindled, in spite of fresh infiltrations of the same spirit. I am thinking of such emigrations as that which accompanied the German revolution of 1848, and, of course, the smaller number who in recent years have been able to turn their backs on any of those reactionaries who now threaten the future of the free world. The strength has dwindled in spite of our increased awareness of those factors in temperament and character which have contributed to the making of what we think of as the American way of life.

In this world of fears in which we live, none has been stronger among Americans than the fear of being thought conservative, and it is that fear with which I wish to deal. I am not writing a plea for conservatism as the only proper mental attitude, which would be silly; but a plea for the *right* to be conservative, and to be so without a sense of embarrassment or of the need for apology. There is among us, and particularly among those whom we describe as "intellectuals," a very real sense of shame at being thought conservative by other intellectuals, and a definite imagined need to apologize for any attitude not shared in common with the intellectual herd. And there are no more timid sheep than are to be found in that flock.

The String and the Bow

Let us remember that there are two kinds of conservatism: one real and constructive, the other false and footling. The true conservatism, the kind which can serve a constructive function, has its roots in inner conviction, in intellectual and moral honesty and integrity. The false conservatism has no roots; it floats on the current which follows the easiest way. It is the product of cowardice, not of courage. With that kind of conservatism we need have no patience, and we should ignore it or sweep it aside, as the occasion demands, wherever and whenever it is encountered.

Our most pressing task in this country is to build and maintain an intelligent and fearless conservatism. It is a task which must be carried on conjointly with those created by the present world emergency, lest in the process of struggling with these latter, we lose the capacity and the power to perform the first. It is my belief that we can not built this form of conservatism while we are hamstrung by a sense of fear and shame at being thought conservative. While we remain thus hobbled we are not fully, in spite of the casual way in which we use the word, *free* men.

We need to keep always in our minds the knowledge that there is a polarity which runs through all things that are alive: sleeping and waking, hunger and fulness, defeat and victory—with death itself at the opposite pole from life. That is why the totalitarian state is dead at birth; it is built about one pole only. The principle of life is absent at its core. The conservative and the radical attitude are as the two ends of a cross-cut saw, or like the string and the bow; without them both, the wood can not be cut, nor the arrow sped to its mark. Only by interaction between the two principles does man ever effect what we call progress; the radical impulse, unchecked, ends in anarchy; the conservative, in stultification. Some natures incline to the one, some to the other; both are necessary factors in the vital conduct of life and society, and there is thus no need for one or the other to apologize for being what it is.

Keeping up with the Joneses

There is of course no more striking manifestation of the fear of being thought conservative than in the history of American public opinion concerning the Soviet Union. The record of shifting winds in that matter constitutes one of the tragi-comic episodes in our history. The amount of misinformation and downright falsehood which we as a people swallowed during the heyday of the Moscow propagandists and fellow-travelers made a perfect illustration of the American intellectual's tendency to run with the pack. To remain skeptical or to assert one's conviction became increasingly difficult for