

SKANDALON

Volume 3, No. 3

SKANDALON

October 28, 1964

EDITORIAL

Campus Christian Council, during the coming weeks, will initiate and (hopefully) perpetuate two new radical activities off campus.

The first of these is a recreational facility for State students - a coffee house, to be called The Golden Eye. We wish to point out that there is a difference between a coffee house and a coffee hour. One amazing difference is that our coffee house is open from 9:00 p.m. till 1:00 a.m. Furthermore, a coffee house is a place; it is an on-going institution; it is an atmosphere - an atmosphere conducive to discussion. We are convinced that a coffee house is an essential accoutrement to any respectable university. We feel that the potentialities are enormous. It is not for these reasons, however, that we recommend The Golden Eye for your consideration - it is because we sincerely believe that the opportunities for discussion on a serious plane regarding serious topics are, now, limited; that such discussion is more than valuable, it is stimulating, interesting, entertaining, and rewarding; and that, whether as active participant or thoughtful observer, you will find such an opportunity for discussion at The Golden Eye. As editor of Skandalon, I therefore extend my invitation and the invitation of Campus Christian Council to be with us on Friday, October 30, at 9:00 p.m., at 820 Madison Avenue, for the opening of The Golden Eye.

The second of these is a church service. The issues involved have been discussed lengthily within this journal and outside of it. What is at stake is a church - your church - a Church of the University Community. Some of us already have churches, of course. Some do not. Some of us are even happy with the church we are attending. Some of us are not. It is to the latter, those who are dissatisfied or unhappy, or who simply want something more relevant to their lives as collegiate Christians, to whom the Church of the University Community makes its greatest appeal. If you wish to belong to a church that is different, a parish that is primarily concerned with your own particular needs as Christians on campus - check the bus schedule on page four for time and place.

-Editor-

WHO IS J. ROGER LEE, AND OTHER THOUGHTS ON THE 1964 CAMPAIGN

I have a recurring feeling of deja vu during Presidential campaigns. In particular, I begin to suspect that the great numbers of polemics from either side are really the work of a few authors. As an addict of the detective story, a favorite pastime of mine has been to determine their true identity. After a careful study of the internal evidence, especially the relentless pursuit of the truth through the thickets of legal and philosophical obscurity, I have decided that J. Roger Lee is really Arthur Krock, doing a bit of moonlighting from the Times. (Or perhaps Arthur Krock is really J. Roger Lee. The possibility is fascinating.)

Under either by-line, his work bewilders an amateur in abstruse political analysis such as myself. However, Mr. Lee (or should I say Mr. Krock) has done us a service in his Skandalon essay by pointing out the lack of empirical content in campaign slogans. Extremism is an empty box, and cannot be labelled good or bad until we specify the behavior that we term extreme. The box can be filled nevertheless, and, in the do-it-yourself American tradition, most of us do so. To me, and possibly to others, political extremism means the rejection of the semi-open procedures for achieving a democratic consensus, but rather the pursuit of violent or conspiratorial methods toward desired ends. I regard this as bad, although Mr. Lee may not, and feel that Mr. Goldwater's San Francisco speech encouraged this behavior. Extremism in the defense of anything, from liberty to bubble-gum chewing, is a vice. Means are important, and their goodness must be evaluated, as well as the goodness of ends. If I am an incompetent teacher, surely Mr. Lee would not shoot me to eliminate me, although competent teaching is a desirable end. To seek liberty by certain means will debase it, or prevent its attainment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Lee's candidates for campaign issues, freedom or paternalism, are boxes as empty as extremism. Whose freedom? Freedom to do what? What behavior does Mr. Lee have in mind? Much of the Goldwater campaign consists of handing us more of these empty boxes. Surely the conservative voice would be

(continued, page two)

WHO IS J. ROGER LEE, AND OTHER THOUGHTS ON THE 1964 CAMPAIGN, continued

invaluable to remind us that expansion of government involves costs as well as benefits. Growth of the government section does bring certain coercions of individuals. The Supreme Court does make laws (and has been doing so for 150 years). Government departments such as State and Agriculture are bureaucratic. Viet Nam is a mess, and the Johnson administration has minimized or misrepresented the disorder (as did the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations as well).

Intelligent public debate on these and other questions is essential, but this campaign has not promoted this debate. I have been one of those who have observed the more ideological British party politics with longing, yet I am afraid that the coming of ideology to American politics in 1964 has lowered the quality and obscured the issues in public debate. We cannot ask the style of a graduate seminar from Mr. Johnson and Mr. Goldwater, but surely we can ask for more than we have been getting.

I am afraid we must blame this on Mr. Goldwater. He is, on his record, a man of principle, but concern with principles, such as liberty or freedom or isolation is merely play with the empty boxes. Principles must be translated into policy, specific social actions to achieve desired social states, and here Mr. Goldwater loses interest. Richard Hofstadter, in the New York Review of Books, pointed out that Mr. Goldwater was not active in Senate committees attempting to formulate or modify legislation, as was another conservative hero, Robert Taft, but began and ended his policy contribution by voting No. Concern for principles without experience or interest in the hard and ambiguous processes of policy formulation leads to the pseudo-profundities of the bull session, and this is the level of much of the 1964 campaign. Public policy is not simple, to be solved in speeches after dinner. As I look into my heart, as Mr. Goldwater recommends, I find him certainly not evil, but innocent and at times foolish. My own innocence and foolishness is of trivial social consequence, but the innocence and foolishness of a President is surely of more importance.

-H. D. Birckmayer-

VIEWPOINT

Sex comprises one of the more significant (and sensitive) areas of concern in the lives of modern men and women. The viewpoints expressed in the following article are not necessarily those of the editor

of Skandalon. We do believe, however, that the questions raised are important ones; we submit them for your consideration, and cordially remind you that the topic for discussion at The Golden Eye, this Friday, will be the meaning of and implications of sex in our time.

-Editor-

THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF
SEX BEHAVIOR ON CAMPUS
by Gregory Moglia

Norman Cousins in a recent issue of the Saturday Review described American society as one of blurred values which have been promoted by the fantastic pace of our lives. His point is worth taking into account when we focus upon questions of sexual morality on the campus.

The campus can be a breeding place for sexual aberration. The on-campus student is made keenly aware of the alternatives regarding sex. As parents and church tend to lose influence, there is a corresponding increase in the strength and influence of one's fellows.

What is the nature of the choices which cause the clouding of values regarding sex? To this observer, there are three basic alternatives:

First, there is the outlook which can be seen as conventional morality. The individuals involved are paragonized by the Doris Day movie stereotype: have fun by dating, search for the one and only, remain virginal until "he" is found. Sex is controlled by that meeting of the right guy for marriage purposes.

Next, we meet the kinks kids. The resolve of this individual rests upon three sexual criteria: wherever, whenever, and however. This is a live-for-the-moment, there's-only-one-life-to-lose philosophy. Entanglements with anybody or anything only hinder the pursuit of action and fun.

Resting somewhat precariously between the two is the individual whose outlook may be summarized as "Sex is fine, but you better be in love." "Love" becomes the ultimate answer, the cure-all. "I'm in love," once spoken, becomes reason enough. The phrase has developed enormous ambiguity, however, for "falling in love" can coincide with the dropping of a milkman's bottle.

Having viewed the possibilities open to us, we can now consider the individuals involved. But for those not involved, those who have not made a selection from the choices above, little can be offered in the way of solution. Social influences exert their force and all one can do is pick and choose as the situation warrants. Unless one's decision is irrevocable and final, there will always be grounds for a dissenting viewpoint within one's own mind.

(continued on page three)

THE CHURCH OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

motive

Meeting for Worship

8:30 a.m. Service of Holy Communion according to the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal Church

9:00 a.m. Ministry of the Word and Ministry of the Lord's Supper for all Students and Faculty

at

United-Fourth Presbyterian Church
916 Western Avenue

Busses:

Leave Sayles Hall: 8:00 and 8:35
Leave State Cafeteria: 8:15 and 8:50
Arrive at the Church: 8:20 and 8:55
Return from the Church: 10:00

The first issue of motive has arrived. For those who know the magazine, this will be good news. For those who don't, a treat is in store, for it is one of the most exciting and original campus publications in the country. Though published by the Methodist Student Movement, students (and faculty) of many denominations and traditions will find it exciting and provocative. The cost is very reasonable, so stop at 501 State Street for a copy.

Skandalon is the biweekly journal of Campus Christian Council. Articles, poems, essays, drawings, or short stories are welcome. Welcome also are written responses to articles published in Skandalon. Anyone interested in submitting work should contact Guy McBride, Editor, via Student Mail or at 500 Hamilton Street (489-4162), or leave materials at 501 State Street.

TO THE EDITOR:

It is well to have pointed out to us, in this time of political emotionalism, that the term "extremism" is merely a quantitative designation referring to a position in relation to the middle point of any political belief. And this was accomplished by Mr. Lee in the last issue. However, the objective and academic tone of the analysis disintegrates with the influx, in the last two paragraphs, of definitely political propaganda. It is these final statements, not the whole presentation, with which I wish to take exception.

Mr. Lee states that one cannot make an ethical judgment of an extremist position until one knows of what quality the position is a quantitative extreme. In the final analysis, he concludes that Senator Goldwater's position is the "extreme of the defense of liberty," which conclusion he bases on the Senator's remark that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice." He then goes on to say that the Senator's position is "either good or evil as the defense of liberty is either good or evil."

This is excellent propaganda technique, for who in this country could justifiably say that the defense of liberty is evil? Therefore, they feel obliged to concede that Senator Goldwater's extremist position is likewise not evil. Not so, however. For in this case, it is not the ends alone to which we must apply the ethical judgment, those ends being the defense of liberty as stated; we must also take full account of the means as well, for just as Senator Goldwater is capable of having an extreme position on ends to be accomplished, he is likewise as able to hold an extreme position on the means through which those ends are to be accomplished. And it is on this dimension of Senator Goldwater's position which I base my exception to Mr. Lee's statement as to the "goodness" or "evil" of this instance of extremism.

I do not wish to involve myself in a political discussion around the subject of these extreme "means," but merely desire to point out what has been overlooked, whether for the purpose of propaganda or of honest oversight. In either case one must recognize that Mr. Lee's argument as to the basically quantitative character or extremism is in all aspects valid, though the inferences drawn therefrom are not, or are, at least, incomplete.

-Phil Lord, Jr.-

THE GOLDEN EYE

A Coffee House for State University Students and Faculty

Every Friday night, from 9:00 p.m. to 12 midnight (or thereafter) at 820 Madison Avenue (between Quail and Ontario)*

Beginning this Friday, October 30
With William Grimes (philosopher) and Robert Garvin (theologian)
in dialogue on "Sexuality and Human Meaning"

All intelligent, inquisitive and vocal people invited!

*Actually it's in the basement of Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, but never mind.