

in reply to mr. mil

We have taken the trouble of answering Mr. Mil's article — Academic Freedom and Studentship (cf. page 11) because it does not represent the truth concerning academic freedom at the University of San Carlos. The article, if left unanswered, tends to put not only the University, not only her students, but also this magazine, in bad light before the eyes of the reading public here and abroad, however good Mr. Mil's intention may be.

Mr. Mil's article, insofar as it assumes as true, without valid proof, that academic freedom or, as he calls it, the exercise of the open mind, is limited at the university by the university authorities (who else?), is highly fallacious; he commits the fallacy of *assumptio non probata*, assuming as true something which is yet to be proved. On paragraph 3 of his article, he says:

"Much is observed regarding the limited academic freedom or limited exercise of the open mind in this university. Call it nix, but it's true."

He cites as proof, that (a) there has not been a single student rally in this university, (b) not a single dissenting voice in the school paper, (c) not a single organization yet formed strong enough to stand on its commitments, favorable or unfavorable to the administration. Let us take them one by one:

(a) Does Mr. Mil mean to say, that the presence of student rallies bespeak of the existence of academic freedom in the university, and that, as a logical consequence, their absence prove the contrary? Obviously, this is the necessary implication of Mr. Mil's statement. Analyzing it, we see that Mr. Mil is telling us: Academic freedom is limited or restricted at the University of San Carlos because there has not been a single student rally there. We have not heard of any student rally held at Ateneo de Manila University, or at the University of Santo Tomas, or in any of the universities in Cebu City. Can we rightfully and logically assert then that academic freedom is being restricted or limited in these universities? Following Mr. Mil's reasoning, this seems to be the conclusion. But what a conclusion! Ateneo? limiting academic freedom? University of Santo Tomas? This can't be! But it is, Mr. Mil seems to tell us. Clearly, this is a fallacy — quite often committed by many, and Mr. Mil has shown himself to be not an exception — the fallacy of *non-sequitur*. — "it does not follow" or of false cause — assigning a wrong cause to a certain effect.

(b) The same observation in the preceding paragraph applies to Mr. Mil's second proof of limited academic freedom at the University, namely that there has not been a single dissenting note in the school paper. He commits for the second time the fallacy of *non-sequitur*. We would like to add, however, that there has not been an instance — at least during our stewardship that THE CAROLINIAN has rejected any article for the mere reason of censorship in the sense that Mr. Mil would like to tell us.

(Continued on page 49)

The Canticle for a Night Owl

(Continued from page 38)

shoved him away from where he stood. But his hand was too cold, like a ghost's, so that the young man screamed at the top of his voice: "Ghost, begone!"

"Are you mad?"

"Yes!"

He ran towards the mirror, stood before it and shouted at the reflections he saw there: "Leave me alone! Leave me alone! Demons of the night, leave me alone!"

He turned away from the mirror and looked around the room. The old man and the middle-aged man were nowhere to be found. But when he looked at the mirror again, he saw their reflections there, ghostly, ugly, sneering at him tauntingly. With a bottle of wine, he smashed the mirror into pieces. "I want now! I want the present! And the present only!" He shrieked.

He fell down in a swoon.

But angry voices sprung like vultures

from out the darkness and into the room:

"Fool! Fool! Fool!"

Then there was the jingling laughter of a happy child — innocent and care-free like the verdant grass of May. But it did not last long. It was followed suddenly by a cry of disillusionment of a young man, then by the fiery words of a matured man, defying the laws of the gods and the laws of man. His cogent voice, full of implacable anguish and heavy with wrath rent the stillness of the room and made the night tremble with fear. But again it did not last long. It was followed later by the whimper of defeat and the painful groan of a dying old man.

V

THE YOUNG man thought he was dreaming and perhaps he was. He didn't know.

THE END

EDITORIAL

in reply to mr. mil

(Continued from page 1)

The best proof is the mere fact that we are publishing Mr. Mil's article. Articles have been rejected, not in pursuance of censorship policies, to which we do not adhere, but in pursuance of maintaining the standards of a college magazine and keeping our sacred obligation to our readers.

(c) The same observation in the next preceding paragraph applies to Mr. Mil's proof of limited academic freedom at the university, namely, that there has not been a single organization yet formed strong enough to stand on its commitments, favorable or unfavorable to the administration. He commits for the third time the fallacy of *non-sequitur*. We would like, however, to ask a question, and this is with reference to the Supreme Student Council, regarding which Mr. Mil advocates for total non-interference of the USC Administration: Has there been any instance that the administration unreasonably or arbitrarily interfered with the activities of the Supreme Student Council? The policy seems to be that of harmonious co-operation between the two, not dominion nor interference.

It would have served the cause of clarity better, if Mr. Mil had given us his definition of academic freedom. For the benefit of Mr. Mil and our readers, we are quoting hereunder Morrison's definition (and we hope that any further discussion, oral or written, as to whether we enjoy academic freedom at the university should be taken in the light of this definition:

"1) The right of a teacher or researcher in a university of other institution of higher learning to search for the truth in his chosen field, and interpret his findings and communicate his conclusions to students and public, without being penalized or molested by authorities within or without the university.

"2) The right of a student in an institution of higher learning not only to be taught by unfettered instructors but to have access to all data pertinent to the subject of his study, and to be reasonably free from compulsive rules and regulations of a secondary-school nature.

"3) The right of a teacher or researcher to exercise the freedom of speech, writing and association that all other citizens enjoy, without being molested or discharged from his academic position."

M. L. L. APARTE, JR.