Professor Dumas Malone, the second lecturer in Rice's spring series on "The American Political Tradition: Theory and Practice," brought to the campus last week an engaging personality and a stimulating lecture on the subtleties of the Hamilton-Jefferson Constitutional conflict.

Professor Malone, recognized as the world's leading Jefferson scholar, has the unique distinction of holding faculty positions at two universities.

HIS FAMILIARITY with early struggles over the interpretation of the Constitution naturally makes the development of American government one of Dr. Malone's chief interests; his attitude toward this development, implied during his lecture, clear- ly emerged during a Thresher interview.

Born in Mississippi and educated at Emory and Yale, Dr. Malone is a true Southern conservative in the traditional sense, a man who is closely tacked to the Jeffersonian principles of individualism. But he is also a man of the growth of a society so vast and complex that it requires the re-examination of old ideas of government and application of new methods.

Professor Malone agreed that it was interesting to view the development of American governmental institutions as a continuing attempt to reconcile the extreme positions taken by Jefferson and Hamilton in Constitutional interpretation -- the former, against centralization of power; the latter, strongly in favor of it. He warned, however, against taking this oversimplification too literally.

Seen from this viewpoint, Dr. Malone said, the recent trend in America is much more Hamiltonian than Jeffersonian; he cited Theodore Roosevelt's belief in the efficacy of action by the central government. The growing centralization of American government has been, in fact, a result of "bigness" in American society -- the recognition of great forces at work in domestic affairs.

This change in method of government, he continued, is not surprising. People tend to forget how much of the growth of Jeffersonian society of a century and a half ago. Hamilton, Dr. Malone remarked, was far ahead of his time. But in his constitutional concept, he had laid down the foundation for expansion, which has become a necessity in the twentieth century.

Moreover, he said, Jefferson's concern for local government is often overemphasized. It is true that Jefferson was a localist, but this fact arose from his concern for the individual. He was primarily an individualist, he believed, and local government a means as a protection for the individual.

"We can't assume that Jefferson would be in favor of the same methods of government he would have in a later day," Dr. Malone said, Franklin Roosevelt couldn't be content with the negativism of the old Jeffersonianism; positive action was a necessity in 1933. The concept of the Presidency that grew with FDR and is carried on, to some extent, by Kennedy is much more dynamic than that envisioned by Jefferson -- but, Dr. Malone said, it is not needed in Jefferson's day.

Today, he said, we must have a strong central government in order to safeguard the individual. The world situation would be enough to require such strength; but, Dr. Malone asked, "Even in domestic affairs, how can the individual stand alone against such mighty forces as big labor?" Our answer to this problem is to use Hamiltonian moans (centralized power) to achieve Jeffersonian ends (protection of the individual).

Dr. Malone is a fervent believer in the importance of the specific over the general: "We're too wedded to theory. We must look at the individual case." Sometimes, theory gets in the way. He cited the example of President Hoover -- "a good man, but unfortunate." When Hoover faced the depression, Dr. Malone said, he was handicapped by the incorrect theory that government could do nothing directly for individuals. FDR, he continued, made many mistakes -- but everyone knew that he was trying to do something for the people.

The VIEW opposing FDR was highly theoretical and dogmatic. When we reach a crisis, Dr. Malone stressed, we must act -- "the ingenious minds will work out a theory later.

The welfare state -- the concept of positive action for the individual by the government -- is new concept. Does it destroy the individual's freedom? "Well, anything the government does limits freedom to some extent -- but you can't say I'm losing freedom when I receive social security payments. You must judge each specific case on its merits.

Our primary purpose in government, he stated, is the protection of the individual; it is in this respect that we use Hamiltonian means for Jeffersonian ends. "But some people are trying to use Jeffersonian means for Hamiltonian ends -- the protection of a certain interest. This is to go backward, and it means a bigger absurdity. The sad thing is that the people of the south think they should spend their own halcyon horses and buggy days."