

THE BENNETT BANNER

"Anything Worth Reading, We Write"

TEN CENTS A COPY

\$1.00 PER SUBSCRIPTION

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor..... SYLVIA ROCK, '49
Associate Editor..... ROBERT ANN BROWN, '50
Feature Editor..... WILMA VESTAL, '50
News Editor..... HELEN KIRK, '51
Art Editor..... GWEN CANN, '49
Business Manager..... GLORIA ALEXANDER, '50

Assistant to Business Manager:
BEULAH BULLARD, '51—SHARON WEBBER, '51
BEULAH ROBESON
Exchange Editor..... ROSA MCDANIELS, '50
Circulation Editor..... BETTY McCONAUGHEY, '49
Secretary..... FANNIE DENT, '50

REPORTERS

ROBERT ANN BROWN, '50
DELORES DOUGLAS, '51
GERALDINE KIMBER, '49
MELEA DAVIS, '49
MAXINE HAITH, '49
KATHERINE NEAL, '49

JACQUELINE YOUNG, '49
VIRA KENNEDY, '49
MARY DULIN, '49
ANN STONE, '50
ANNIE SMITH, '49
WILBA HARRIS, '50
GERTRUDE JONES, '50

TYPISTS

RUTH MORGAN, '50
SUE WARD, '50
REGINA RODGERS, '49

ELIZABETH A. JOHNSON, '52
BETTY JOHNSON, '50
MARILYN MOTLEY, '49

PROOFREADERS

EMMA HAZEL, '52
ATHALINE DANCY, '50
AUDREY COCHRAN, '50

BETTY ELLIS, '50
NOLA BEWLEY, '50
RAMONA GEORGE, '50

Personally, I Wonder...

Do you really think privilege is something holy that will bring you all the joys of life with none of the clouds? The French Nobles thought that before the French Revolution, and look where it got them! That's right, not only behind the "eight ball," but underneath the Guillotine. Now some people lose their heads over a few privileges, and some lose their reputations, but it is a losing proposition any way you look at it—that is, without one other thing.

Of course, you'd like to know what the heck that one thing is, so you can continue reading something else, wouldn't you? That's not the idea, though, and I'm not going to tell you. You've got a brain, now use it!

Privileges can be considered one of the worst perils in a lifetime without this "checkmate." It is this "other thing" that has kept people like Roosevelt from turning a Democracy into a dictatorship or that has made people on your campus look to you for your share of it before they grant you your little "Peril pearl!"

Now, the Seniors probably don't realize it, but they're diving right into it head-first. Usually, some Senior gets her neck broken for not carrying "it" out, for not accepting it, or for ignoring it. It is something that cannot be forgotten, ignored, half done, or walked over if you're on the road to graduation (and I guess you are).

But, let's stop playing games and get down to real facts. You know by now (if you carried your share of it) that Responsibility is the "other thing" I'm talking about. And everyone of you who reads this article knows that you don't take your share of it. Well, sister, if you plan to be anything (and if you live long enough you'll be SOMETHING), you'll have to carry it and carry it well. If you don't believe me, stop and ask somebody . . . anybody, in fact. Everybody knows. Really, if we face facts, you know too.

We might call privileges our particular "Ides of March" and, not assuming our responsibilities each of our Brutuses. Believe me, turn your back on it, and it will surely stab you right where it hurts the most, in the . . . results.

As a fellow student I know the angry protest that will immediately leave each of your mouths. You claim that you haven't enough responsibility . . . and look how you cheerfully

pass them by.

I know you don't believe me, so here are some examples of the responsibility you could, if you would, assume:

How many of us like to have dances and parties? Yet, how many help decorate, pay our dues on time, help clean up? Just ask yourself the reason you don't head such committees . . . because you're afraid you'll have to do all the work yourself. Yet, knowing this, you gaily dance the night away on some class martyr's neck. There have been cases of girls decorating the gym practically singlehandedly for a dance and then being so tired and sick they themselves could not attend. What a little acceptance of responsibility on the part of her classmate could have done there!

Then there are the Lyceum programs which always cause bitter feelings. We are offered so many opportunities here which we may never see again, yet how many of us go to programs to which we're not forced? Oh, yes, we say that we don't go to more programs because there are so many we "have" to attend. I wonder if you realize that if you attended the non-compulsory ones there would soon be more and more of these until Chapel would all be a voluntary affair.

We are so fond of demanding things that we do not realize often that the best way to get more of anything is to show that you know what to do with what you have.

Now we are to soon have an opportunity to test this principle in action. The Homemaking Institute will be here on the third of April. You know that will mean afternoon, evening, and morning programs. The morning programs will take the place of regular chapel time, but the afternoon and evening ones will be non-compulsory. If any of us are the adult young women we claim so avidly to be, we will not miss a session. It concerns intimately any girl who plans to combine marriage and a career for any length of time.

To prove to yourself that you are adult and capable of taking responsibility of all kinds seriously, go Don't miss because you can. Remember, only an adult can demand adult treatment; and an adult cannot afford to neglect responsibility any more than she can afford to enjoy privileges.

HOMEMAKING INSTITUTE (continued from page 1)

and speaker for the afternoon sessions will be provided for the students to sign. Those students who wish to attend may sign these sheets and go. Their attendance will be checked at the session to which they go. If they are not in class or the session either they will receive a regular class cut.

It is the hope of those on the planning committee as well as all others connected with the Homemaking In-

stitute that you will as a student body participate actively and interestedly in the various activities of the week. They are for your benefit and growth. It must be realized that a program such as this, no matter how high its aspirations, depends solely for success on those who attend. You will be expected and welcomed at all sessions of the Homemaking Institute for Bennett College, 1949!

Robert Views The News

On March 3, the President accepted James V. Forrestal's resignation as Secretary of Defense, and Louis A. Johnson was chosen to replace Mr. Forrestal.

We have been hearing rumors about Mr. Forrestal's resigning as Defense Secretary since the Presidential election, but those rumors were never confirmed by Truman or Forrestal. However, the resignation of Forrestal is a verification of the long-circulated rumors which I think were not entirely groundless.

Forrestal did not support Truman during the recent Presidential campaign as was expected of a cabinet colleague. I certainly feel that Truman could not overlook Forrestal's failure to bolster him and that an appointment of a new Defense Secretary was inevitable although Forrestal tried to hold out as long as possible.

Truman's appointment of Louis Johnson as Forrestal's successor must be merely considered as a way the President says "thank you" to Johnson for his support during the campaign. It is true that Johnson received most of the credit for the scrapping of financial aid for Truman's campaign, but that it is not all that recommends him for his new job.

Johnson was army mobilizer at the eve of World War II and it is said that his planning shortened the war by eighteen months. Here's hoping that he will be able to demonstrate successfully his keen intelligence and diplomatic skill in this new job as he did in government posts he has held previously.

The issue in the Senate nowadays is whether there should be unlimited debates or to pass a proposed amendment to Rule XXII that would enable two-thirds vote of the Senate to close any debate to force any measure, motion, or other matter to a vote.

Most of us are familiar with the way the filibuster works. It is a tactic very frequently employed by Southern Senators who oppose a bill but are not sufficient in number for a vote against the bill to prove effective. The filibuster is merely a "numble jumble" of nothing that goes on incessantly to prevent the measure, motion, or a matter being brought to a vote.

The proposed amendment to Rule XXII will enable a two-thirds majority vote to force an issue. Now just how there will be a two-thirds majority when it seems that the Republicans have pitted themselves against the northern Democrats and have allied themselves with the Southern Democrats? Of course, it might not be true that the Republicans will vote against the proposed amendment, but it does seem to us that they're rather set against the Democrats who hold the power in the Senate.

The Senate leader could put an end to filibustering on an issue, but this method has never been tried and I don't think it ever will. If Alben Barkley, Senate leader, was to hit gavel after a prolonged session of filibustering and say "we will now stop all debate on the issue and vote," the debating would have to cease. But if this were to happen the leader of the Senate would be criticized as distasteful, authoritative, and everything imaginable so that it is reasonably sure that he will not take this step regardless of how much an issue might warrant it. The American people would declare loudly that he was violating the American principle of democracy.

Personally, I detest the filibuster, but there is a fundamental democratic principle upholding it. The American idea of democracy is that an important minority should never be coerced. Is it right to try to force a decision when there is strong opposition is a question I wish that those of you who read this column will ponder.

Culture Corner

The usual criticism concerning the theater today is its trend for stark realism which many feel has been so exaggerated until it has ceased to be real, but rather fantastical melodramas put upon the stage designed to shock audiences into . . . moods, or to digress with pessimistic themes on the tragedy of the universe; they believe, in other words, there has been too drastic a change from Victorianism that so dominated the theater in the beginning of the century.

I disagree completely with these reserve seat critics inasmuch as I believe that drama today,—as it always has—is reflecting the life we live, and if that life seems unpleasant, it is only because we have made it so.

Certainly it is a paradox on society that in a day of psychiatrists, psychologists, and what have you, there are more complex neuroses than ever before. Of course, the obvious answer might be it is because in the twentieth century we have stuck labels on emotions that are as old as mankind . . . Euripides wrote about them, Shakespeare wrote about them, and now Tennessee Williams writes about them. As Shakespeare said, "Drama is the mirror of life," and whether we like it or not the mirror of Broadway is reflecting us in all our horror of anxiety and frustration.

Yet, don't let this business of drama reflecting unpleasantness that none of us like to face prevent as many theater excursions as possible for the spring and summer vacations, for there are a number of top shows running on Broadway this season. Perhaps the most outstanding of these is Maxwell Anderson's *Anne of the Thousand Days*, which is quite typical of the Anderson tragedies concerning the Tudor's rule. This drama is a stately moving one, yet full of passion and interests as it tells the romance of Henry VIII and one of his many loves, Anne Bolen. Rex Harrison has been given any number of praises for his portrayal of the fantastic King Henry VIII.

Also outstanding is Giraudoux's weird French drama, *The Madwoman of Chailiot*, and the latest Cole Porter musical *Kiss Me Kate*. Arthur Miller, author of *All My Sons*, too has another successful play now running titled *Death of a Salesman*, a psychological drama of a man who realizes too late that he is a failure because his life had been based on rationalization rather than reality.

As for the season's repertoire here, Harvey, one of Broadway's longest running shows comes to the National Theater the first week of April. *Harvey*, which has come to be practically a by-word for comedy in the

theater, will have in the leading role Joe E. Brown.

We understand that A. & T. is making plans for a spring production of comedy, and that *John Loves Mary* is being given consideration. We were somewhat disappointed, however, in their programs for the earlier part of the month.

The *Minstrel* was planned well and designed to capture a spirit of vaudeville of bygone days, but unfortunately an audience who did not wholeheartedly respond prevented too much success. The dance recital on the whole was entertaining while individual numbers were often quite good for amateurs who seemed to have really had special talents, but rather enjoyed modern dancing as a hobby. The lighting was superb, especially in the "Horror Dances," while the "Broadway" numbers done by Miss Lowe were quite outstanding.

Our own spring production, *The Damask Cheek*, left its audience with mixed, but delightful emotions. We were thoroughly disgusted with Mrs. Randall although she was a case for sympathy or a psychiatrist; we viewed Rhoda's metamorphosis taking place shockingly; thrilled to the ladies' man, Neil; immediately liked Jimmy because he was just Jimmy; understood the adolescence of Michael and Nora; thrilled to the vivaciousness of Calla; were amused by Miss Pinner, and, in other words, we spent quite an engaging time in the "upstairs living room of Mrs. Randall's house in the East Sixties."

Especially well cast were Vira Kennedy in the role of the proper Mrs. Randall, and Margaret Pleasants as that tolerable Miss Pinner, the most interesting scene, of course, was Scene One of Act Three which included the most unlady-like fight between Rhoda, Gwen Cann, and Calla, Maxine Haith.

Yet everything is never as smooth as a cast, director, and stage crew would like for it to be. The very fact that they release their shortcomings means productions will be technically smoother, lines will be said with still fewer breaks; character portrayal will strike a happier medium rather than exaggeration too often, and on the other hand insincerity too often.

That's certainly a tall order for any college theater, but *The Damask Cheek* has proved it can be done and that they are what one might call "on the ball." Responsible for putting it there was the director, Miss Johnson, for the play moved as though it were a light balloon being tossed in the air which made for wit and light comedy. One must be good to make a comedy do that.

Letter to the Editor

To the Editor of The Bennett Banner.

It has been said that the United States is a democracy. Going from the general to the specific, one would presume that because Bennett College is located in this democracy the departments of the college should also be democratic. If one has had any dealings with the Records' Office, for example, she begins to doubt this.

What do you, the reader, consider the purpose of the white cards which are given at compulsory meetings held outside of chapel? We both thought they were to check attendance at these affairs. However, that is definitely not so. What their real purpose is, not even the Records Office could truthfully tell. If the girls who give out the cards haven't time to take them back, why have such inefficiency, laziness, and lack of responsibility toward a duty when others, not she, suffer?

If, when attempts are made to clear up misunderstandings authority takes a biased, hypocritical, one-sided view of the situation, what then can the student do? If concessions are made to one, why not make them to

all? When laws are made they are as firm as concrete. They aren't stretched and twisted to aid a few and repulse others. If Ella picked a flower in a public park because she liked its beauty, do you think she should go unreprimanded? It would not happen in any place I know of except in the Records Office where, because Ella smiles sweetly she suffers not at all and Jane is given some half-baked, stuttery, flimsy excuse for inconsistency.

No matter what weak argument is offered in defense of it, this biased practice is wrong. When a girl is given cuts they should be taken when she CUTS chapel without an excuse, not because of some unknown policy of an inefficient department.

Unfortunately, one student cannot remedy the situation but she can bring it to light so that all shall see and know that it is WRONG, downright unfair, and not democratic. I do hope, in spite of their failings, the employees of the Records Office do have broad enough minds to see that these are facts which should not be.

Respectfully yours,
—One of the Wronged Students