

The Decision

The Supreme Court yesterday struck a mighty blow in the American struggle for individual freedom and equality before the law.

Southern schools, this University among them, must now face the truth—that "separate but equal" is a meaningless phrase, that places of learning, if separated, are inherently unequal.

We hold this one—like those other great truths declared in our Constitution—to be self-evident: It is time to stop postponing brotherhood. This is a time for the turning of thought and opinion into wide, new channels, a time for the yielding of old prejudices and ignorant discrimination before the patient and powerful light of Christianity.

Even if ethics did not compel it, the international position of the United States requires us to enter this new day in Southern education with resolution. We stand as the champion of the free world, as the protector of the dignity of the minority, as men with inalienable and unassailable rights. This is lent special significance in a world in which the majority of people, by our standards, are colored.

However, it would be erroneous and immoral to predicate doing the right thing upon the wrong reason; for the practical considerations, important as they are, are none the less secondary. We hail the Supreme Court decision, not because it enhances our prestige in a troubled world, and not because it pleases a segment of professional



NO PLACE IN EDUCATION... a gavel for discrimination

equalizers, but because it is the right thing to do.

South Carolina's Governor Byrnes and many like him in the South, many of them our friends and people we love, now stand eclipsed. Their South is gone, or it is going, and the bitterness and antagonism no longer seem very significant, though we do not deny that there is bitterness yet to be overcome before perfect equality is achieved, even in North Carolina, even in Chapel Hill. It is simply that the path is now very clear indeed, and for the Southern states and the University, there is no other path, though we be emotionally reluctant at first to follow it.

From whatever point you view it, the essential equity of the Court's verdict is plain to see. That, we think, is a good test: the human test, how you feel about it. And we feel good.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday, examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Chapel Hill Site of the University North Carolina which first opened its doors in January 1793

Editor CHARLES KURALT Managing Editor ROLFE NEILL Associate Editors LOUIS KRAAR, ED YODER Sports Editor JOHN HUSSEY Business Manager AL SHORTT News Editor Jerry Reece Society Editor Eleanor Saunders Librarian Connie Marple Asst. Sports Editor Dick Barkley Subscription Manager Tom Witty Advertising Manager Jack Stilwell Asst. Subscription Manager Eugene Polk NEWS STAFF—Fred Pledge, Ken Sanford, Richard Thiele, Jennie Lynn, John Jackson, Babbie Diforio, Charles Childs.

Lines On Literature

Amid The Rumbblings: A Quarterly Of Merit

Palinurus

The Spring issue of the Carolina Quarterly is the appropriate answer to the cry that the Quarterly should be abolished. It is both ironic and gratifying that Charlotte Davis & Co., have produced the best Quarterly in years just when the first rumbblings of abolition were heard. Absolutely no apologies are needed for this issue.

Before reviewing the present number, I want to survey briefly what Miss Davis and her staff have done for the Quarterly. It was just a little over a year ago that the magazine was in the depths of despair. Its end seemed certain. At that time DTH Editor Rolfe Neill and I, believing that the Quarterly could survive if it were free of the ivory-tower set, published the harsh "Quo Varis" editorial stating that the staff should examine anew its original purpose. Then the editorial board of the Quarterly appointed Charlotte Davis to take over the editorship. A marked change was noticeable in the Spring issue. Then in the fall the upward pull continued. With the present number, the staff has attained the excellence that is expected of a Carolina literary magazine.

The contents of the magazine are neither overly-estetic nor vulgarly low-brow. They are, in the main, solid achievements.

The big news in the Quarterly is the article on "The 1954 Faculty Evaluation" by Thad Seymour. Here is the article for which the whole campus has been waiting, faculty and students alike. Yet it will be a pity if this article completely overshadows the three fine short stories in the magazine.

The award story, "The Lost Beach," by Louise Hardeman is noteworthy for its polished style. It is a sensitive story that is long on character and full of realistic touches that come from a woman's writing about a young girl.

In "Operation Ah-Choo," Vin Cassidy has produced a delightfully satiric story about a sneeze. Not since Richard Stern filled the pages of the old Carolina Magazine with his satiric pieces have I heard anything quite as funny as this in a campus publication. Mr. Cassidy's humor calls attention to the great drought of genuinely good satire on the campus.

Excellent as the above stories are, to me the real "find" of the Quarterly is a young sophomore called J. A. C. Dunn. His "A Quantity Unknown" reveals the most talent I have seen in an undergraduate since Charles Brockman was starting the campus. Dunn's story is a three stage glimpse into the life of a math teacher. In each stage there is a marvellous achievement of tone. In the first stage Mr. Babcock is young and cocky, and his students, especially Mawson, are impatient. In the second stage Babcock is middle-aged and cynical while Mawson is quietly subdued. Finally, in the third stage Babcock is old and nostalgic, and Mawson is confident and grateful. This is a story with much laughter and more truth; it is a story that disturbed me greatly, one that I shall read again and again. The insight and maturity of Dunn are great for one so young. I shall watch with interest the future of this young new writer on our campus.

In addition, Hamilton Horton, Jr., has written a surprising article defending the liberal and the individual. Although his piece, "American Freedom and Faith," begins a bit like a ponderous oration, it gets down to cases at the end with such pertinent observations as "it is no less obvious that the American search for a faith is falling into a dangerous pit of dogmatism, and that if the average citizen does not learn to respect a questioning and criticizing of his in-

all contact with the truth he seeks... far from weakening us, our tolerance and respect for the multitude of human ideas and institutions is the very skeleton and fiber of any rights for the individual." It certainly is an appropriate article at this time.

Finally, there is also an ample serving of poetry, illustrations, and book reviews in the present Quarterly which helps to provide a balanced and varied magazine. I think that now, one year later, one might ask again of the Quarterly, "Quo Vadis?" A magazine such as this thrives only in an atmosphere of creativity and encouragement. WCUNC's Corvada is consistently excellent because of the constant influence of people such as Randall Jarrell and Peter Taylor. Here at Carolina there is now an indication that we can hope for a literary revival under the influence of Phillips Russell, Hugh Holman, and Jessie Rehder. Young talent seems to be appearing again—J. A. C. Dunn; Joanna Scroggs (whose work is very good); Louis Kraar; Ed Yoder; and many others on the freshman and sophomore levels. A hard-working staff will corral this talent just as Charlotte Davis has done this year. An ivory tower never produces an issue as good as this one—it takes work.

Secretary Hobby Backs Down

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — There has been a backstage hassle inside the Administration over the badly needed Federal program to promote construction of new schools.

Sam Brownell, Commissioner of Education and brother of Attorney-General Brownell, is for the school-construction bill, but he's been stopped dead in his tracks—largely by the baby member of the Eisenhower subcommittee, 27-year-old Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Roswell Perkins. Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary for HEW, is also against the school bill. However, it looks as if the Senate would pass the bill anyway.

Here is what has happened: About three weeks ago, Secretary Hobby testified before the Senate Labor and Education Committee that she favored the principle of school-building construction, but wanted further confer-



MRS. HOBBY

ences before it was undertaken. Specifically she wanted one conference in each of the 48 states, plus one big final conference at the White House.

To this, Sen Lister Hill of Alabama, long-time champion of federal aid to schools, objected.

"There have already been seven national conferences on this question," he said in brief. "The conferences even began with the Hoover Administration. Seven million dollars have already been spent on a school survey. Meanwhile our schools are more and more overcrowded. So it seems to me this is a time for action, not talk. The Eisenhower Administration," said Hill, "made a specific pledge to help the schools, and this is the time to do it."

Sen. John Cooper of Kentucky, Republican, agreed, and as a result the Senate Committee went ahead with hearings on a bill authorizing federal aid to school construction.

Sam Brownell Muzzled Lead-off witness at the hearings was to have been Education

previously announced that there was a national shortage of 349,000 classrooms. And his staff worked late at night preparing his testimony for the Senate Committee.

But just before he was scheduled to testify, Brownell phoned Chairman Cooper to say he could not appear. He had received blunt orders from Mrs. Hobby that he could make no statement.

Actually it was bright, young Assistant Secretary Roswell Perkins who was behind Mrs. Hobby's action. He had written a report, which went to the Senate over Mrs. Hobby's signature, opposing federal aid for school construction—even though she had previously stated that there is a \$5,000,000,000 backlog of school construction.

The Senate Committee, however, is proceeding with the bill. Note — President Eisenhower during the 1952 elections said of school construction: "The American answer is to do in this field what we have been doing for a long time (with highway and hospital construction)."

A-Bombs In Asia?

The Air Force is now prepared for a momentous step. Faced with growing Communist aggression in the Far East, the Air Force has notified the White House that it is prepared to bomb any place in the world, including Indochina.

Furthermore, there is growing sentiment inside the Air Force for the use of atomic bombs in Indochina.

These two capabilities are extremely important because among other things, they represent a change in Air Force point of view. Hitherto, Gen. Nate Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, had opposed Admiral Radford's recommendation that the Air Force be used in Indochina. And though still opposed, he has reported that the Air Force is ready to act as outlined above.

There have also been other changes in the viewpoints of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And the Army, which is dead set against having an expeditionary force get bogged down in the Far East, now backs the idea of bombing operations and is willing to use land troops to protect air and naval bases.

Reason for this change is significant. It is induced by apparent Communist determination to push ahead in Southeast Asia plus the realization that in two years Russia could meet the challenge of American air power. Today she can't.

Russia Advancing

Today the United States has a powerful-striking force of long-range, B-47 jet bombers unmatched by Russia. This is in addition to our high-flying B-36 turbo-jet bombers. As a result,

atomic blows with the United States—now. But two years from now she will be. She will have enough jet bombers and possibly an atomic stockpile as big as ours.

The all-important question of whether atomic bombs should be used in the Far East now rests largely in the hands of the State Department. The armed services have given their okay.

During the siege of Dienbienphu, the White House asked the Pentagon what could be done to break up the attack, to which the Navy and Air Force recommended dropping tactical A-bombs on the ring of Red guerrillas massed around the fortress.

This not only would have saved the fortress, but would have forced the Chinese Communists to do one of two things: 1. Leave Indochina altogether; or 2. call on Russia for help.

The Air Force was willing to take the calculated risk that the Kremlin would avoid an atomic showdown with the United States at this time.

State Department Veto

However, the State Department said No. It argued that 1. our Western Allies would desert us; 2. the huge populations of Asia would turn irrevocably against us. American hatred would sweep all Asia, the State Department argued.

The Air Force replied that the A-bomb is much more human than the napalm fire jelly with which we have been splashing enemy troops in Korea and Indochina. The State Department, however, prevailed.

YOU Said It

Poetic Letter

Editor: I am 'I' in this vast universe! Unique am I, for better or for worse! Forever and ever, my mind, in limitless measure Creates, and creates anew; such as its pleasure! My self, not full awake, is still in waking, My world, not given or made, is my own, in making; My lofty soul, my whole and sole control Has endless quest-conquest, its only goal! What if this life with sin and evil is fraught, What if is God in Heaven a know-not-what, What if the world of things is void and nought? Sorry death may strike, but ends me not, My self yet stands erect, and high, My boundless Spirit and I shall never die!

'Nope — We're Putting On McCarthy And Cohn Instead'



HERB LOCK FOR THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

Carolina Front

Segregation Decision Is A Challenge

Louis Kraar

NO ONE, including University officials, knew just what the Supreme Court's segregation decision meant when it was first announced yesterday.

The Court, it seems, has allowed for a gradual switch. There are, unfortunately, still some of us who offer the same, hackneyed arguments against granting Negroes equal rights as guaranteed by the Constitution.

Some say, "What about the argument that mixed schools will lead to violence?" And Carolina's Dr. Guy B. Johnson, of the Department of Sociology, once answered this saying:

"Anyone who thinks that the transition from segregation to racial co-education can be made without problems, tensions, and even personal tragedies is a fool. Anyone who thinks that the transition means the end of civilization is also a fool. The operation may be serious, but the patient will recover. And when he recovers and looks back over his experience, he may say, 'Well, it wasn't half as bad as I thought it would be.'"

Whatever the arguments against granting Negroes equal educational rights (and the Court said yesterday that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal"), I hope that Carolina students and the rest of the South will accept the decision with an effort to push aside outmoded prejudices.

The Supreme Court's decision, it would seem, means that we have finally come of age and can now live and learn with each other here in the South without regard to the rather artificial barriers of race. At a time when we're striving so much for unity abroad, it seems a good thing that we've finally decided that America doesn't have any room for second-class citizens — particularly in the classroom.

CAMPUS CAFE

looked like New York's 44th Street as the cast of "Dark of the Moon" packed into the long, narrow eating place Sunday night after the performance.

Janet Carter, who played the female lead, and Leonard Bullock sat at a back table looking both tired and pleased.

The play is really grand. After two rain-outs in a row, "Dark of the Moon" opened under a full moon and with a full house

'Dark Of The Moon' Needs A Welding Job

Ted Rosenthal

After a two-day boycott, the stars came to the Forest Theatre Sunday night for "Dark of the Moon"; but when the last witch had fluttered out of sight, beyond the crags of the Baldy Mountain set, perhaps they were sorry they'd changed their minds.

The Howard Richardson-William Berney fantasy, if played sensitively, might have appeared a good deal better than it did, but in the hands of Director William Long, it emerged as an unhappy union of over-extremes—the too-phantasmal supernatural sequences clashed discordantly with those of the mountain folks, which in turn appeared improbably sordid. The overall effect was that of a duet between a theremin and a rag-time trumpet and the result was cacophony.

"Dark of the Moon" is the story of a boy-witch who falls in love with a human girl; he persuades a mountain sorceress to change him into a man, and she does, but stipulates he must marry the girl, and she must remain faithful to him for a year, or he will again become a witch.

The boy descends into the valley, finds his love Barbara, and because she had become pregnant after their first meeting, has no trouble in gaining her parents' consent, although he is a stranger. Because of his origin, the boy is unable to enter a church—this arouses the suspicion of the community, and when Barbara gives birth to an in-human creature, there is general agreement that he is a witch. Barbara speaks to her husband, learns his story, and remains in love with him.

But on the evening of the allotted year, her parents take the girl to a revival meeting. She is goaded into revealing the truth, and the hill people, to end John's ex-boyfriend, force her into intercourse with an ex-boyfriend, upon the floor of the church. John returns to his former state, and Barbara, because of the jealousy of the witch-girls who entice the boy throughout the play, loses her life.

Daniel Reid, starred as John, gave too-frenzied a performance to be convincing; had he moderated his efforts, the fantasy would have been more compelling.

Janet Carter did much better as Barbara. She displayed warmth and sincerity, and a contagious sympathy for the role.

Marian Fitz-Simons delivered a good performance as Mrs. Allen, Barbara's mother, and Leonard Bullock was capable as the father. Les Casey acted well playing the Conjurer Woman, as did Christian Moe as Preacher Haggler.

Both Suzanne Elliot and Mary Helen Crain, playing witches, tended to exaggerate their voice treatments, but since over-stressing was so general a flaw with the company, probably again the director was at fault.

Donald Treat's settings were excellent. Jeanette Pratt's makeup, Art Winsor's musical effects, Foster Fitz-Simons' choreography, and John Taylor's costumes were all well-handled, as were the technical phases of the production.

In the last analysis, no matter what attributes of plot, acting ability, and stage-craft are present, unless they are welded into a firm structure, little worthy of praise can result. It is the director's responsibility to interpret the play and integrate the performance into a consistent fluid entity. This was evidently not done with "Dark of the Moon," and from that lack stem many of the shortcomings of the production. Treated with more perception, it might have been engaging and satisfying, instead of indifferent and disappointing.

Meet Kerr Scott

Bob Byrd

The continual harping by the Lennon forces on the refusal of Kerr Scott to release his income tax returns is just one more indication of the desperation to which the impending defeat of their candidate is pushing them. Unable to find much to say on behalf of their own candidate, they have banked on a strategy of running down their chief opponent—a strategy which is producing limited results, since Scott refuses to make a campaign for high public office into a bitter squabble over pseudo-issues of scant relevance to the fitness of the respective candidates to serve in the United States Senate.

The reason why Scott decided not to make his income tax returns public is simple. It is not that he has anything to hide: his salary for the 16 years he served as Commissioner of Agriculture and Governor is a matter of public record. So are the amounts he has been paid for rights-of-way taken by the State for highways built across his land. But in addition to these sources of income, he also carries on extensive farming and dairy operations, the tax returns for which are likely to be quite complex.

But Lennon could count on the average voter of the State not knowing much tax law and could expect them to fall for the allegation that the whole proceeds of the sale of land to the State should be reported as income, and that Scott was trying to beat the tax collector in not so reporting it. But why didn't Scott release his returns, and then explain to the people the various details about which Lennon might raise a curious eyebrow?

Because when the issue came up, there were only three weeks left in the campaign. Scott wanted to continue to talk, as he has talked to date about the issues facing the Senate and the nation. He couldn't do that and also engage in long-winded quibbles about incompressible details of tax matters. So he chose to refuse to release his tax returns, even though he knew it would hurt him politically, in order to continue to discuss with the voters of the State the issues which are really relevant to the campaign.

We agree with the editor of the Durham Morning Herald, a generally pro-Lennon paper, who recently said of the income tax "issue," "The candidates... would render a greater service to the people if they would emphasize their stand on public issues rather than what they earned last year... The people need to know what the candidate thinks about the critical problems now con-