

Kefauver, Charming Indian

The results of the Minnesota Democratic primary raised mystery for Stevenson supporters and storm clouds for the Republicans.

Senator Kefauver no longer has the lustre of the big-time crime investigator. He has even doffed his Tennessee coonskin. What is the attraction about him as a political candidate that would give him a victory margin of some 50,000 votes in his contest with Adlai Stevenson?

Is he, like William Jennings Bryan, the new man of the people, with some lightning message in oratory that strikes to the hearts of the voters? Hardly. His oratory is flat, often stale, and while the Senator is plainly a man of principle and some ideas, his speech-making will not hold a candle to Stevenson's.

Has it a resplendent personality? Hardly, again. Kefauver is affable enough in person, but standing in supposed conversation with him during his last visit to Raleigh, we might as well have stood to converse with a cigar-store Indian. We

had the strange feeling that he was thinking either about nothing at all or about far-distant phenomena like flying saucers or the Dead Sea Scrolls.

He stared over us, into the distance. Did that stance win him votes in Minnesota? It hardly seems possible; but on the other hand, he assumes the glassy-eyed cigar-store Indian attitude often while talking to others face to face.

Did Minnesota Republicans cast their votes in the Democratic Primary so as to upset their nemesis, Adlai Stevenson? Likely so. But unless the swing was more massive than suspected, the Democrats actually gave Kefauver part of his margin of victory.

Yes, we are mystified, and without a solution to this enigmatic charmer's prowess.

But the huge Democratic vote does not mystify us. Storm clouds gather — even for the gods — and we suspect there are Republican frowns along Pennsylvania Avenue.

Ervin Vs. Marshall

IN THIS DAY of mass communication — and mass debating about racial segregation — astounding things can happen to you if both sides of the question enter your living room.

Almost every evening debaters on this subject take over my attention, men like Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Thomas R. Waring, and others. It seems odd sometimes to find myself taking discussants of a subject so long outlawed from polite Southern conversation into my bedroom.

But hardly a night goes by that I don't share my armchair or bed with one of these debaters. It's all very proper, you see, because even the most fiery of the arguers is properly pressed in the pages of a perfectly legitimate magazine or newspaper.

My latest visitors were Senator Ervin, a polite moderate on this question, and Thurgood Marshall, chief counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People, and some of the latter's associates.

THE NORTH Carolina senator is a calm, reasonable, and moderate proponent of racial segregation, and — of course — Mr. Marshall is the leading force in Negro legal battles against segregation. Senator Ervin speaks from the wholesome, family-aimed pages of Look magazine and gives "The Case for Segregation." Attorney Marshall is vividly reflected by Bernard Taper's lucid report on "A Meeting in Atlanta" in New Yorker magazine.

Perhaps I dozed off the other night after listening to the arguments of Marshall and Ervin, thought neither was dull. At any rate, I seem to have a running debate between the two gentlemen resounding through my mind. It goes something like this:

Senator Ervin: Social segregation based on race is an actual condition and not a mere theory in the South. It is, indeed, recognized by the vast majority of Southerners, both white and Negro, as an acceptable way of life for both races.

Counsel Marshall: You know, you hear all this talk about the movement for the Negro's rights and desegregation being pushed by the North faster than the colored people down in the South want. Thurgood Marshall's supposed to be master-minding this whole campaign, somehow, against the wishes of Southern Negroes, those millions of childlike, happy, easygoing colored folk — that's the way segregationists talk about Negroes when they're not describing them as vicious, immoral and diseased—who would be as contented as pie if agitators didn't come along and stir them up. That's funny, because our people in the South are actually way ahead of us on

this thing.

Senator Ervin: (The Supreme Court) clearly implied that their novel decision was based on this astounding constitutional philosophy: The Constitution automatically amends itself from time to time without any change in its wording and without any action by the Congress and the states as required by Article V; and the scope and times of the automatic amendments are determinable by the Supreme Court alone. If this philosophy prevails, the Constitution will be reduced to a worthless scrap of paper, and the American system of government will perish, and the states and their citizens will become helpless subjects of a judicial oligarchy.

Counsel Marshall: (After being asked what the NAACP would do if it found in the future that it won court decisions but couldn't get the decisions put into effect.) I don't know what we'd do. That's something I can't even contemplate. It would be anarchy. It would be the end of the country. I can't imagine it coming to that.

Senator Ervin: (Southern states) know that the social commingling of the races is alien to the way of life of Southerners of both races. They are satisfied that the children of both races will make the most satisfactory progress in the relaxed atmosphere of segregated schools.

Counsel Marshall: If 90 colored children out of 100 are diseased—which obvious they're not—I believe that under this country's notion of justice you still have no right to penalize the 100th one for that. If 99 Negro children out of 100 should be found to be stupid, that hundredth one still has a right to equal educational opportunities.

Senator Ervin: The interfering outsiders are leery about putting everything Negro leaders do not stop with denying Southerners freedom of thought and speech.

Counsel Marshall: Some (NAACP leaders) and leery about putting everything they know on paper. And when they phone and hear clicking on the line all the time, they get leery about that, too. I can't blame them. It's not safe to be an NAACP leader in some parts of the South today.

Senator Ervin: The most crucial problem confronting the South today is this: How can we obtain an opportunity to seek a sound solution for the South's racial problem in an atmosphere free from emotional tensions and mental misunderstandings? As one who loves and understands Southerners of both races, I believe that this atmosphere can best be obtained at this hour in a system of voluntary school segregation. Such a system is sanctioned by the decision of May 17, 1954. It would afford moderate Southerners of both races an opportunity to solve the South's racial problem in an atmosphere of good will, patience, and tolerance. This is the only way the problem can be solved.

Counsel Marshall: (His reporter explains that a citizen of one of the Southern states might, in debate with a Northerner, plead the cause of gradualism and going slow in changing deep-seated social customs, but he would run the risk of ostracism if he suggested in his home town that change should ever come. Then Marshall adds:) They don't mean go slow. They mean don't go.

So the argument goes — with no apparent conclusion or victor yet.

As long as the fight is verbal and legal — and doesn't involve the untruths of those who maintain that one race is inherently superior — it seems a good thing.

Both Senator Ervin and Counsel Marshall deserve some attention; they both speak wisely and with apparent sincerity. — Louis Kraar.

READER'S RETORT

Assails Student Government Heads For 'A Warped Sense Of Values'

Student politics on the campus has fallen and is continuing to fall to an all time low. Or at least this is the impression that a serious minded student should get from even a hasty reading of Tuesday's Daily Tar Heel. When the leaders of one party accuse the leaders of the opposing party of dirty politics and in the act of doing so use methods which in political circles are considered to be dirty politics, this can only mean that there has been a gross misunderstanding of what is dirty and what is above-board by one or both of the parties' leaders.

As I continued to read the other political articles on the front page I became convinced that the error is not in the organization or in any one of the parties of student government but rather lies in the philosophy which lies behind student government here at Carolina.

PRESENT TREND

I think that I can best illustrate what seems to be the present trend by using another article on the same page telling of the University Party presidential candidate Jim Exum's plan to solve what is tenderly referred to by politicians as the "Parking Problem." From reading the article I gather that Mr. Exum would favor completely eliminating what little beauty and aesthetic appeal the campus has left in order to provide parking spaces for another hundred freshman cars.

Surely nothing has less aesthetic value than a lot filled with even the latest models of cars. I simply cannot even picture the grass of the Forest Theater or Kenan Woods or Emerson Field replaced with asphalt and the majestic pines, elms, and oaks of which Chapel Hill boasts so proudly replaced with Buicks, Cadillacs, and Thunderbirds. Construction companies could come in tomorrow and spread asphalt over the entire area, surrounded by Dr. Mitchell's walls and this would do little more than solve the problem for perhaps one or two years. Then at the present rate the enrollment of the University is increasing the same problem would be with us in an even greater way in a short time.

When I confronted one of the UP's top student body office candidates with this problem he said that this did not worry him in the least—that all he is interested in is that the administration does not limit student cars while he is still here and has a car. Such apathy! Is this typical of the qualifications that we as voting students are demanding of our so-called student leaders? As a member of the University party myself, it grieves me to think that this is the kind of men we nominate to represent us in the highest offices of the student body.

As their chief weapon against the restriction of student cars the leaders of our student body and the administration alike cite the fact that we do not have class discrimination at Carolina and that this would segregate freshman and sophomores from juniors and seniors. However, we do have discrimination on our campus. In order to hold a University scholarship a student cannot own a car or belong to a social fraternity. Surely this is discrimination. However I am not saying that discrimination is necessarily bad, even though this is the present connotation that is given to the word. Perhaps it would be better if freshman and sophomores were denied the use of cars in Chapel Hill. If this were done I am sure that the number of students who flunk out during their first two years would be reduced considerably. Would this be bad?

Then comes the argument that there is nothing to do on the weekends. Must the students be reminded that this is a University and not a high school — that the University is a community of persons who should be devoted to getting the knowledge that is power in order that they may heal the wounds of their not-so-fortunate neighbor in an age that is staggering under the pains of its own rapid growth. A university is not a country club.

Surely our student government leaders are suffering from a warped sense of values and an extreme case of near-sightedness. It seems that student leaders are only interested in trying to see how many inches of space they can fill with their varied extra-curricular activities under their names in the yearbook. Never before have we needed leaders who will unselfishly use their talents for the benefit of their neighbor because of love for him and not for personal glory.

On his campaign poster a candidate may list "Student Legislature" among his qualifications. How many students ever question this and ask how many bills the candidate introduced while a member of the Legislature? Once the campus politician gets this extra pearl on his string, the extra line in the yearbook, he is for the most part content to sit by and watch someone else introduce the bills and because of party pressure and obligations vote "yea" if the bill is sponsored by his party and "nay" if sponsored by the opposing party. We as the student body need to see the distinct difference in political success and qualities of leadership.

Surely if we could conceive of a new philosophy and theory on which to build, our candidates would stop walking on eggshells and would no longer be afraid to take a positive stand on what they believe to be the answers to existing problems for fear of losing the vote of some area of the campus.

Student government is still wearing the same garment mistakenly placed on it years ago.

The size is too small, and the cloth has become threadbare. However our "student leaders" are continuing to sew patches of new cloth on the old and soon the new cloth and the old will be lost because the new cloth will cause the old to tear because the new does not agree with the old.

Jackie Cooper

THE CAMEL'S BACK

We note with rising spirits that a New Hanover jury found the courage to deny an estranged wife alimony, in face of her somewhat irregular behavior.

The plaintiff of Joseph Meshaw, in case you missed it, was something like this:

She stabbed him as he slept, for his refusal to go out and buy her a hot dog;

She knocked him unconscious with a hot poker;

Smoked his cigars at a party;

Went home with a clutch of Marines;

Tried to run him down with an automobile;

Staged a party while he was out of town, with lights out;

Someone yanked a rug from under him as he entered, and slashed him with a knife;

She publicly clamored for a younger husband;

Their marital relations had been no more than formal and cursory for 25 years.

We have one question for the jury, for guidance to future Tar Heel couples-at-war:

It was the cigars wasn't it, fellows? — Greensboro Daily News

LONELINESS AS A PENALTY

In establishing citizenship in the life community, man profits in many ways. He grows and integrates his life by the increasing circumference of his social responsibilities. Instead of measuring the universe by himself and making all things include his gods in his own image, he begins to measure himself by his universe. He thus achieves a valuable humility without being humbled, for the universe lives in him. His satisfaction in life issues in no small part from the wideness of his comradeship, from the inclusiveness of his interests, love, and understanding.

Loneliness is a kind of social illiteracy, an ignorance of the community that exists among all living things, a failure to de-

velop skill in communication with words and without words. Loneliness is a penalty for tolerating inequalities, for harboring inferiority-superiority attitudes. Snobbishness can be found on both sides of the tracks and prevents fellowship wherever it exists. Loneliness is a protective pain, warping of a condition needing correction; if heeded, saves the tooth. There is a cosmic maturity by which a man finds himself at home in every land. But the conquest of loneliness is more hopefully fought within the limits of our own horizons.

John Truslow, M.D.

PROOF

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

Second Hunter: "You've shot a deer?"

First Hunter: "Say, John, where are you?"

Second Hunter: "Right here."

First Hunter: "Are you all right?"

Second Hunter: "Yes."

First Hunter: "Then I've shot a deer."

But how can a job be done, as all citizens expect it to be done, when a basic science professor may retire after 31 years at a top salary of \$6,900 and retirement income of \$250 a month for the duration of his life only? This man twenty years ago was receiving \$4,800. If that were extended to the present value of the dollar he should be receiving now about \$12,000 at the same salary rate, so this man has been receiving a reduction in income during the past twenty years. A professor of pathology receives an income after 28 years which is actually two fifths of the salary offered to two of his residents on the completion of three years of training under him. Every year over the country several hundred able young men and women, disposed and qualified for teaching and research choose to go into practice rather than to accept \$2,400 or \$3,000 a year from college, augmented by \$5,000 from grants, possibly, which are annually submitted by themselves. When a clinical professor, for example, has to spend 75 per cent of his time in private practice to make the difference between his basic salary and an income ceiling which is scarcely one third of that of at least ten of his part-time colleagues in the department—

John Truslow, M.D.

TEACHING VS. PRACTICE

But how can a job be done, as all citizens expect it to be done, when a basic science professor may retire after 31 years at a top salary of \$6,900 and retirement income of \$250 a month for the duration of his life only? This man twenty years ago was receiving \$4,800. If that were extended to the present value of the dollar he should be receiving now about \$12,000 at the same salary rate, so this man has been receiving a reduction in income during the past twenty years. A professor of pathology receives an income after 28 years which is actually two fifths of the salary offered to two of his residents on the completion of three years of training under him. Every year over the country several hundred able young men and women, disposed and qualified for teaching and research choose to go into practice rather than to accept \$2,400 or \$3,000 a year from college, augmented by \$5,000 from grants, possibly, which are annually submitted by themselves. When a clinical professor, for example, has to spend 75 per cent of his time in private practice to make the difference between his basic salary and an income ceiling which is scarcely one third of that of at least ten of his part-time colleagues in the department—

John Truslow, M.D.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS

The first part of his argument is being essentially argument against proposals. Stated positively they are as follows:

1. The Mundt-Coudert proposal would

2. It would not weaken party representation and the breakdown of the

3. It would not encourage proportion

4. It would not encourage proportion

5. It would not encourage proportion

6. It would not encourage proportion

7. It would not encourage proportion

8. It would not encourage proportion

9. It would not encourage proportion

10. It would not encourage proportion

11. It would not encourage proportion

12. It would not encourage proportion

13. It would not encourage proportion

14. It would not encourage proportion

15. It would not encourage proportion

16. It would not encourage proportion

17. It would not encourage proportion

18. It would not encourage proportion

19. It would not encourage proportion

20. It would not encourage proportion

21. It would not encourage proportion

22. It would not encourage proportion

23. It would not encourage proportion

24. It would not encourage proportion

25. It would not encourage proportion

26. It would not encourage proportion

27. It would not encourage proportion

28. It would not encourage proportion

29. It would not encourage proportion

30. It would not encourage proportion

31. It would not encourage proportion

32. It would not encourage proportion

33. It would not encourage proportion

34. It would not encourage proportion

35. It would not encourage proportion

36. It would not encourage proportion

37. It would not encourage proportion

38. It would not encourage proportion

39. It would not encourage proportion

40. It would not encourage proportion

41. It would not encourage proportion

42. It would not encourage proportion

43. It would not encourage proportion

44. It would not encourage proportion

45. It would not encourage proportion

46. It would not encourage proportion

47. It would not encourage proportion

48. It would not encourage proportion

49. It would not encourage proportion

50. It would not encourage proportion

51. It would not encourage proportion

52. It would not encourage proportion

53. It would not encourage proportion

54. It would not encourage proportion

55. It would not encourage proportion

56. It would not encourage proportion

57. It would not encourage proportion

58. It would not encourage proportion

59. It would not encourage proportion

60. It would not encourage proportion

61. It would not encourage proportion

62. It would not encourage proportion

Raymond Moley, columnist for the Columbia University Review (across the street from Columbia University) argued in favor of the Mundt-Coudert proposal for this proposed amendment. While he has to have merit there are certain portions of Moley's discussion which need to be pointed out.

NEGATIVE ARGUMENTS

The first part of his argument is being essentially argument against proposals. Stated positively they are as follows:

1. The Mundt-Coudert proposal would

2. It would not weaken party representation and the breakdown of the

3. It would not encourage proportion

4. It would not encourage proportion

5. It would not encourage proportion

6. It would not encourage proportion

7. It would not encourage proportion

8. It would not encourage proportion

9. It would not encourage proportion

10. It would not encourage proportion

11. It would not encourage proportion

12. It would not encourage proportion

13. It would not encourage proportion

14. It would not encourage proportion

15. It would not encourage proportion

16. It would not encourage proportion

17. It would not encourage proportion

18. It would not encourage proportion

19. It would not encourage proportion

20. It would not encourage proportion

21. It would not encourage proportion

22. It would not encourage proportion

23. It would not encourage proportion

24. It would not encourage proportion

25. It would not encourage proportion

26. It would not encourage proportion

27. It would not encourage proportion

28. It would not encourage proportion

29. It would not encourage proportion

30. It would not encourage proportion

31. It would not encourage proportion

32. It would not encourage proportion