

Election

The campaign is over, and the various claims and counter claims have been spoken, the public, those of whom deem their franchise important, will vote, and the result will be known shortly.

Significant change may not be effected by the ballot today, but the possibility is there. Indeed, the only possibility for the people, not the various interest groups, to effect change is to exercise their vote in all forms of national and local politics on every level. The votes that will not be cast today will be important too, for they will reflect that democracy in the United States is not actually the government of the people, by the people, and for the people, but rather government of perhaps of half influenced by the few. It is hoped that all thinking individuals will exercise their franchise wisely, and that campus participation will be at maximum.

After the balloting is over, enjoy watching the results in the Rendezvous Room of Graham Memorial, The Daily Tar Heel, the Dialectic Senate, the Philanthropic Assembly and Graham Memorial are cooperating in bringing the students an up-to-the minute account of the election returns until 1 a.m.

Computer

The University of North Carolina has a new computer, and it is an event to be hailed. The growth of the research triangle is a signal achievement to be hailed, and the significance of the computer being placed at UNC is not to be overlooked, for it places UNC as the leader in pure research in the Research Triangle.

The development of North Carolina is proceeding at a rapid rate, and this new piece of evidence is a sign to pave the way.

Education

There is a lack throughout the United States in a basic commitment to education. In a time when education was never more important, the present emphasis seems in all other fields.

Congress in its first action toward aid to education could do no better than set up loans and provide for scientific education, and the state of North Carolina at the present time carries its primary commitment to road building and industrial expansion.

Throughout the United States education is treated with disrespect, and the tangible manifestations of this are all too obvious. Low teacher's salaries, the increasingly high cost of education, and the lack of legislative programming for this vital area.

Democracy is dependent for its existence on a thinking populace, who by their vote can delineate more important issues. It is a necessity that democracy have for its leadership intelligent people who are able to grasp the problems of the day not only in terms of the day, but in terms of the long range future. It is important that the many realize that the value of democracy lies in the individual contributions that are made in all fields from the artistic to the scientific. It is important that the idea that a real contribution cannot be made until each individual thinks and each individual has the tools of thought is given credence.

On the national level, this has not even been started, and on the state level there has been only slight growing.

North Carolina is growing thanks to the economic leadership of Governor Hodges, but its growth has not been compensated by a concern for education and for the expansion, growth, and qualitative improvement necessary to bring the level of thought up in the state, and to provide for the growing population.

Industry will bring revenue to the state, but where that revenue is applied will be the most important question to be decided. The necessity for making the primary commitment to education rather than road building or any other facet of life is extremely important.

A commitment on the national level to the same effect might bring the United States out of the doldrums which it now inhabits. A combined effort to bring back respect for the intellect, to breed a thinking people, and to make democracy work is necessary.

Education, which has never been made an issue in an election, had better be the main issue before long. If not, it may soon be too late.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday and examination periods and summer terms.

Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8.50 per year.



How To Cast Your Ballot Today View & Preview

Anthony Wolff

James Reston

(The following is from Sunday's New York Times)

Voting next Tuesday should really be very simple. All you have to do is analyze the major speeches of both parties and follow their advice.

Both parties are for peace and prosperity, and of course both are "forward-looking," except that the Southern Democrats and Republican conservatives are less forward-looking than the "Northern radicals" and Eisenhower Republicans.

The danger in voting for the Democrats is that "the dominant wing of the party" will lead the country down the road to socialism and meanwhile get into such a fight with the Southern Democrats that it won't be able to lead the country anywhere.

The danger in voting for the Republicans is that they won't spend enough money to defend the country from its Communist enemies and besides have piled up in the last year a \$12 billion deficit. This is a policy of "less bang for two bucks" and is enough to bring on a depression that will curl or at least wave your hair.

Next to Khrushchev and his one-drink-to-a-customer policy, the greatest menace to civilization is the selfish, power-hungry defiant labor-union boss like Walter Reuther, who voted for Stevenson, and Jimmy Hoffa and Dave Beck, who voted for Eisenhower.

The Democrats are indifferent to the corrupt labor union bosses, which is why Senator John McClellan, Republican of Arkansas, and Senator John Kennedy, Republican of Massachusetts, had to summon Hoffa and Beck before the McClellan Committee.

The Republicans, on the other hand, are the friend of the working man and the foe of the labor goons, which is why 77 per cent of them in the House voted against the Kennedy-Ives Bill requiring union leaders to make public un-

ion financial reports, insisting on regular union elections by secret ballot, and denying union offices to convicts. Senator Irving M. Ives, Democrat of New York was co-author of the bill.

The Democrats were so angry

Author! Author!

HERBLOCK
©1958 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

about this, so eager to reform labor, that they voted against an even tougher anti-racketeering bill, and this, of course, clarified everything.

Both sides are for the laborer's right to work in one form or an-

other. The Democrats are for his right to work in compulsory union shops, and they are also for his right to sell his house and move to some other state if he doesn't like to work in states that rule out compulsory union shops.

Letters From Readers On Many Topics

Editor:

Tonight I witnessed one of the finest exhibitions of asininity ever perpetrated on an audience in Chapel Hill. I refer to the Young Democrat Club meeting held in the Law School courtroom. Scheduled to begin at 7:30, the speaker tumbled in at 7:45. Then the waiting group was regaled with a show of proper parliamentary procedure while an executive committee of seven was elected and a vice-president was railroaded into office. Finally—thirty-five tedious, boring, emul-infected minutes late—the orator was allowed to take the rostrum. I'm sure Congressman Durham was a fine man in his day, and he was candid enough to admit that he had prepared nothing to say; however, his rambling conceit of platitudes, geneology and personal aggrandizement had the most ardent Democrat I know (the even likes Harry) weighted down in spirit by the dreariness and listlessness of the address. There was a bright spot when he told of sail-

ing a ship to Atlanta (Georgia?) during the War of 1812. But that is excusable; after all, he's getting old. Suffice it to say, I strongly feel that it is impudently rude, ill-bred, ill-mannered, and ungracious to keep an audience (matterless how small) waiting for over half an hour unnecessarily. It would have been so very easy to hold the business session after the allocation. Admittedly it was a private club meeting, to be conducted as the presiding officer saw fit; nevertheless, if the Young Democrat Club expects to progress at all, it would do well to improve the way meetings are engineered.

Editor:

In this day of great "ecumenical" activity, I am happy that my own church—the St. Peanuts' Fanaticopalian Church—is careful to distinguish between Charity and compromise of the One True Faith.

We didn't choose to become the repositories of the One True

Faith. It just happened that way, although we must confess that it couldn't happen to a nicer cat! activity. I am happy that my fraternity brothers. Anyway, you can easily see that as a consequence we couldn't possibly be caught before God eating with publicans and sinners at the Lord's Table. Therefore we have CLOSED COMMUNION. You know—closed communion, closed minds.

This is not being narrow-minded. It is simply being loyal to our Lord, out of gratitude for the fact that he has confided in us the One Great, August, Real, Infinite and Eternal Truth.

Why be bigoted, Mr. Malone,

when with a little effort you too, can become a Fanaticopalian?

L. MENTON

Editor:

If the mouse is smaller he can maneuver better, but the larger mole will have the advantage. If the mouse is larger he won't be able to maneuver as well, so the mole again has the advantage. The mole, being blind, appears to be at a disadvantage, but due to the hole being underground the mouse can't see either so this eliminates the mouse advantage. Mice should keep out of mole holes.

JACKSON BOSWELL

Editor:

Pertaining to a "A Letter" name withheld by request.

"Drunks we may be,
But cowards we are
Not.
Even in our drunken
Stupors, we lift our
Heads, and say—
Yes, it's I who is
Very drunk!"

JOHN F. MILLER

There is a lot of difference in pioneering for gold and pioneering for spinach.—Will Rogers
There are pioneer souls that blaze their paths where highways never ran.—Sam Walter Foss

On Temple Bombings

Ronnie Shumate

To borrow a phrase from Norman Smith's column in Wednesday's Daily Tar Heel, the "temples" of too many people are being bombed. I do not speak of Webster's definition of the word. Webster defines "temple" as "an edifice dedicated to the worship of a deity."

True the papers have been full of Webster's kind of temple bombings of late. But Mr. Smith is the first to bring to light the bombings of personal temples, meaning the fear, revulsion, and aggression we harbor for those who are "different."

Too many people seem to be almost totally unaware of their feelings toward those who are "different." Mr. Smith's acknowledgement of his fears, etc., show the deep thought he has put into his writings.

But these feelings we harbor in this respect go much, much deeper than most of us realize. Such feelings toward our fellow-man reach into our beliefs.

Our beliefs, whether we speak of moral, spiritual or physical, are not to be sneezed at. We should not turn away from our beliefs just because we fear we will be ridiculed. As Ovid once said, "We are slow to believe what hurts when believed." This, unfortunately, is all too true.

Then there is the question of "What" we believe. How many of us know just what we do believe? Few, I'd say. This problem is prevalent in the minds of all of us, though many of us are not aware of it. And the few of us who are aware of it cannot, or will not, admit it. No one can answer this question of what one believes except the individual himself. But this question will never be answered for many of us simply because we are afraid to answer it.

Thus another question rears its ugly head. Why are we afraid to answer such questions? We are, in part, wary of answering them because we are so set in our ways and thoughts that we refuse to permit anyone or anything to interrupt our lackadaisical lives. We choose a pattern for our lives and adhere so closely to it that we seldom give a thought

to any "foreign" incidents which should happen to pass our way.

So, we find ourselves confronted by still another question. This one is almost unanswerable. The question, why do we believe the things we believe, can only in Rare (capital "R") occasions be put in black and white in so many words. In fact, I will readily admit that I do not know exactly why I believe some of the things I believe. This is the one question mentioned thus far in this article for which we cannot be too sharply criticized for leaving unanswered. I don't think we are wrong to doubt why we believe. The wrong in doubting comes when we merely let our doubts drift along and nothing is done about them.

It is not enough just to believe. We must know, or at least have a reasonable facsimile of, the answers to our questions and doubts. If we merely set our ideals and beliefs on a pedestal before us, and leave them there to decay, we don't really believe. We only think we believe. Most of the things we "believe" we really don't believe at all. We have merely memorized things we have been taught from childhood. We learned, or most of us did, that there is a God; just as we learned that 1 plus 1 equals 2. That seems to be the only basis for our beliefs, which, as I have said before, are in reality, not beliefs at all unless we attempt to answer some of these questions.

If any of us should take it upon himself to answer, or even attempt to answer, these questions he will certainly gain more than knowledge that can be put down on a sheet of paper somewhere. In the answers to these questions lies the basis for our whole concept of life and living. But, on the other hand, if we continue to let the answers drift along ahead of us, out of our reach, we are bombing our own temples. We complain if someone else bombs our temples, but we don't seem to so much as realize that more damage is done by our own bombs.

Why don't we close our bomb-bay doors? Then we will be able to put an end to the destruction of the temples of others, as well as our own.

Some Republicans in some states, California and Ohio, for example, are for making voluntary unionism compulsory, but of course, some others, like the Republican Governor of California, Goodwin J. Knight, are against it. The administration in Washington, led by President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, is neutral on right-to-work legislation, and this policy is followed by the Eisenhower cabinet, except, of course, Secretary of Labor James Mitchell, who is against state right-to-work laws. Understand?

On the national economy, the Democrats, who let prices rise 50 per cent under Truman, are furious because prices rose 8 per cent under Eisenhower, and there are only 65,000,000 people working in the country today, compared with 61,000,000 in 1952.

In contrast, the Republicans think "the last six years have been the best six years of our lives" and that "things are good and getting better all the time," except of course, in Michigan, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the other places where there are 4,000,000 people unemployed.

This tidies up everything except foreign policy, and here the voter must take a stand either for or against Secretary of State Dulles, except that he's not on the ballot, and the Democrats voted to let him do what he liked about Quemoy and Matsu, anyway.

In these circumstances, a few simple tips on voting may be in order:

1. There is some truth in all campaign statements but not much.
2. Experience shows that most politicians are never quite as good or as bad as they sound, and the country's capacity to endure them is pretty stout.
3. Finally, when confronted by a choice between an old numskull and a new numskull running for Congress, always choose the new ones because the old ones have seniority.

THE DHARMA BUMS. By Jack Kerouac. 244 pp. New York: The Viking Press. \$3.95

In the English Department of an old New England school there is a great teacher, and among his virtues is his unwillingness to accept from his early-adolescent pupils anything which smacks of sham or pretense.

It is the practice of this personage to assign a paper of five hundred or one thousand words each week or two, and should any one of these papers offend his delicate sense of sham, the guilty student is warned with an inconspicuous "e.i." or "c.c." on the top of his paper: "e.i." stands for Ellis Island, the gateway to the U.S. for immigrants to these shores, and as a grade it indicates that the writer is ignorant of the English language; "c.c." is mark of a more serious offense, and its rare appearance indicates that the offending work bodes the complete "collapse of civilization."

Mr. Kerouac merits "e.i." and "c.c." for "The Dharma Bums."

The "e.i." is applicable because Mr. Kerouac affects a complete innocence of the conventions of English prose, and he does so to no apparent end. It is quite permissible today to stretch the language quite out of form, as in "Finnegan's Wake" or the poetry of E. E. Cummings, just so long as the distortion is in the service of communication. It is not legitimate, however, to be sloppy—to neglect punctuation and sentence structure without purpose; as in the following: "... Japhy and I were kind of outlandish-looking on the campus in our old clothes in fact Japhy was considered an eccentric around the campus ..."

Mistakes of this sort are minor, however, in comparison with the other indictments which might legitimately be drawn against Mr. Kerouac. To lump all of these into one charge, thus doing each an injustice but saving space, Mr. Kerouac is unbelievably naive in every way. He is naive about Zen Buddhism (as all but the extraordinary Westerner must be), he is naive about English prose, he is naive about poetry, etc. Should his naivete become general, and everyone act as Mr. Kerouac does, the result would be "c.c."

The immediate problem is that Mr. Kerouac makes himself unavailable to criticism from any angle. If one strips away his artifacts in search of his idea, one must find that he has no idea; and the mere stripping away of the artifacts of his prose, idiosyncrasy, would result in a criticism both longer than "The Dharma Bums" and superior to it. Inside the cover of the review copy of "The Dharma Bums" are sixty notations of only the most obvious idiocies. A random sampling may suffice in lieu of more formal criticism.

p. 14. "F— you! sang Coyote, and ran away! read Japhy to the distinguished audience, making them all howl with joy, it was so pure, f— being a dirty word that comes out clean."

The word "f—" may have meaning and impact, and thus be legitimate in poetry. But it will never never come out clean, thank God. Mr. Kerouac considers this fine poetry. If it is, then even dormitory bull session is a veritable orgy of poetic creation.

p. 32. Speaking of Japhy again, "Besides all the background he has, in Oriental scholarship, Pound, taking peopete and seeing visions . . . wow, Japhy Ryder is a great new hero of American culture."

Here the "c.c." looms imminent.

p. 34. "Your Buddhism has made you mean Ray and makes you even afraid to take your clothes off for a simple healthy orgy."

Oh, m'God . . . afraid of a simple healthy orgy. Obviously not fraternity material.

p. 46. "These people must be assholes," he added in a sudden straight revelation.

This is fundamentalism at its worst.

p. 86. After supposedly running down a high and treacherous mountain: "I just skipped and jumped and danced along and I had really learned that you can't fall off a mountain."

Got that, Mr. Hillary?

p. 100. Mr. Kerouac is invited to recite his latest poem, and it is judged "fine." The poem: "Mother of children, sister, daughter of sick old man, virgin your blouse is torn, hungry and barelegged, I'm hungry too, take these poems."

The difficulties of criticism become more obvious here.

More of Mr. Kerouac's poetry: "Light a fire, fight a liar, what's the difference, in existence?"; also, "A watermelon seed, produces a need, large and juicy, such autocracy"; and, ". . . I want my Dharma Bums to have springtime in their hearts when the blooms are girling and the birds are dropping little fresh turds surprising cats who wanted to eat them a moment ago"; and so on.

Somewhere toward the end of all this, Mr. Kerouac comes to the conclusion that he is a Buddha. Earlier in the book occurs the definition "the Buddha is a dried piece of turd."

Mr. Kerouac is safe in this apparent contradiction for the simple reason that Buddhism is by definition unavailable to the intellect, and so if a man says he is a Buddha, he cannot be proven wrong. Mr. Kerouac's Buddhism remains extremely doubtful. Unfortunately, it appears that The Viking Press is guilty of the commercialism which Mr. Kerouac avowedly deplors, but in which he seems quite willing to participate. The Viking people are accepting manuscripts which were written and generally rejected years ago, taking advantage of the public's interest in and partial sympathy with Kerouac's particular way of being "Beat."

There is hope, however, that no-one else will take Mr. Kerouac as seriously as he seems to take himself. The old Gods may be dead, but we will not choose Buddha in the person of Mr. Kerouac to fill the void.