

Armed Forces

Today is Veteran's Day, alias Armistice Day, alias Tuesday, for what needs to be said at this juncture could be said at any time and any place, but had better be acted upon soon.

Out on one of the fields of this University there will be a group of students marching. One group will wear blue uniforms; the other will wear bluish-gray. Both are in the process of defending the United States of America. All the students among the group are being partially or totally subsidized by federal funds. All are being trained.

Last week, the Air Force unveiled a fighter plane capable of flying at twice the speed of sound. This is an incredible achievement, but what is more incredible is the fact that this plane with the money and hours of planning and labor that went into it is obsolete or will be within six months. Yet, a mass of public funds went into its creation, and equal masses are going into the creation of items of warfare which will do nothing constructive but utilize some of the public funds to put many to work for the anticipation of a war in which the article that this many is working on will be useless.

The problems posed are three-fold. The economic problem of a country built on military expenditure is primary. The problem of military planning is secondary. The problem of service organization is tertiary. The human factor counts as over and above all these three, and must be realized in connection with each.

In an article written by Felix Morley in Modern Age and given to all freshmen in the special fifty advanced group, the author points with some validity to the commitment that the United States has made to defense as being a necessity for the preservation of a national economic balance. In short, he points out that the United States is committed to preparation for war.

He backs his up by showing the plight the United States would presently be in if armament spending would have not such a high priority on the list of appropriations. He shows a picture of massive unemployment and a recession that would not only curl one's hair but would no doubt make one bald. Forty billion dollars is a lot of money and supports many people.

If the country is so committed to a war economy then, how can the United States present a peace-loving face to other nations. The answer to this is simple. It can't. It tries quite hard, but it comes ensnared in its own efforts whenever such questions as disarmament and cessation of testing comes up. The truth usually will come out, and it has done so on many occasions.

How can one reverse this trend? This is more difficult to answer, but can be. The trend can be reversed in several ways. First, legislators must realize that defense is not the only vital factor in the nation's economy—that things such as foreign aid, school construction, and many others have as high or higher priority in making this country a vital force. They must cut through the swath of propaganda that makes every request respectable and needed in order to find out just exactly what is necessary and vital to the nation's defense, and in what areas America's competition is improving. It must channel what money is necessary into this area, but with an eye for the importance of such things as education. School construction, road building, and foreign aid may place American finances in different areas, but it will not radically endanger the American economy. At some time or another, the overall military establishment must be reduced and the money placed strategically. Not only will the people of the United States save money, but some of the more worthwhile goals America should be striving for—free and competent education for all to the best of each person's individual ability—might become a reality.

But how can one strategically place the needed defense money. The answer is not simple. It is even more complex when a report such as the Gaither report of Russian military strength has never been released so that the necessary facts are in the hands of the legislators. However, certain facts can be deducted.

The day of the manned aircraft is in its twilight if not already moved on into the day of the missile. Hence any increase or continuation of high level expenditure for the construction of airplanes is useless and a drain on the taxpayer.

The development of cruisers, destroyers, and aircraft carriers is likewise getting to be outdated as the Russians have realized long before us, and have been able to capitalize on by concentrating their naval force on submarine construction. Project Polaris, the submarine to air missile is the largest single worthwhile development of the present military establishment. Coupled with atomic submarine development, the Navy has shown at least in part a forward look.

The third factor that needs to be looked at is the army. There are two types of war to prepare for. In a limited war the readiness of only a limited amount of men is necessary to sustain the United States in a respectable "defensive posture" as George Washington put it in his Farewell Address.

Hence, the necessity for the draft as it is now, is somewhat limited. If the war is to be

Continued On Column Seven

An Address

Marion A. Wright

(The following is the conclusion of an address made before the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Council on Human Relations)

We have been concerned thus far only with affirmative action to destroy constitutional rights, best typified by the decree, the edict or the legislative act. But such rights may also be negatively destroyed. Here the procedure is relatively simple: Merely fail to support or uphold the rights. The results are identical in either case; individuals have been denied rights which the Constitution and courts have said are theirs. There is no difference in morals or in practical effect between suspension of a constitutional right by formal decree, on the one hand, and by non-enforcement, on the other. The individual whose home has been searched without a warrant, whose printing presses have been stopped, or who has been kept out of a school is hardly concerned with the precise method used to deprive him of a right the Constitution and Court have said is his. All that concerns him is that he has been the victim of despotic power.

One struck by lightning is only academically interested in whether the bolt which hit him is positive or negative electricity.

Nor does the number of persons who exercised the power make any appreciable difference. It may be one man—a Hitler, a Mussolini or a Stalin—or it may be a few or many acting in concert—a government and a legislature, or a school board—who have thus made a mockery of the constitution they were sworn to uphold. Tyranny is tyranny, whether or one or many.

There is no scale by which rights guaranteed by a constitution may be weighed and compared with each other. All are of equal sanctity, equally entitled to support. An assault upon one is an assault upon the Constitution itself. It is no more and no less reprehensible to strike down the right to attend a public school than to strike down the right of assembly or of worship.

Individuals who applaud the one run the grave risk that they will be confronted by other invasions not so agreeable. The people, beguiled in the one instance, may be shocked in others. Liberties perish not so much by inundation as by erosion.

Surely, it is not necessary to labor an obvious point. The denial of the right of school attendance is a bald suspension of a constitutional right. But, as the dark and bloody record of tyranny reveals, one suspension is not enough. The attack upon the right of school attendance was merely the beginning. It has been followed by other gross invasions of personal liberty. Teachers' oaths; law requiring that organizations bare their memberships; laws designed to forbid aid to litigants in Civil Rights cases; congressional and state inquiries into groups favoring observance of law; discharge of professors, legal harassment of liberal or even moderate newspapers—there has been a host of repressive actions designed to stifle dissent. Non-official action everywhere has been blown into flame. We in North Carolina have not stooped to much of this folly.

This violence to constitutional principles has been accomplished by the ancient technique of, first, planting in men's minds fear of a minority, creating a bogeyman, and next, depicting its organizational spokesmen as menaces to "our institutions." If the shades of Hitler, or Mussolini, or Stalin could crawl up to the edge of the pit they would confer their benediction upon what here transpires.

When those who now seek to deprive certain human beings of their rights first emerged into public notice—these governors, legislators, school boards—they were champions and protectors of the rights of all men. Such is the familiar and historic role of the demagogue. The people have nursed such men into power. Having been thus elevated, their true characters are revealed. What we now behold is the ugly image of tyranny.

Dress it up in all the pretty words in the dictionary, it is still tyranny. It follows the historic pattern. It uses the tools. Its leaders strike the poses. It seeks the same ends. Unchecked, it will run the same course.

It not only can happen here. It is happening here.

On Writing

Sidney Dakar

Recently a friend of mine said she was a poetess. At first I thought I said that she wasn't, yet. I pointed out that even though she had written over thirty poems, some of them quite long, that she would have to sell some of them before she could really call herself a poetess.

After giving this some thought I realized how wrong my thinking had been. Why should selling poems be a criterion of success in this field, as indeed it is? If she believes she is a poetess and writes poems, which may or may not be called good by various people, then in reality she is a poetess.

Who is a critic to judge just how good a poem really is? Who has the right, merely by writing a critical review in the influential press, to make or break a young author? How do these critics know how much emotion was poured into these writings? True, any great writing must produce the same emotions in the reader as the author had while writing the work. But the critic can't possibly determine what affect the reading of a certain work will have on the millions of individuals that might read it. It seems to me that about the only thing the critic can do is to pass upon the technical construction of poetry.

Some of our greatest poems and novels in the world could not be sold for more than a few dollars, if at all. Many great manuscripts gathered dust for years before

some publisher would even agree to pay the printing costs. Emily Bronte finally sold her WUTHERING HEIGHTS for about \$10 of today's money. The publisher kept the work for several years and finally sold it back to Miss Bronte for the same price. Finally, it was published. At least one author, Maugham, thought that WUTHERING HEIGHTS was one of the ten best novels ever written. The list is endless of authors who died without a penny and without any recognition of their works. Now these authors are proclaimed masters of the craft, as I am sure many of the unknown authors of today will be in the year 2000.

Of course there is no absolute determination of greatness. Greatness is merely defined by the generation in question. The next few generations may and usually do have a completely different idea of greatness. It is too bad that the only scale of greatness our civilization has is fame.

GEMS OF THOUGHT

If you have great talents, industry will improve them; if but moderate abilities, industry will supply their deficiencies. — Samuel Smiles

Nothing splendid has ever been achieved except by those who dared believe that something inside them was superior to circumstance. — Bruce Barton

"What Do I Do Now, George?"



On The Pasternak Award

Harrison Salisbury

In the fury of political propaganda set off by the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature there is serious danger that the nature of Boris Pasternak and his work may be cast into the shadow.

What the Nobel committee has done is to pay homage to the nobility of man, to the courage of the solitary hero, to the individual as opposed to the mob. It has honored not only a literary talent but a philosophy of life and a life lived according to that philosophy.

There has been some surprise that out of the charnel house of art erected by Stalin should arise a gift so free and vaulting, a mind that shrugs off shackles, a poet of humanity, a critic not only of the land which hedges in his presence but of the age and civilization of which he is a part.

Such surprise is rooted in an unawareness of the dialectics of nature and in an undervaluation of the force of human spirit. Indeed, it may be that only in Russia, only in a soil deep scarred with ideological plows, could such genius be nurtured. The harsh knout of Russian dictatorship has yielded us a century of poets, philosophers, creators, and thinkers. If Czarist intrigue set the stage for the deaths of Pushkin and Lermontov, if Dostoevsky faced a Czarist firing squad and went in exile to Siberia, if Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Turgenyev felt the hand of Russian censorship and Russian oppression the world engraved their names in golden letters. The names of their persecutors are long forgotten. Pasternak's life and work are in the great tradition.

The official Soviet detractors have said that in "Dr. Zhivago" Pasternak has betrayed the Bolshevik Revolution and provided his country's enemies with a useful weapon. Such rubbishy talk merely betrays how little these men understand what Pasternak is about.

It is true that he rejects "the modern coddling and worshiping of man," holding that such systems are based on a false premise and "pathetically amateurish." He has little faith in current practices of social betterment in Russia, but he concedes that there have been "wonderful, unforgettable" achievements in the care of workers, the protection of mothers, and the curbing of the money power. Of the Revolution itself and of Lenin Pasternak speaks in terms of awe. His attack is against the miscarriage of the Revolution, against the "fanatical men of action with their one-track minds" who fill the world with fanaticism which "is worshiped for decades, thereafter for centuries." And he is repelled by the "revolutionary madness"—the mass guilt feeling which produced a compulsive desire to confess—even to confess false crimes.

Even these profound caveats are secondary, however, to the basic conflict between Pasternak and the order in which he finds himself. This conflict has to do with the nature of life and of living, of the relationship between the individual and society.

"Man," says Pasternak, "is born to life, not to prepare for life. Life, itself, the phenomenon of life, the gift of life is so breathtakingly serious. So why substitute this childish harlequinade of immature fantasies, these schoolboy escapades?"

"When I hear people speak of reshaping life it makes me lose my self-control and I fall into despair," he says. "Reshaping life! People who can say that have never understood a thing about life—they have never felt its breath, its heartbeat, however much they may have seen or done. They look on it as a lump of raw material that needs to be processed by them, to be ennobled by their touch. But life is never a material, a substance to be molded. Life is constantly renewing and remaking and changing and transfiguring itself."

Thus, Pasternak takes his stand and sets himself apart from the modern tendency, not only the tendency of his own country but

the tendency of conformist, materialist America. The Soviet propagandists who suppose that Pasternak has merely stripped from Communist file its veil of sham and hypocrisy have missed the mark entirely. Pasternak's indictment covers the Organization Man as well as the Party Man. "The fashion," he writes, "nowadays is all for groups and societies of every sort. Gregariousness is always the refuge of mediocrities, whether they swear by Soloviev or Kant or Marx. Only individuals seek the truth."

This is the heart of Pasternak. His lovers are concerned with "the riddle of life, the riddle of death, the enchantment of genius, the enchantment of unadorned beauty" and not with "the small worries of practical life—things like the reshaping of the planet." They live in the imminent presence of death. Tragedy is their chaperon. Lonely they live and lonely die. But in their life they are complete in themselves. They expect nothing and they are not disappointed. It is out of this solitary contemplation that Pasternak has gathered the strength to fulfill, as he says, his duty as a writer, to bear witness as an artist, to write of the times through which he has lived.

Perhaps, as Pasternak suggests, it is only when "all customs and traditions, all our way of life, everything to do with home and order, has crumbled into dust in the general upheaval and reorganization of society," only after the whole "human way of life has been destroyed and ruined" that we finally perceive "the naked human soul stripped to the last shred."

Such is Pasternak's message to the world—to his own Revolution-wracked Russia and to our slick technocratic society. It is probably only in the fire and stress of forty desperate years that this brave, resonant philosophy could be forged. Once again to Russia are we indebted for revealing to us the triumph of man over the world in which he lives. —From The Saturday Review

Letters To The Editor

You have proclaimed your desire to arouse the campus since the beginning of your campaign last year and you have tried to accomplish this in a great many ways this year, often using issues of questionable validity. Now you have dug to the bottom of the heap and come up with the nastiest insinuation of all. I am referring to your editorial of Nov. 5, concerning the bi-partisan board selections for candidates for Women's Honor Council. Had you taken the time to inquire about those things which you questioned, I think you would have seen for yourself that the implications in your questions were completely unfounded.

I don't intend to try to answer all of your questions because I'm sure the able chairman of Women's Honor Council can and will do a better job of it. I only wonder why you didn't do a little investigating before you issued forth your intimations.

As I recall from a high school-journalism course, a good reporter (and I'm sure this would apply to editors, also) always find out "who, what, when, where, and why" before he writes the article. Perhaps a short review of these basics would be beneficial to you.

The campus has the right to know the news and I'm under the impression that you are in charge of seeing that this right is fulfilled. Is it wrong to ask for a few answers or a few fewer questions?

JAN COBBS

(Armed Forces Cont.)

full scale, the foot soldier will be of limited value, if of any value at all, since the war may last but a few days or less depending on how many nuclear missiles can be launched in how much time and how accurately they will be launched. There are those who would say that the two opposing governments may agree on ground rules respecting nuclear weapons, but there should be a reminder made that no weapon has ever been created that has not been used, and no weapon will not be used when a country is threatened by losing its identity, and the people in charge with losing their power.

The United States under the present situation would probably be the first to use these weapons, for at present the U. S. is in a good position to be losing a war. Hence, a commitment to sheer manpower would be foolish. Hence although many key industries would suffer from loss of business, the country would not be weakened by shifting emphasis and cut back.

Finally, the government must realize that the threat of Communism is real, and the forces amassed against the United States are united in their defense and in their outlook. It would seem rather ridiculous at the present time for the United States military establishment to be divided against itself, but the fact remains that it is. The Army, Navy, and Air Force, not to mention the Marines are in a minor war against each other for supremacy, causing the United States no small amount of lost time, money, and knowledge in red tape, bickering, and research overlap. Internal competition is fine when it serves a purpose, but when it tears into the entire military establishment, it destroys the strength of the United States, and in doing so gives the best reason in the world for combining the three forces into one United States defense unit under a single head.

Veteran's Day

Veteran's Day was created in order to honor the Veterans of American Wars.

Originally it was Armistice Day, named to honor the World War I dead in the name of the day that ended that war.

It must today be set aside as a day of tragedy, where human life has been sacrificed or utilized for the ambitions of a few.

It must be looking forward to the day when men, turned rational, will be able to avert war, and breed understanding amongst the people of this world.

This is not too much to ask.

Communications

In this week's issue of The Reporter, Edward R. Murrow pointed a charge against the radio-television industries for their failure to grapple with the presentation of ideas on the air waves in favor of the western and soap operas.

Speaking of the industry, Murrow pointed to the complete lack of programming designed to shake the comfortable situation of the common American and awaken him to the realities of a troubled world in which he lives.

He told further of the complete lack of news presentation unbroken by commercials, and the increase of the five-minute news broadcast in which the resultant program is something less than what should be news-informing the public adequately.

He showed ironically how the Federal Communications Commission was urging editorialization since none was voluntarily coming from the networks.

The problem of the communications industries is acute. Only on Sunday afternoon are people subjected to anything worthwhile, and much of this is watered down to be uncontroversial.

Mr. Murrow has himself presented challenging programs and, as a result, his See It Now is no longer being televised.

Mr. Murrow said rightly that the communications industry will one day reap the reward for their lack of endeavor. The reward may well be the decay of American democracy.

As Mr. Murrow says, the economic dent in the network budget would not be so great as to prohibit more serious fare on television. Maybe his words will be heeded.

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.



Managing Editors — CHARLIE SLOAN, CLARKE JONES
Business Manager — WALKER BLANTON