

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publications of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is published daily except Saturday, 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 34 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered, \$6 and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor **ROLFE NEILL**
 Managing Editor **JOHN JAMISON**
 Business Manager **JIM SCHENCK**
 Sports Editor **TOM PEACOCK**

News Ed. **Bob Slough**
 Assoc. Ed. **Nina Gray**
 Sub. Mgr. **Tom Witty**
 Circ. Mgr. **Don Hogg**
 Ass't. Sub. Mgr. **Bill Venable**
 Soc. Ed. **Deenie Schoeppe**
 Adv. Mgr. **Bob Wolfe**
 Feature Ed. **Sally Schindel**
 Exch. Ed. **Alice Chapman**

NEWS STAFF—Louis Kraar, Ken Sanford, Richard Creed, Joyce Adams, Jennie Lynn, J. D. Wright, Jess Nettles.

SPORTS STAFF—John Hussey, Sherwood Smith, Eddie Starnes.

EDITORIAL STAFF—A. Z. F. Wood Jr., John Gibson, Dan Duke, Bill O'Sullivan, Ed Yoder, Ron Levin, Norman Jarrard.

PHOTOGRAPHERS—Cornell Wright, Bill Stone-street.

Night Editor for this issue: Dorman Cordell

The Paperback

— Norman Jarrard —

The paperback book business is finally coming of age in this country.

A few good books a month have been hidden away among the many inconsequential ones which were being published all along but one had to keep a sharp eye out to find them. Now Doubleday has started a new series called "Anchor Books" which plans to include only "consequential" books. Anchor Books will appeal to a smaller circle of readers, perhaps, but Doubleday believes—and I hope they are right—that there will be enough buyers (prices: \$.65 to 1.25) to make the project a success.

Here's what they say they wanted to do: "Each book selected had to be inherently good—authoritative, well written, important to the modern reader, and of sufficient general interest so that its audience would not be restricted to specialists. Each title had to be absolutely unavailable in any other inexpensive reprint form—and as often as possible titles were selected that were available in no other edition at all, expensive or otherwise."

"It is hoped that Anchor Books will . . . supplement the reading programs in the curricula of American colleges and universities by making available to students, at small cost, books of which even the most completely stocked college library can offer only a few overworked copies."

I have finally got my hands on two of these books—twelve titles have been announced—D. H. Lawrence's *Studies in Classic American Literature* and Joseph Bedier's retelling of *The Romance of Tristan and Iseult* (both 65c). Bedier has gathered all the parts of the story and made a connected narrative which he hopes is completely faithful to the originals.

Lawrence's book will probably make many people angry when he begins to ridicule some of America's past literary masters. He says of Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, "It is, perhaps, the most colossal satire ever penned." He says Hester Prynne and Arthur Dimmesdale were so "pure . . . till she tickled him in the right place, and she fell Flop. Flop goes spiritual love." He says the book is our most perfect piece of art but that its meaning is false. Much of what he says I sympathize with if not agree, because I am glad to see someone point out the falsity of the morality which—dying if not dead in Hawthorne's own day, as Lawrence points out—underlies the book.

In his essay on Whitman, Lawrence praises him for leading the way to a new attitude toward the body but blames him for preaching the loss of individuality.

In an essay satisfyingly sprinkled with quotes, Lawrence gives most of his saved praise to Melville and *Moby Dick*. "It is a great book, the greatest book of the sea ever written."

Certainly a mention-worthy book is Rutherford Platt's *A Pocket Guide to the Trees* (Pocket Book, 35c), well illustrated with photographs and drawings. Amateur naturalists will want it to go alongside PB's earlier book on wild flowers.



The Washington Merry-Go-Round

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — The records are supposed to be confidential, but one ex-Congressman has parlayed a \$14 investment into a lifetime government pension of \$2,160 a year. He is William P. Lambertson, Kansas Republican, who served 15 years in the House.

However, he didn't contribute a cent toward his own retirement until after he left Congress. Then his Kansas colleague, Congressman Wint Smith, put Lambertson on the Federal payroll from January 3 to January 31, 1947—just long enough for him to pay \$14 into the retirement fund. This made him eligible for retirement benefits and, under a technicality

in the law, he was able to take credit for his full 15 years Congressional service.

Irony is that both Lambertson and Smith have voted consistently against social benefits for others, but apparently believe in government handouts for themselves.

In addition to his \$2,160 government pension, Lambertson is drawing another government salary as a county commissioner. He also owns a 200-acre farm in Fairview, Kansas.

Ex-Congressman Lambertson, reached for comment, said he didn't want to discuss the matter but admitted he had never paid any money into the pension fund

while in Congress.

President Eisenhower makes no secret about his irritation at the load of paperwork and other details that bog down the office of the presidency.

Speaking before the American Retail Federation in the Washington Hotel, he confessed:

"I'm certainly glad to leave that maelstrom behind in my office for a while."

Ike chafes at the number of callers, says nine out of 10 are pure formalities and could be eliminated. They give him no time for constructive thinking. He also dislikes the chore of signing his name about 400 times a day as required by law on many State papers. Sometimes he even wishes his name were shorter.

"Dwight D. Eisenhower" has a few more letters than "Harry S. Truman."

On a recent Saturday, the President was on the verge of going out to the golf course, when Bernard Shanley, White House special counsel, rushed in with new problems requiring decisions. Ike let off steam, chewed Shanley up, later apologized.

CPU Roundtable

Joel Fleishman

Two weeks ago when we discussed the over-all problem of student government, we decided that the subject was much too big to complete in one evening's time. Therefore tonight the CPU will conclude its analysis of student government and formulate its recommendations.

The discussion tonight will be directed towards three of the main phases of student government: administration of justice, recreation (SEC, gymnasium, forum, etc.) and relations with other schools. This is going to be one of the most informative and interesting discussions on such a topic as Student Government because most of the controversial questions that exist today fall in one of the three above categories.

Do you prefer a voluntary or compulsory gym fee? Are you satisfied with the Student Entertainment program? What are the fallacies in the judicial system here on campus? Why should Carolina belong to the National Student Association? What is the purpose of the Consolidated University Student Council and how can Carolina benefit from its activities? Should there be a re-evaluation of the penalties imposed for Honor and Campus Code violations?

Answers to all these questions and many others will be put forth and fully discussed. Be sure to come to the Grail Room in Graham Memorial Student Union tonight at 8 o'clock and join in what promises to be a very heated crossfire.

Democratic Congressmen are so alarmed over rising interest rates that they are drafting legislation to curb Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's power to boost the rates.

The Democrats charge that Humphrey is soaking the taxpayers and enriching the banks by hiking interest rates on the bonds the government borrows. They point out that the increased interest on the national debt will cost the taxpayers several billions

(See PEARSON page 4)

The Eye Of The Horse

Roger Will Coe

"The horse sees imperfectly, magnifying some things, minimizing others . . ." Hippocrates; circa 500 B. C.

His first day at work for The Daily Tar Heel, The Horse crashed the gate at Emerson Field for the Wake Forest-UNC game, and after settling himself down in the outfield prepared to enjoy the get-together. And he did: we won!

But The Horse is afraid our great national pastime is in sad need of some streamlining. Here we are squarely in the middle of the Speed-Up, and what do we have? Baseball games that take two hours, thirty minutes as a rule, and that have run to more than three hours, forty-five minutes in the big leagues for a regulation nine innings.

The Horse, of course, saw instantly what was wrong. Mostly, it is this warming-up stuff the players do between innings. You know what The Horse means? The Deamon Deaks leave the field to take their licks at bat and we take the field. So what? Do you think the game can go ahead? Don't be foolish, the boys have to warm up.

The pitcher, who may be showing every evidence that the next pitch will be both wild and his last, stands up there and whams nine or more practice pitches to the catcher. While this goes on, the infielders possess themselves of another ball, and they warm up. Understand, it is not as if they just came onto the field. They have been playing, say seven innings already. So they keep warming up.

Now, The Horse says that if they are not warmed up by this time, the chances are they never will be. And if they are warmed up, well, what are we waiting for? Besides, there is something else The Horse tells me that may bear serious thought.

"A throwing arm, or a set of running legs, have only so many pitches or so many sprints built into them, and every one you use up is one more you do not have. Save it for the clutch, and not for spending needlessly."

And while all this needless rewarming up is going on, the umpires stand around talking to themselves—a not too surprising occupation in view of what the fans and players say of their I. Q. Ratings—and warming themselves up.

Is it any great wonder that people are staying away from ball parks in droves, when they know they will not be able to see the finish of a game?

Take football, now. That is slowed up enough. The Horse says. But imagine if after each quarter the opposing teams came out and raced the ball up and down and punted and passed and went on like that? Or if, like in baseball, they practised punting and passing and tackling after each set of downs, or after each play?

The Horse says in baseball they make a putout and the infield goes sort of crazy and starts to fling the ball all around. The Horse says it is not the boys' fault, that it is rather custom not only outdated, but even injurious.

Look at it this way (The Horse says): You are afraid the shortstop, or someone, may make a wild throw on a simple grounder; and as if spitting in the eye of the law of averages, which serves up one bad toss to first-base out of maybe a dozen, the shortstop fires off eleven good ones in the rewarming-up sessions, and—bloody!, the very first ball hit to him, he tries to heave into Caldwell-X.

"How many Derbies do you think I would have won, and how many people would have paid to see me win them," The Horse asks, "if I ran myself maybe a few practice races before the race?"

The Horse says the only thing it is fun to watch warming up is food in the kitchen. But The Horse has imperfect vision.

on the Carolina Front

Louis Kraar

He looked a little more lonely than usual. That's why I decided to come over and sit with him.

"Hey, how're you doing?" he said dissemblingly enough, but with a face that almost dragged the ground.

I asked him where he'd been.

"Partying out at Hogan's," he answered, drinking the steaming black coffee. The all-night cafe was filling up with smoke and people, so I had to lean forward a little to hear what he was saying.

"You know something, I don't even get any more fun out of that now. I can't figure out what the hell's wrong with me," he answered getting philosophical in a one o'clock in the morning manner.

He wanted to talk. The tone of his voice both begged and commanded you to listen to him. I listened.

"It's the darndest thing you ever saw. Came down here this Fall and just had a great time partying and all. Now I never have a good time. I've been thinking about joining the Army."

The dishes, hour and noise made you want to leave, but you couldn't. This guy was worried.

"Don't get me wrong. This place was just great at first. I used to love that English class. Hell, then it got dull or something. Aw, I don't know."

Finally I eased out of the booth, paid the check and went out the door.

"Hey, I'll see you at the house party tomorrow night. Man, I can't wait," he yelled back.

"Yeh," I said thinking about a guy that was going to join the Army—but not before tomorrow night, or next weekend.

Freedom To Search For Knowledge

(This is the first of a three part series of guest editorials by Dr. Robert MacIver, Columbia University sociologist.—Ed.)

There has never been so much commotion over the freedom of the scholar or the educator as there is in his country today. In the past there has indeed been less, much less, academic freedom, for in the ages of authority it was at best a very limited affair. But never in modern times has there been so massive and many-sided an assault upon it.

Many of these assaults have been repelled, but more than a few have succeeded. All across the country there are groups that, under one banner or another, are seeking to limit it. Dozens of organizations are "investigating" it, including at present three Congressional bodies. There is not a single important institution of learning that has not been the object of some accusation concerning it. There is scarcely a college or university president who has not run into some troubles over it.

What is this academic freedom? What is its importance? Why is there so much concern over it? These things need to be explained, for the people are being misled about these questions, and even some educators are by no means sufficiently alert to the situation.

Academic freedom means the freedom of the educator to do his proper work, to fulfill his function, to render to his society the special service that he has to offer. His work is to learn and to teach, and this is what every genuine scholar wants above all to do. That is what the institution of learning is for. Here lies its unique function, its primary mission in society.

Every major type of social organization has its own unique function which requires an appropriate range of freedom to fulfill. The church aspires to one. The family another. So also the academy, the college, or the university. Academic freedom then is the freedom of the men of the academy, the faculty members, within their various areas of competence, in the field of learning and teaching.

Observe that this freedom is not the freedom to express opinions on any matter under the sun. In a democratic country that is the freedom of the citizen. What we're talking about is a special form of freedom derived from a special function—the freedom proper to the member of a particular profession, without which the calling is perverted and falsified and the service it renders is betrayed. Just as the medical man needs a particular area of freedom for his work, or the man of law, so does the man of the academy.

The effort to seek and impart knowledge means a limit to the control of any external authority over the institution of learning. Where this freedom exists, no authority can say: "This is the truth, this is what you must teach." Or: "This is the truth; if your investigations lead you to doubt it or to deny it, you must refrain from doing so."

It is the freedom to teach conclusions through scholarly investigation. It does not imply the freedom to act according to your conclusions, if such action is against the law. It is emphatically not a freedom to conspire to overthrow government, or to incite others to do so. But it embraces the freedom of the serious student of government to reach and express conclusions regarding its nature and regarding the good or evil results of this or that form of government.

Academic freedom is at the same time a high responsibility. It is not a privilege possessed by an academic guild. It is not a concession granted by a government or by a community to an enclave of scholars. It is claimed as a necessity, not a luxury; as a condition of service, not as a social award. As we shall presently see, it is a fundamental condition of a free society.

(To be continued next Sunday)

