

# 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.

## Why Not?

Students have come up with a suggestion for students. At the recent All-Campus Conference it was recommended that student art works be hung in University buildings to afford a wide showing of the artists' work, and to encourage the appreciation of painting.

We like the idea; we'd like to add to it. Why not an arts forum for Carolina? Something like the delightful one held at Woman's College each year where student creations in art, music, and dance are exhibited in a weekend program. National authorities in these fields participate in the forum, lecturing, answering questions, and acting as critics.

If the reception at WC is indicative, an arts forum at Carolina would attract much campus response. Aside from offering an outlet for the creator and an opportunity for the spectator, something like an arts forum would help restore to the University some of the prestige we once held. We are living on our heritage in these arts. Out-of-state visitors are surprised to see us so decayed, surprised that Chapel Hill is not what they had always heard: the cultural center of the state.

Either February or March would be good months in which to hold it. If students would initiate it, say perhaps student government, we believe the respective departments would jump to cooperate. It's worth the effort to find out.

## Why?

The Daily Tar Heel is disappointed that the InterFraternity Council is going to continue to keep secret the fraternities which break the laws under which they operate.

We find the argument poor that if the honor councils do it the IFC should, too. The honor councils deal with one or two people in each case; their aim is to help rehabilitation by keeping the guilty person's name secret.

This is not applicable in the case of fraternities whose organizations are composed of 30 to 60 members and whose actions are of wider concern to the campus. If some of the foolish acts they commit were publicized, those fraternities which are chronic offenders would police themselves.

The Daily Tar Heel shall continue to publish every offender's name it can get.

## Into The Viscera

American newspapers aren't as healthy now as they once were.

Alistar Cooke, widely-read American correspondent for the British *Manchester Guardian* expresses this viewpoint in "The Press and the Common Man," an article in the new *Saturday Review*. He suggests a prescription we might follow to get off the sick-bed.

First, the root of our journalistic incapacity: Cooke says it's a collaboration of ownership's over-control of editorial opinion and failure in some quarters of healthy rivalry of news presentation and viewpoint.

The steelworker in Gary, Indiana, and the date farmer in Indio, California, he holds, "read the same columns written by the same men in New York or Washington. If you go down to Times Square, or that block-long newsstand off Hollywood Boulevard, you can, on an investment of about \$3 in fifty-odd American newspapers," find that American journalism is getting wrapped up in "artificial debate" and is losing its "index to regional character."

To maintain quality, most papers lacking the wealth of the New York *Times* and its brother giants find they must subscribe to syndicated columns. Their foreign news, almost in toto has to come from press services.

But this does not mean that they have to print only those columnists or reporters who feel the same as they about domestic and world problems. There is certainly room for both black and white in newspaper columns. As Mr. Cooke says, soundness of journalistic body will hinge on our refusing "a blind surrender of human individuality to the lowest common denominator." Humanity is colorful, and we are trying to make it colorless.

A reversal is implicit, a turn from this surrender to "the unhampered dissemination of any news a reporter can smell out, and the printing of the widest variety of views about it." That, says Mr. Cooke, is the only safeguard against the creation, by stereotyped news and opinion, of the "mass bigot."

A wise philosopher once maintained: "Opposition brings men together, and out of discord comes the fairest harmony, and all things have their birth in strife."

We think those words still hold wisdom.

## On The Carolina Front

Louis Kraar

Three coeds promenaded across campus by the Old Well Sunday night about 7 o'clock caroling the juke-box refrains of "Secret Lover." Ten minutes later, a trio of boys sauntered past Y Court harmonizing on "I Want a Girl."

A car edged down Cameron Avenue about 7:30 and came to a stop in front of the Old Well. A girl with a guitar and a boy without much of a voice got out of the car and crooned "I Love the Pin You Made Me wear." After a chorus, the two left.

And just ten minutes later, another coed marched in front of South Building singing an operatic aria. Her escort dashed into the Y for a moment, then hurried back out to meet her.

All in all it was a musical Sunday night. To top it off, Memorial Hall was playing "Kiss Me Kate."

—lk—

Sen. McCarthy's demands for radio time equal to that Adlai Stevenson was given are proof that Adlai was right when he said the GOP was "half McCarthy and half Eisenhower." The Republicans picked Nixon to answer for them, and McCarthy insists that the networks let him answer for himself.

—lk—

At the All-Campus Conference last week, a meeting to decide what to do to make the University better, most agreed that we were improving. *Academic Progression*, a new book by a gentleman with the intriguing name of Ernest Ernest, agrees with that campus optimism.

Students here in 1848, Arthur Ernest reports, rode horses through dorms and shot up the campus. This was something of a warm-up to what happened on Southern campuses during the Civil War. We are improving.

—lk—

Dr. A. T. Brauer, mathematics professor, this week sounded a note of hope for students who find math dull.

Dr. Brauer urged a group of teachers to "successfully show students the beauty and romance of mathematics and its importance for the training of logical thinking." He said that math faces a "great danger" unless teachers do this.

"It must be our aim to interest the majority of our students, and this is not possible if our own interest in mathematics has died some years ago," he said. And we agree.

—lk—

Ernest Hemingway, who writes books as well as emerges from plane crashes with gin bottles and bananas, is the subject of a series of articles in a Raleigh paper. Besides telling of the great, gut-loosening fear that is an "obsession" with Hemingway, the series has the latest count of the author's scars.

The official count, as of the last article, is six bullets in the head; battle scars on both knees, both feet, both arms, both hands and the groin; six broken ribs, and "no less than ten brain concussions."



HERBLOCK ©1954 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

## O'Dwyer Suffers For Sins Not His

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — The other day I flew down to Mexico City to interview Bill O'Dwyer, sometimes called the most mysterious man of American politics.

The former mayor of New York City had not granted an interview since he retired as U.S. ambassador to Mexico and chose, at least temporarily, to live there, rather than return to the United States.

PEARSON

I had known of Bill O'Dwyer when the State Department described him as the most popular and effective ambassador since Josephus Daniels. I had known him personally when he was in charge of Roosevelt's committee to help Jewish refugees escape the prison camps and soap factories of Adolf Hitler. I had also known him when, as a brigadier general in the Army, he had helped rebuild Italy.

And one very cold December day I had driven up Broadway with him when the historic canyons of lower Manhattan welcomed the Friendship Train with the traditional shower of ticker tape.

And, like a lot of other people, I wondered why he did not come back to New York.

The answer can't be given in a single sentence or a single paragraph—except to say that he is coming back, and did come back to meet me in Miami when some technicalities in our TV interview developed and it had to be refilled.

I suppose that part of the answer to the mystery of Bill O'Dwyer is found in the old French

adage, *Cherchez La Femme*. In brief, he got married to Sloan Simpson, a girl half his age, and there seldom has been a marriage that more cruelly and sensationally went on the rocks. At first it was just the opposite. Sloan was the toast of Mexico; later her flirtations were the talk of Mexico.

At the very height of this gossip when he needed a wife most, Ambassador O'Dwyer flew back to New York—of his own volition—to testify before the Kefauver Committee. O'Dwyer was suffering from pneumonia at the time and his temperature was 101, though his doctor didn't know this until later.

Specifically, O'Dwyer was grilled about James J. Moran, his deputy fire commissioner who later went to jail for perjury and extortion. Moran had been close to O'Dwyer, though not a bit closer than J. Russell Sprague and N.Y. Secretary of State Curran and some of the other men who boosted Tom Dewey up the political ladder and who have now been exposed as having their hands in the race-track till.

When I asked O'Dwyer about some of these things, he said he still could not understand Moran, that he had always trusted him. "As far as Dewey is concerned," he added, "you have to judge him on his accomplishments, not the men around him. The head of any state or city can't always know everything that going on around him, and you can't hold Dewey responsible for what some of his friends did."

Discussing graft in New York City politics, O'Dwyer said:

"The biggest graft is in contracts—building contracts. That's the case not only in New York

City but any any city. The contractors will swarm around your office, if you give them a chance, ready to do anything for you.

"But I continued Bob Moses in the job of handling building contracts, and not a five-cent piece went wrong out of more than a billion dollars."

In that connection, it's important to note that O'Dwyer built more schools, more hospitals and more public housing than any other mayor in New York's history—even more than Fiorello La Guardia. He made a crusade of his building program.

He also pointed out that he had appointed the present mayor of New York, Bob Wagner, to his first New York City job, and that Dr. Luther Gulick, now administrator of New York City and acclaimed by Republicans and Democrats alike, had first been appointed by O'Dwyer.

I asked O'Dwyer about the problem of race-track gambling and a proposal of his which had caused headaches and criticism.

"People will gamble," he said. "They will gamble in New York or any other place. And I thought that since they're bound to gamble, why not make it legal and take it away from the underworld. By that I meant, put it under state control. When I proposed this, I got a storm of criticism. But since then I notice that today some of the newspapers have come round to that point of view."

"I'm coming back to New snow gets off the car barns and when business brings me back. Or even if business doesn't bring me back, I'll be there when the Dodgers win the World Series."

My own guess is that he'll come back later this year.

## YOU Said It

Editor:

Recently there has appeared in your publication a number of comments and editorials concerning the Economics Department and the School of Business Administration which reflect, being as charitable as possible, misconceptions concerning both. Inasmuch as editorial comment should be based on at least rudimentary knowledge of easily available facts, positions taken with respect to subjects concerning which legitimate differences of opinion obviously exist may quite reasonably be expected to have been taken only after considerable investigation of the facts involved. Surely it is reasonable to request that editorial judgments display some evidence of having at least perfunctorily weighed the evidence for and against one position taken before categorically expounding that position.

To be more specific, one of the misconceptions recently displayed concerned the relationship of the Economics Department to the School of Business Administration and the College of Arts and Sciences. The Economics Department is a department of the College of Arts and Sciences as well as a part of the School of Business Administration. Economics is one of the social sciences just as history, political science, or sociology. Majors in economics have no more required courses in their major subject than do the majors in any of the other social sciences.

It is by no means readily apparent that their education is any less broad or any less effective in permitting them to "see what's going on" than a major in any other of the liberal arts; nor is it readily apparent that any of the other social sciences provide vastly superior tools for analyzing "what's going on" in the world today. Obviously the world's problems are not exclusively non-economic nor such that an understanding of our economy and that of other nations (even though imperfect) is not beneficial.

Furthermore, it is at least debatable that an understanding of history, for example, can be most effective in training the student to "see any sense to what's going on" without some training in economics.

In the present world struggle for men's minds the advantages we claim for "our system," "our way of life," and the like, refer in part to our economic system and our economic way of life. If this be true, time spent in attempting to understand our economic system can hardly be wasted. The problems with which sociology, political science and many other fields of learning are concerned are at least partially rooted in economics and adequate solutions to those problems will be at least more difficult of attainment without some understanding of those economic roots.

With respect to business administration majors, a recent column in your newspaper stated, as supposedly a fact, that the business school graduate was well versed in (among other things) economic theory. However, the vast majority of business school graduates takes no courses in pure economic theory. The average business school graduate's training in general economic theory consists primarily of that portion of the principles of economics courses devoted specifically to economic theory (approximately 20 class periods) and that coincident to the treatment of other topics in the principles courses, Money and Banking course, and the courses of his major.

The editorial attitude of your paper toward the business major does not appear to be one that is completely buttressed by logic or framed with objectivity. True enough, the business major's education is specialized in the sense in which you use the term. But are there no reasons for this? Are there no advantages to be gained thereby? Are there no important areas in which the Business Administration major can understand "what goes on" better than a major in the liberal arts, for example? Is this specialization as great as you imply? The Business School graduate has had more courses in liberal arts than in business administration . . . .

Business administration majors spend as much of their time in college enrolled in liberal arts courses as in business administration courses. In contrast, non-business majors take no business administration courses (nor have their teachers ever done so) . . . .

No field or area of academic training can validly claim dominion over all useful knowledge or over a majority of the knowledge most beneficial in understanding "what goes on" in the world. The presupposition that your area of training is best for the understanding of life's problems implies an ability to compare your area of training to all others. Such a comparison to be valid would require a mastery of all areas. Needless to say, such a mastery is impossible of attainment.

In view of the above, is it unreasonable to request that your expressions of opinion concerning the Economic Department, the School of Business Administration and the problem of specialization be somewhat less oracular?

W. D. Maxwell

(At least half — the first half — of Reader Maxwell's letter is concerned specifically with economics. We, too, are concerned with economics. There has not been a single editorial against economics. Rather, we have suggested that every student in the University be required to take basic economics. It should be part of the core curriculum, that curriculum by the way, which has been whittled by the Business Administration School until their majors now spend half their time in business administration.)

(We think the letter writer has confused us with several columns in which economics have been discussed. Columnists' opinions do not necessarily reflect those of the editor, and in this case are contrary to his.)

(We are against the present BA School curriculum. Certainly, we do not oppose specialization, but we oppose over-specialization and we interpret the BA School's requirements as over-specialization. Yes, we gladly would be less oracular if we could get those who make the curriculum decisions to discuss publicly their reasoning and philosophy. But it is characteristic of our University—it has not always been this way, however—that we do not discuss such questions as these.—Editor)

