

Needed: More Flutes

Newspaper headlines don't always make us wince and gnash our teeth. Announcement of the Ford Foundation Grant of \$246,000 for research in the behavioral sciences is a cheery note.

But good news for the University right now is but a flute trill above the discord, at least to a superficial observer. Just listen:

1. **The Presidential Situation:** The University is still playing the role of a headless horseman with its president in Washington. This is not to detract from Dr. Purks' own capacity, since it is above the power of any man to function to full effect as an "acting" president.

2. **Finances:** The 1955 N. C. General Assembly granted neither staff additions nor permanent improvements to the University, in an hour when the need for both is crucial.

3. **Undergraduate Education:** Not altogether dark, since the administrative changes recommended by Cresap, McCormick and Pager brought Deans Spruill, Johnson, and Sitterson into greater prominence in the total University picture. But encroachment of the B. A. School and other agitators for vocational study on the soundness of undergraduate curriculum, understressed academics, concentration on graduate schools to the detriment of the undergraduate plague this quarter of the University.

4. **Ultimate Policy-Making:** The recent action on admission of Negro undergraduates—in which the decision was appealed—shows, we think, that the power of the Trustees to override local administrative attitude and general faculty will be growing. Not only do the Trustees now make policy; they move closer by the day to being its executors.

The newly-created Board of Higher Education will pose catchy questions. What relation will it have to policy in Chapel Hill?

5. **Enrollment:** No downward trend to be seen. A thumb can't be pushed into a thimble and the problem of selectivity must be faced.

6. **Student Union:** We have come to the fork of the road in the student union issue. We will either stagnate in old, inadequate Graham Memorial, or begin to think about a building with equipment equal to our needs.

Now, where was that flute?

Free Enterprise & Local Dry Cleaners

If local experts questioned by The Daily Tar Heel are correct in their interpretation (and we think then are), local dry cleaning establishments are sticking students and breaking a state law. It is illegal in North Carolina to form any "contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce . . ." Apparently, local cleaners have broken this law in agreeing to up their prices. Free enterprise demands a system of competition under which businesses compete, setting their prices individually. And there is doubt whether cleaning establishments in Chapel Hill are very free—or very enterprising, for that matter.

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 and examination and vacation 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: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

- Editors: ED YODER, LOUIS KRAAR
Managing Editor: FRED POWLEDGE
Business Manager: BILL BOB PEEL
Associate Editor: J. A. C. DUNN
News Editor: JACKIE GOODMAN
NEWS STAFF: Neil Bass, Charles Dunn, James Nichols, Mike Vester, Bennis Baucom, Bunny Klenke, Ruth Rush, Curtis Gans, Jimmy Purks, Joan McLean, Nancy Link, Bill Corpening, Virginia Hughes, Clarke Jones, Wilson Cooper, Charlie Sloan, Jerry Cuthrell, Peg Humphrey, Nancy Rothschild.
EDITORIAL STAFF: Rueben Leonard, Bill O'Sullivan.
Staff Cartoonist: Charlie Daniel
Night Editor For This Issue: Rueben Leonard

Carolina Front

Bits Of Glup & A Tip For A Boulevardier

J.A.C. Dunn

WE CAME blasting into the editorial office of this newspaper last Monday afternoon, feeling bright-eyed and bushy-tailed, ready for anything the clattering halls of journalism might bring us; we flung off our coat (we only have one to share among us), whipped out glasses, polished them with a piece of the editor's copy paper, teapots



the desk and ripped off the top three inches of paper from the typewriter (this is always a good beginning), and then tried to think what to write about.

AT THIS juncture we noticed a small stack of smaller scraps of paper lying on the desk. They had been typed upon. The top one read as follows:

"I never met a man I didn't like"—Will Rogers. You never met Christine Jorgenson." This is true. We never did. We never laughed at that little joke, either. Not even the first three times we heard it.

We went on to the next one: "disestablishmentarianism I had one, but the wheels came off." We have heard this before. This, if we recall correctly, is a comment retailed to us some time ago from only as far away as the next county, and has been bandied around the editorial office on various occasions since then whenever the spirit of levity goes out of control.

THIS SORT of glurk continued throughout the collection. In all there were about 15 scraps of painfully humorous paper. We callously threw them all away except one, which we liked very much—not because we hadn't heard it over and over and over before, because we had, but simply because it has a zany quality about it that worms its way under our cynical defenses and daubs our duodenum with a particularly stimulating brand of intellectual pickle juice:

"Gotta go back to Tara Tararaboomdeay There'll be just two in our bed tonight But ashley the wars over lawsy me miss scarlett."

LAWSY US. Recently it seems we have been battling, or perhaps we should say 'earnestly discussing,' the question of the editorial. We with a gentleman named A. Starr. Mr. Starr sent us another letter the other day, which we are not going to quote because we have finished with Mr. Starr as column subject matter.

However, we were informed recently, by a gentleman who shall remain nameless (practically everyone does in this column), that Mark Twain—once remarked on the editorial We to the following effect: That the only people who should be allowed to use the editorial We were editors (we are one, as a quick look at the masthead will show), pastors, and people with tape worms. Daddy can we have a dime for a tapeworm?

EDWARD AND James Gaylord have written to Ed Yoder, from the Hotel Ritz (15 Place Vendome, Paris) asking him to help them pick a name for what they term "A brandnew American automobile" which is "making its debut on October 6th at the Paris Automobile Salon." They say the car has a 300 HP engine, a custom-built body, and that all their mechanical problems are solved. Now they want a name for the car, one that begins with G, as does their own name. The car is plugged as perfect for the "scart bonterardier." We suggest the "Gomango."

English Club

Placement Bureau Statistics Still Not The True Measure

John Mahoney

(The Daily Tar Heel welcomes the English Club and its distinguished penmen back to the editorial page. Old readers will no doubt remember the notorious "X—Clawhammers On The Bathroom Floor" controversy, the English Club's last of many before its departure from these columns. Back, now, for good, the club members will occupy this space weekly. Today's essay is a second look at an academic shotgun wedding.—The Editors.)

One of the most noticeable phenomena that has appeared on the academic sky in the period following World War II has been the strong and eager defense of the study of the humanities. This effort has had its effect in an apparent increase in interest in these studies, and in a closer working relationship between the representatives of business and industry and academicians.

An orientation seldom approaches, a commencement seldom passes which is not the scene of commendation for humanistic studies on the part of business and of friendly smiles of welcome on the part of professors. It may be said, however, that this new rapport of helpfulness between the two groups has produced an unfortunate unity, a unity based for the humanities on the principles of defense.

There is scarce a scholar or teacher who does not appear on each new academic scene armed with statistics from placement bureaus and girl with the delights in industry for prospective employees who have studied the Classics. By a quantitative evaluation of such facts, there seem to be no subjects more profitable to study than language or history. Literature or even philosophy. The only inevitability for this alliance of usefulness, and it seems an unhappy one, is that since the humanities have chosen to take their stand for continuance in the role of an outstanding and efficient means, they will eventually, if the program persists, forget their own purposes.

It disturbs me to think that so few of the students who pour into required courses in the impractical arts and sciences are not told that they are indeed impractical, are not offered opportunity to study because they came to college to learn what sometime everyone learned, and do not hear that they are doing so predominantly because no one has discovered a better way to become educated. If educators tend to be unrealistic, as has been frequently charged, they are so partly because they imagine a student will study English grammar on the grounds that it

will contribute to his future career. One would think this subject might seem more justifiable labor to him if he knew that its purpose is a mental one, measurable only by the code of personal evaluation and improvement.

In any case, more might be contributed to the cause of the humanities if at least a few of its exponents could be mentally incapable of defense and even a bit aristocratic in their conviction of purpose. The name of student and teacher is a proud one, but one so defined in its meaning and sound that it blends not well with the euphonic symbols of organized practical purposefulness on an office door.

'Uncultured'

The Geneva spirit descended in time to waft flocks of Congressmen to Moscow, an unexpected boom to the Russian people. Now for a few weeks they have visitors around who can explain to them what they, the people, want. Congressmen are good at that; it takes scholars and diplomats and the responsible press months and years, and then they aren't positive, but Congressmen can tell what people want in a day or two. This uncanny insight works fine at home, and apparently it works in Russia too. Senator Ellender discovered that the Russian people don't want war. Senator Malone discerned that the Russian people don't want to rise against their rulers. Representative Joe Holt found that the Russian people want American jazz.

Malone was in Russia nine days, and discovered that the Voice of America is pointless and wasteful, because the people over there aren't going to revolt against the Soviets. Holt found that the Russians wouldn't let him look to much. "About all you can see," said Holt and his companion Representative John J. Rhodes, "are museums and Lenin's tomb." Also, their guides kept leaving them to take care of pro-Communist delegations.

But worst of all, Holt was detained at pistol point for an hour by a Red Army lieutenant. On the occasion of the conversation on that occasion, as reported by the Congressman, is especially interesting. "He poked the gun about a foot from my face and it was cocked on the shouted 'You're uncultured! You're uncultured!' I said, 'I sure am.'"

Y-Court Corner

Garbage Cans; The Place For Sex And Men?

Rueben Leonard

CHARLES DUNN did a magnificent job in presenting to the readers of The Daily Tar Heel his opinion of just what the relationship between young men and women should be prior to marriage. Although the major part of his column, Over The Hill, was a speech presented to his summer school class, he nevertheless concurred with its content. To quote Mr. Dunn, "... Take it for what it is worth. My only comment is that I wish I had said it."

THE TEXT of the speech presented by someone in Mr. Dunn's class stated that "Almost every man is out for all he can get in everything he does; business, politics, women, even fishing and hunting." Of these many things that man is out to get, woman, is the only one elaborated on by Mr. Speechmaker. Mr. Speechmaker implies that "almost every man" is lascivious, libidinous, lustful, lewd, wanton, immoral—but more important, that he habitually indulges his sexual lust and no woman is safe within his arm's reach. I ask you, do you really believe that implication? I say NO, you don't believe it and you never will.

MR. SPEECHMAKER does not stop with labeling "almost every man" an iconoclast, but continues his moaning by saying that men do not respect women, men's hands and minds are filthy, and weak men say "Yes" to the curvaceous Jezebels of today—strong men say no. After reading that I was afraid to put Saturday morning's paper near the desk lamp for fear it would break out in a rash of illegitimate babies.

WHERE DO you draw the line between morality and immorality? Is everything on one side moral and everything on the other side immoral? What if some couple do have intimate relations before marriage—is this filthy, does it degrade the persons involved, are they to be cast on the garbage heaps of society? Of course sex to some people is filthy—to filthy people everything is filthy, but "almost every man" does not fall into this category.

Let's suppose a couple has sexual relations and doesn't get married. Although this poses an entirely different problem, it is basically the same. Is this couple to be tossed into rapids of public opinion and finger pointing? Are they to be socially damned? Who is the judge—Mr. Speechmaker, me, You? No, we are not the ones to pass judgement on these people, but due to the existing social conditions we are compelled to peer down our sanctimonious beaks at this hypothetical couple and pity them in their quagmire of filth and squalor. Is it really filthy and squalor? Could they possibly be in love at the time and consider their actions something beautiful and wonderful? So what if they don't get married, isn't it better to find out before marriage, that they are not right for each other than to wait until there are children to share their unhappiness with them?

BACK TO Mr. Speechmaker. He says men are out to ruin every young girl, old girl, and female in general that enters their reach. This may be true in a few instances, but most men don't really enjoy something that isn't mutually shared. I admit this may be true in some instances, but most men exercise some degree of discretion. What are men supposed to be anyhow—a group of bovine, phlegmatic, and vegetablelike ninnies?

I DO not advocate free love (it is a nice thought though). I merely wish that people would take the "filthy" label off sex and as they start to criticize others—remember that old adage, "When you point your finger at someone else remember that there are three pointing back at you."

Indignity White Wa

Brooks Atkinson

(Brooks Atkinson of the New York Times, is also a well-known political critic. Hear below his indignity and the reflections it throws over Broadway.)

What good purpose was served by the testimony of 23 actors by the House Un-American Activities Committee? One confessed his sins, which he had reported voluntarily to the FBI and received

lution from the tee. During the hearings and his tee members grew at equal uniform tones of indignation. The proved at least level of conviction low.

Three of the witnesses did not invoke the notion of any constitutional amendment. They ones who have the courage of the conviction against testifying before a congressional committee about their private beliefs and associations. Since they stood on principle, their conduct be respected, or they can be automatically contempt of Congress; they are likely to serious trouble and they may have to go. Those who claimed the protection of constitutional amendments are in a relatively secure position. COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS ALREADY KNOWN.

But what good purpose was served by the of public hearings? No one knows anything not known before. The one man who confessed sins had already confessed them to the Government agency, and might decently have spared the humiliation of having to repeat them in public. But even before the hearings began it was obvious that they could not sustain Rufus Francis E. Walter's assertion that he was trying to find out who was contributing to the of Communist unions. The witnesses he called so minor and obscure, at least in the theater, their earning power is modest.

Even if they were Communist sympathizers, the hearing did not prove, any contribution could make would not pay the deficit of the Worker for one day. At the conclusion of the first day's hearings, Walter made one statement that actors would be justified in asking him to withdraw from the balking witness he said: "I had seen these people have demonstrated that something to be concealed in the frames of the (theatrical) unions, something that was to make them as captive as the United Electrical Workers and the Mine, Mill and Smelters' Union. 'AS POPULAR AS SMALLPOX'."

Later Mr. Walter qualified this statement having been prompted by one of his colleagues. But it was a gratuitous defamation of an organization. In Actors Equity and in the in general, Communism is about as popular as smallpox. There was a time in the 30's when wingers gave Actors Equity a lot of trouble, trouble was caused by the fact that most had no use for left-wingers and fought the ously.

Although the Communist party is a legal party, Congress has passed legislation that restricts its activities on the assumption is an international conspiracy, as it is. The left-wingers in the theater has violated these laws he can be indicted by a grand jury in the courts. That is the traditional can way. It is also the best way that people have been able to devise. No congressional committee, maneuvering sensitive areas of personal thought, belief, or conviction, can preserve the moral health of the try as the courts do.

DOUBTS RAISED IN PUBLIC MIND Over the last five years, in fact, congressional committees have weakened the moral basis of the country. They have provoked American distrustful Americans. They have spread record and suspicion; and one of them has doubts in the public mind as to the loyalty theater.

Congressional committees have the right to inquire into conspiratorial acts that are out to be the basis for new legislation. But into belief and association do not have sanction. They may invade the area of the Amendment, which law that, among other abridges the freedom of speech or of the or of the right of the people peacefully to assemble. Whatever the legal sanction may or may it is certain that no Congressman or congressional committee is endowed by God with enough standing to preside over another citizen's or associations. No man, Congressman or not, enough to operate simultaneously as prosecutor, judge and parish priest.

If by some unforeseeable stroke of Providence, a Congressman turned up who was of passing judgment on questions of speech would be wise enough to refuse to do so would know where demagoguery begins. JEFFERSON ON 'CENSORIAL POWER' "If we advert to the nature of republican government," Jefferson said, "we shall find that the power is in the people over the Government and not in the Government over the people. It is why people go to the polls.

In and out of the theater there are many minded people who hope that some day the States Government will support the theater that the British government supports the theater through the autonomous Arts Council idea is reasonable on many grounds and the Arts Council is an admirable organization. The Russian government does not show loyalty of the Russian theater. It is a long time ago by putting the theater on a roll.

"Shall We All Recognize The Situation?"



Let's suppose a couple has sexual relations and doesn't get married.

Although this poses an entirely different problem, it is basically the same. Is this couple to be tossed into rapids of public opinion and finger pointing? Are they to be socially damned? Who is the judge—Mr. Speechmaker, me, You? No, we are not the ones to pass judgement on these people, but due to the existing social conditions we are compelled to peer down our sanctimonious beaks at this hypothetical couple and pity them in their quagmire of filth and squalor. Is it really filthy and squalor? Could they possibly be in love at the time and consider their actions something beautiful and wonderful? So what if they don't get married, isn't it better to find out before marriage, that they are not right for each other than to wait until there are children to share their unhappiness with them?