

All-Campus Conference May Die From Neglect

The University's only forum of students, faculty, and administration hovers near death, mainly because of the student Legislature's neglect.

The All-Campus Conference in the past two springs brought together all three segments of Carolina to discuss common problems. It offered the only formal meeting ground for students, faculty, and administration. And at these meetings, each group came to understand the others.

But the death pains closed in early this past fall, when the student Legislature refused to grant funds for printing the All-Campus Conference's report from last spring. (The money was appropriated last spring, but reverted back to the legislative till at school-year's end; legislators refused to give it back in the fall.)

Now, with spring semester well in progress, student legislators have yet to begin plans for this All-Campus Conference.

Chancellor House, evaluating last spring's meeting, declared:

"Education has already improved when faculty and students sit down together and examine process, ways and means. I hope very much that this beginning will be carried forward in the years to come and that this means of eliciting constructive faculty and student thought may become the resource for the University which it certainly can be."

The Daily Tar Heel firmly agrees with the chancellor. We urge student legislators, before currents of spring elections surround them, to begin work on this year's All-Campus Conference.

Reputation In, Soul Out

"In Alabama we have seen what fiery publicity can do to a university's reputation."

With those words, the University of Mississippi student newspaper has withdrawn from a dispute with the University chancellor, Dr. J. D. Williams. A month or so ago, the Mississippian, edited by student Wallace Sherwood, raised eloquent protest when the chancellor announced intent to cancel an invitation to the Rev. Alvin Kershaw. The Rev. Mr. Kershaw, a sworn enemy of segregation, was to speak — and advance ideas acutely unpopular in Mississippi — on the race question. The Chancellor said ensuing publicity might damage the University. The Mississippian said it stood rigidly for segregation, but that it stood at the same time for open debate. It stood for the principle that students should forsake spoon-fed prejudice, hear both sides, and think the issue through.

Hard on the heels of the Miss Lucy incident at Alabama, the Chancellor has gone through with his plan: he has evoked the Rev. Mr. Kershaw's speaking invitation. And with him, the student newspaper has turned from the garbisons of debate and run. A month ago, the newspaper was getting notice for its stand against suppression. Today its line is this: "We certainly agree with (Chancellor) Williams that it would be unwise

for Kershaw to speak at Ole Miss. How could students enhance their spiritual life when the garish flash of cameras replaces the fulfilling glow of Christ?"

That essential right of debate, of hearing both sides, so important to The Mississippian a month ago, has gradually become non-essential in the face of possible bad publicity. "Reputation" is at stake, claims the editor in a signed editorial. Now that the newspaper has printed a long letter from the Reverend Mr. Kershaw, the obligation of the University of Mississippi to hear him is filled, in The Mississippian's shifting eye.

Happily, The Mississippian's sudden reversal is not sitting well with several University of Mississippi students. Especially the student who commented with telling sarcasm:

"We must have nothing to do with these people. Some of their subversive ideas might rub off on our sacred institutions. They might contaminate the minds of our innocent young people, and we can't let that happen. Such beliefs are like a contagious disease; which one catches upon exposure — the only protection is complete quarantine."

Free inquiry is the soul of a University. We wonder what it profits the University of Mississippi to save its "reputation" if it loses that soul.

Vote In Recall Today

As our enterprising advertising manager said, perhaps a bit hyperbolically, "Not since the issue of Saturday classes has there been so much written, spoken, and shouted about one issue in Chapel Hill."

Although this may overstate the case, campus interest in today's recall election is great. And, despite the images it may evoke, we find it heartening that Carolina can get worked up over a campus issue, and debate it with skill and vigor.

Now both sides have been heard. The debates have been reshaped,

and the reshapes have been challenged and counter-challenged. The arguments are all in, and today the campus electorate will render its verdict at the polls.

We urge each student to go to the polls and vote in accordance with his own convictions.

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 LOUIS KRAAR, ED YODER
 Managing Editor FRED POWLEDGE
 News Editor CHARLIE JOHNSON
 Business Manager BILL BOB PEEL
 Sports Editor WAYNE BISHOP
 Advertising Manager Dick Sirkin
 Asst. Bus. Manager Carolyn Nelson
 Coed Editor Peg Humphrey
 Circulation Manager Jim Kiley
 Subscription Manager Jim Chumblee
 Staff Artist Charlie Daniel

BUSINESS STAFF—Fred Katzin, Stan Bershaw, Rosa Moore, Charlotte Lilly, Ted Wainer, Daryl Chasen, Johnny Witaker.

OFFICE TELEPHONES—News, editorial, subscription: 9-3361. News, business: 9-3371. Night phone: 8-444 or 8-445.

EDITORIAL STAFF—Bill O'Sullivan, Bill Ragsdale.
 Night Editor Mike Vester

STEVENSON CAMPAIGN Comments Reflect 'Moderate Temper'

By Doris Fleeson

SAN DIEGO, Calif.—In his first moments of seclusion since he entered California, Adlai Stevenson turned his full attention to the civil-rights issue.

Stevenson is told that he has failed to satisfy the legitimate hunger of the Negro people for Federal guarantees against such violence as is being practiced against a Negro woman student at the University of Alabama. He is unhappy about it—his managers are unhappy.

'GUT REACTION'

The former Illinois governor is willing to match his "gut reaction" against violence with any man's. That he has failed adequately to express it he is being forced to ponder. The national press for one thing is asking for transcripts of his remarks.

They are stronger and more detailed than those of President Eisenhower. Indeed the President's remarks are barely noted out here nor is it mentioned that he will shortly vacate at the Georgia estate of his Treasury Secretary, George Humphrey, next door to Alabama. Yet the President has the nation-

al office and the power to act. The Stevenson staff points this out.

The fact remains that civil-rights is an emotional, racial issue of burning importance to the party whose nomination for President Stevenson seeks. To any Republican it is hardly a political problem at all and only a segment of the party feels deep emotion about it.

MISFORTUNE

Stevenson had the further misfortune that the Alabama story broke coincidentally with his foray into the vital primary in this state where civil rights is an important issue. Also his hand was forced by his underdog rival Senator Kefauver.

The feeling in the Stevenson camp is that he was inadequately briefed by his local handlers both on this and many other aspects of his campaign. He clearly needs an advance man with better political antenna than amiable Hy Haskins, assistant to his campaign manager, James Finnegan. Because Stevenson has all the party big wheels on his side, details and rank and file problems were neglected.

The candidate also needs a bigger staff to help handle the press and write drafts suitable for the

dozen occasions of a normal day.

NO DECISION

There is no sign of any important California defection. The remarks of Negro dissidents who spoke up at Los Angeles have been reviewed and are not thought to be dangerous.

Still, any feeling that Stevenson took a merely correct position, a purely intellectual approach to what can easily be, as the Alabama incident proves, a matter of life and death, is a warning ripple in the Democratic political pond. If it spread, it could be dangerous to him.

Adlai Stevenson will never breathe fire and brimstone. His comments to date reflect his genuinely moderate temper. He is too steeped in Lincoln lore to wave a bloody shirt and he is one who believes that had Lincoln's moderation and conciliatory spirit been truly understood by the South there would have been no Civil War.

Hence his inner debate is over the question of when in truth and honor he can do to meet a condition, not a theory.

GOP & Congress

By The Alsop

WASHINGTON—At the close of the current session of Congress, one thing is almost certain: the Eisenhower administration's legislative program, a masterpiece of political calculation in an election year.

The program is being calculated to exploit the divisions in the Democratic Party. As a result, the Democrats control of both Houses, analyzed on a whole, is a politically potent domestic issue. As one of the shrewdest observers in Capitol Hill has noted, "The Republicans are going to have a fairly good showing in the 84th Congress, Democratic 84th Congress."

Take the school issue. Democrats were prepared to exploit this emotionally charged issue, by passing the Democratic school-aid bill as almost an order of business in the Senate. But the Administration, with a bill of its own, preventing the Democrats from getting the sole glory for helping school children. At the same time, a Democrat, Adam Clayton Powell of New York, threatened to introduce an amendment ending Federal aid to segregated schools.

The Republican House, Joe Martin and Charles McNamara passed the word to support the Powell amendment, thus assuring its passage—of course, assuring the Democrats of being filibustered to death in the Senate. But this will leave Republicans in a happy situation. They will be able to credit the amendment with Negro votes the same time, they will be able to pin the blame for making the school aid bill squeak through the Democrats. In this situation the Democratic leaders have the school bill off the floor, they wrestle with their dilemma.

The President has said that he means to ask for legislation to establish a rights commission, to deal with racial discrimination. Southerners immediately made clear that they would like this modest proposal to be Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, for example, would speak on the issue. There was "breath in his back."

Some Democrats distrust the Administration's attempt to spring still more rights proposals, in order to exploit further the North-South divide in the party. But it is not clear that they are paralyzed.

President Eisenhower broadened coverage for the minimum wage. But many Southerners bitterly oppose this, and it is expected to come up for a vote. The President has also commended that the proposal of the McCarran Immigration an emotional issue among city groups, be "re-examined." It is most unlikely that the Democratic leadership will attempt to revise the act.

Then there is revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the President's modest health-reform most certainly be blocked together it is easy to see why Democrats press the farm so lovingly to their bosoms—just about all they have got.

But even here they may be appointed. The present situation is that 90 per cent of the will be tacked onto the Administration farm program, with help of Republican votes. A belief is growing that the President may sign the bill, on grounds that it is an "good legislation, despite the party provisions."

Thus even this favorite Democratic issue may be aborted. If Secretary of Agriculture Benson then resigns in protest, as he has indicated—it will be remarkably little pain to the breasts of farm state Democrats.

Finally, the Democrats somberly convinced that the Administration will spring a getting tax-cut towards the of the session. To be sure, shrewdly-led Democrats may have a trick or two up their sleeves. But they are obviously in danger of being backed into a corner on many issues. It is ready it is clear that the Administration has been putting sure-footed and sophisticated political performance, in contrast to the clumsiness of first couple of years.



Reader's Retort

Alumni Wire DTH Support From Mannheim, Germany

Editors:

TO THE STUDENT BODY:
 URGE CONFIDENCE IN DAILY TAR HEEL LEADERSHIP OF KRAAR AND YODER IN TUESDAY'S ELECTION. OUSTER WOULD BE GRAVE DEPARTURE FROM TRADITION.

Mannheim, Germany
 Ken Penegar
 Gene Cook
 Robert Pace
 Al Lowenstein

Paper Supported by Taxes Should Be Uncontroversial

Editors:

If I might, I should like to finish my work here without becoming involved in this sort of activity, but that is difficult for any man who dislikes being forced to pay his money for your support.

In spite of the incessant talk about it, there is no real freedom of expression for the student here. Freedom has always been reserved for the favored minority, which has been kept in power by the ever present interference of the university administration, and by the use of student funds to publish the editors' personal campaign literature.

Whenever any true expression of student opinion appears, the administration immediately acts to bring it under control. Always, we see the interference of some dean, eager to encourage whatever sort of atmosphere in the school that he thinks will win him a pat on the head when he goes off visiting in the Ivy League. This situation is clearly illustrated by the withdrawal of one candidate from the approaching recall election, with the remark that he felt handicapped by his having to run against "the assorted deans of the university."

If the University acknowledged the truth by stopping the affectation of student "freedom", that honest action might be respected. If it kept its snuffling noses out of student elections, that restraint, too, might be respected. The existing farce cannot be respected.

The most laughable part of the whole slapstick comedy is the monumental clamor about "freedom of the press." It must be admitted that no participant has stated the issue clearly. The Daily Tar Heel cannot be compared to a corporation, with the students as stockholders, because the student does not have a stockholder's freedom to get rid of his stock. The Daily Tar Heel is a monopoly supported by a form of taxation. It is not only a part of what is, with undue flattery, called "student government"; it is also, by some legally questionable delegation of state power, a part of the government of North Carolina, for this university is a state university, and attendance here is conditional upon the payment of the tax to The Daily Tar Heel.

The American political philosophy has always maintained that a government publication ought not to be used for personal or partisan purposes. The government does not publish a paper analogous to Pravda or The Daily Tar Heel. It does publish information, but domestic political controversy would not be tolerated in, for instance, the Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards. No government publication is a part of the "free press."

It is unfortunate that the student, during a very impressionable period in his life, should be taught that a tax-fed monopoly is representative of the American free press.

The free press is that press whose publisher and customer are both free. If we want a free press, we must free the customer and permit him to decide whether he wants to subscribe to your paper. Of course, it will be said that without taxation we can have no paper. The university will probably renounce the principle and continue to present a crude little burlesque of freedom.

If we want a paper supported by taxation, then we ought to follow the American way, by forbidding it to publish controversial editorials.

—John M. Ruth

More Comments From Readers

Concert Segregation Called Inconsistent

Editors:

On last evening my wife, a friend of ours, and I attempted to attend Mr. Williams Warfield's recital at Memorial Hall. After purchasing our tickets we were informed by an usher of the Student Entertainment Committee that a section had been reserved in the balcony for Negro patrons. Certainly we could not accept this type of arrangement, hence, we secured a refund and left.

It seems so inconsistent that Mr. Warfield, a Negro artist, was being forced to sing to an audience where members of his own race had to be segregated. We have written Mr. Warfield's Manager calling this incident to his attention because I am certain that Mr. Warfield was not conscious of such arrangements.

The usher stated that the reason for the segregation was State owned property. I did not want to force the issue with him or create a scene but we attend the concert series at North Carolina College and I have seen members of your faculty attending these concerts, however, they are not subjected to discriminatory practices in spite of the fact State property is involved.

I think it advisable that we bring this incident to your attention because I have followed, with a great deal of interest, the editorial column of the Daily Tar Heel and it seems to approach the segregation problem from a liberal point of view.

W. A. Clement
 Durham

Student Queries Nance About Recall, Freedom

Editors:

I am writing to say that I hope you are reelected. I feel that any other outcome would be defeat of the press and a warning to any future editors not to say anything too committal on any issue more controversial than a Christmas card list.

To Junior Nance:

1. If your primary concern in submitting a recall petition was not to remove Kraar and Yoder, then why wasn't such a petition circulated before Tatum's hiring if you were dissatisfied before then?

2. Is limited freedom any freedom at all. If you want to present a view opposing that of the editors, just write a letter. I have seen in the last two weeks many more letters opposing the editors than those for them. As for The Daily Tar Heel representing the views of its "stockholders"—students—aren't these letters proof that the only limit to the presentation of student opinion in The Daily Tar Heel is the student's own interest—or laziness?

And doesn't the writing of editorials with unpopular views stimulate thought. Most of us would not have thought nearly as much about controversial issues without the stimulation of opposition.

3. What opinion would you print in an editorial on an issue over which the campus was equally or in many parts divided?

As for athletics, I am in favor of reform, but I would suggest that it be conference-wide. The Ivy League did it; we can too. But even if I were for Big-Time professional football, complete with all its faults, I am still for freedom of the press, and I would still support Kraar and Yoder.

Grace Alley

Spoon-Feeding

It is not only that we feed them (students), in the form of lectures and textbooks and outlines, all the information they will need to pass a series of examinations. The spoon-feeding carries over into other areas as well. Thus we provide our students with their sports and games, wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars and enormous energy and time on puerile athletic spectacles which do no conceivable good and actually cause immense harm to education.

Why not sweep away the whole absurd paraphernalia of organized intercollegiate sports, with their insatiable demands for money, their fantastic distraction of energy, their immoral emphasis on winning teams and on spectator interest, and let the students manage their own games.

—Henry Steede Commager in The New York Times Magazine.

John M. Ruth