

The Liberal Arts Education: Other Campuses Beliefs

Richard Snyder
In The Michigan Daily

Education should be a big ice cream cone. So it seems from the increasing tendency to cry for more "integration," more survey courses, more "broadly-oriented courses."

That there should be some unity in knowledge in the liberal arts, no one will deny. That compartmentalization of the disciplines is bad when it leaves uncovered areas between the disciplines is also a virtuous remark.

But when a student asks for a course which will coordinate all the knowledge in a given area of natural science, social sciences or the humanities, then he is citing evidence of his own shortcomings. The function of the liberal arts school and faculty is not to crawl inside the mind of the student and form all the knowledge from the various courses he has taken into some kind of a map of life.

It is the student's responsibility to assimilate the various disciplines, to give them proper balance in view of what his aim in life is. The faculty may tell him what balance of courses would be advisable, but it cannot and should not also provide a mental blueprint showing where each intellectual two-by-four goes and how it should be nailed in.

If education were to consist of a mass of survey courses — where the student gets a "broad" view of Science or Culture or Life — its products would wind up knowing plenty about everything in general, nothing about anything in particular.

Moreover, the Science or Culture or Life major would have no power of ability to find out anything in particular. (We would have to grant, however, that he would be able to speak eloquently after graduation on any subject — for go seconds.)

We agree with Prof. Eisenberg that education in breadth comes only after education in depth in a particular area. For it is not until a student develops his faculties of thinking and expression that he can grasp the relation of particulars.

And these faculties cannot be developed without concentrated work in specific disciplines where there are specific problems and philosophies to be discussed. The power to think does not develop in a vacuum.

In this role, the faculty should only act as the catalyst. It should not mix the ingredients for the student. It should not serve Education-Under-Glass to the student. Obstacles in the way of a liberal education today are caused more by student irresponsibility than by some of the notorious flaws in teaching methods.

The faculty can to some extent dip the student an educational ice cream cone. But it would not take too long for that type of education to melt.

Bob Wohl
In The UCLA Bruin

One of the great problems facing all universities at the present time, and especially important here at UCLA, is how to impart to the general student body a liberal education.

The reason for this problem is that during the last century there has been a greater and greater tendency toward specialization and the splitting up of the educational process into isolated fields of concentration which, although giving the student an excellent preparation in one small segment of study, does not provide him with the general cultural background which is the object of all education.

In the last decade, and especially in the last few years, educators have come to be more and more concerned with this problem, and several special committees have been formed to study this situation from the point of view of making it possible for the student who is required to specialize, to attain, at the same time, a certain amount of general education.

One of the most interesting and informative reports to come out of this type of activity has been the publication of a small booklet by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, summarizing a discussion of liberal education by 17 of the foundation's trustees, most of them college presidents.

This report is significant for a number of reasons, but is mainly interesting for its conclusion that liberal education is compatible with specialization.

According to the summary, in order to rescue the liberal arts college from the onslaught of specialization, it is essential to distinguish the goals of liberal education from those of the professional schools.

"The goals of a liberal education," say the report, "are the goals of a lifetime, and few men achieve them."

In other words, it is not a question of either-or, of a general education or a specialized one; the truly educated man must have both. The purpose of the liberal education is to learn how to live.

And, although a liberal education will obviously make a man a better professional, this should not be considered its only reason for being. It is an end in itself.

As the report states it: "The first orientation of a liberal education is toward man as man, not toward man as money maker."

It would be well for all of us to remember these principles in an age when specialization has been made an object of veneration.

Suggestion:

A suggestion for Phi Kappa: Get a queen. You're lost if you're an organization or an event that doesn't have a queen. The Carolina campus has got so many queens right now that coeds who haven't been crowned queen of this or that have ample reason to harbor inferiority complexes.

So, to provide more interest in that noble organization, Phi Beta Kappa, we propose a queen. She could be selected from the A-average girls on the campus, crowned in the Reserve Reading Room of the Library, and Chancellor House could kiss her on the cheek.

What a boost for the society of scholars! People would be falling all over themselves to pledge up.

Reminder:

"(University Business Manager Claude) Teague said he hoped construction will begin soon after Christmas of this year. Once construction starts, he said, it will take about one year to complete the buildings..." —From news story in fall of 1955, concerning construction of new dormitories for the University campus.

Construction hasn't started yet.

CAROLEIDOSCOPE

Most Writers Are Iconoclasts

Frank Crowther

In the past few years, I have brushed over many thousands of words concerning writing. None of it has rubbed off on me as I would have wished...but I have clipped several interesting pieces during this period. I have found that Fulton Oursler was born drunk; talent is built in solitude; writers are trying to express the difference they feel between themselves and the rest of the world (something about which I have often thought). Here are a few explanations:

Dorothy McCleary in Creative Fiction Writing:

"Why do we want to write? In order to express the difference which we feel between ourselves and the rest of the world; to let our inner vision, which has been accumulating inside of us ever since we drew our first conscious breath. The only way we can express this very personal possession is by putting it into terms of everyday life so that the reader will be able to understand and enjoy it..."

Goethe said once that we build character in the stream of the world but talent in solitude.

He said that after one has lived hard, danced many dances, sung many songs, observed as many things as he could hold, he should then find a quiet place, to withdraw... be it an attic, or a sea-side resort, a mountain lodge, or whatever, as long as it is in solitude where your mind and soul will have time to slow down, clear its throat, and begin again to function.

If they function well, you may be a great storyteller; if they don't, you may still be a successful writer, but only of second or third rate.

This final quotation is from an unknown source, but its meaning is not in who wrote it, but in its interpretation:

"I once asked Fulton Oursler why he never drank and he said, 'I was born drunk. I was born in-

toxicated with life, all of it. So were you. Add alcohol to this and it's a conflagration."

"This is true, and the high emotional reaction is an absolute essential. All writers have

Nor must you be fooled by, say, the man-of-the-world poise and savoir-faire of a Gallico; he is actually an old softie. Or the cold, deadpan exterior Ring Lardner presented to the world. In-

side, Ring was a man of the violence against evil which produced Champion and Hair Cut. "Most writers are iconoclasts in some way or another, bitter against existing wrongs."

'Tsk Tsk'



THE LION AND ANDROCLEES

Playmakers Play Shaw -- Shaw Loses

Paul McCauley

Seeing the Playmakers' production of "Androcles and the Lion" reminded me of what happened when a college theatrical group wrote to G.B.S. and requested permission to do one of his plays. This very Shawish reply was received by the group: "You can't, but you may." So went the evening and the Playmakers' dubious "tribute" to Shaw.

"Androcles and the Lion" is the story of a tiny, timid, terrified lion and a not-so-terrible, articulate lion, who become dancing partners after Androcles removes a thorn from the Lion's paw.

Androcles is captured by the Romans and led away to Rome with other Christians to be fed to the lions in the arena for Caesar's amusement. Just so happens that Androcles ends up in the arena with Tawny, the gregarious "fellow"

These two again give Marge

and Gower Champion a run-for their money. The curtain drops after Androcles' proclaims to Tawny: "Whilst we stand together, no cage for you; no slavery for me."

David Small as the Lion, John Sneden as Caesar, and Ted Parker as Spintho share the honors in the acting department. Mr. Small nicely timed several appropriate phrases in between roars. This was a refreshing touch inserted by Director Harry Davis. I'm surprised that Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer hasn't thought of the same thing.

John Sneden gave a very nice interpretation of a pampered, spoiled, selfish, egotistical Caesar. Ted Parker as Spintho, the Christian who wanted to be a martyr, combined his Jerry Lewis type antics with nice timing and brought to life a relatively dead audience. He was obviously having a good time and so was his audience.

Dick Newdick did not convey the genuine naivete and warmth

of Androcles. John Whitty and Amanda Meiggs, as the Captain, and Lavinia (the love interest) made a nice-looking couple, but lacked enough variety and seemed to be taking Mr. Shaw a little too seriously.

Robert Bailey gave a sincere effort as Ferrovius but needs more polish and also more variety. Mr. Bailey also was taking Shaw a little too seriously.

The most prominent thorn was not in the Lion's paw but in the side of the production in the form of Frank Beaver as "Metellius". "Metellius" is a Playmaker's combination of Lentulus and Metellus who are both courtiers in the play as originally written.

Frank Beaver fits Shaw's description of Lentulus: "slender, fair-haired, epinepe" — but was given the name "Metellius". "Metellus is manly, compactly built..." — according to Shaw's description.

There was nothing manly about

the figure that appeared on the stage in the guise of "Metellius" except that it was flat-chested and had a crew-cut. An incongruity of this sort is certainly not in keeping with a commemorative production of Shaw's play.

Tommy Rezzuto designed a functional set for a tour show that is practical and is instrumental in establishing the light air of fantasy and farce necessary for this play. Lights, sound, costumes, and makeup were all good and provided attention outlets during periods where the production dragged.

The audience response was luke warm and they seemed to enjoy Shaw more than the production. The pacing was slow for the most part and the audience was no catalyst. This production did not come up to my expectations or to pass productions of lesser plays given by the Playmakers.

Pogo



By Walt Kelly

Li'l Abner



By Al Capp

DUKE GAME

Finally, A Display Of School Spirit

C. S. Young

Saturday was a great day in Chapel Hill. It was the scene of a football game, the caliber of which has not been played here in a long time.

When the Blue Devils from Duke took the field against the Tar Heels from Carolina, a near capacity crowd packed the cold hard seats in Kenan Stadium.

Surprisingly enough the student sections were filled, a fact which thoroughly disproves the claim that Carolina students have school spirit only when it doesn't interfere with anything else. Spirit was in abundance on Saturday.

The fans watched two good teams play hard aggressive football. The blistery wind and light snow flurries dampened the spirits of only a few. The stands remained full until very near the end of the game, a well deserved tribute to the members of both teams.

The field was literally covered with outstanding players all afternoon. Ed Sutton, for one, played a tremendous game. Some contend that it was the best of his career.

But it was not all Sutton. On the other side of the line there was big Sid Deloatch, who battered and pounded at the Tar Heels until it looked as if he were in complete control of one whole side of the line.

And then there was Sonny Jurgensen, who directed the Duke team with such finesse and split-second timing that at times he was almost obscure. His passes were almost non-existent; none were thrown in the second half, and the option play was used only sparingly.

The most gratifying thing about this football game was the reaction of the Carolina fans. Although beaten by two touchdowns, the fans remained loyal, something that has been lacking in the past.

There were no angry cries of dissatisfaction at the end of the game. The fans were proud of the showing made against the strong Duke team. As the game ended, the supporters of both teams poured onto the playing field to congratulate the winners and the losers.

It was a football game that will not be forgotten soon in Chapel Hill or in Durham, and it is evident that the real winners were the fans who saw it.

FELINE FRIENDS

Cats' Diets Don't Include Bird Meat

Woody Sears

One night several weeks ago, while riding up Rosemary St., I saw the car in front of me hit a cat. The poor animal was flipped into the air and fell back to the pavement, convulsed several times, then lay still in the classic pose of the "Chessie" cats.

We always hate to see anything get run over, whether it be a cat, dog or squirrel, or whatever else. The thing that was so striking about this was the fact that the people in the car never seemed to notice that they had hit the poor beast. But I imagine the big tires and excellent shock-absorbers of their Buick concealed the fact for them.

I doubt seriously that they realized what they had done, and I feel sure that they wouldn't have done it on purpose. Yet the fact remains that they did, and that's what counts.

That little episode somehow seemed indicative of everything we do nowadays. We do everything so fast that half the time we don't look where we're going, and if something or someone gets in our way, we have good shock-absorbers to null the jolt. And this is not only in cars.

We jump from place to place and from thing to thing without giving it a lot of thought, and we are so often careless about the other person's feelings that we all hit somebody low occasionally without really intending to do so.

And some just say, "C'est la vie!" So? What do you think? Or do you? On campus we have a good opportunity to observe a lot of this sort of bungling along. Much is said that should never be said, and a lot is done that should never be done. Just look around... if you can stop bungling along long enough to do so.

Maybe the reason for all this is that I like cats. Lots of people don't, but I admire the lonely cat quite a bit. This is because I admire independence wherever I see it, and the cat is a very independent creature!

You hear tales of these poor, pampered dogs who live indoors all their lives and eat nothing but cooked meat, etc., and how they can't be induced to eat anything else, even if they are starving.

Maybe this is a lot of hooey from people who like to brag about everything, and having a dog that lives so high off the hog might be something to brag about. I don't know because I never had a dog that fared so well.

But the point I'm making is that you can't ruin a cat that way. A cat always manages to eat, and doesn't seem to be so prone to adapting to eating habits so thoroughly.

Maybe you never heard of it, but there's an outfit called the American Feline Society which concerns itself with the welfare of America's millions of cats.

Naturally, these folks might be a little bit biased, but they maintain that cats are very beneficial creatures, especially in the area of rat control.

They also ran a survey of 196 dead cats; that is, they dissected that many cats that had fallen victim to autos, and found that none of them had bird meat in their stomachs.

These figures were used by the Society to prove to cat haters who were bird lovers that cats don't eat birds... except those that are in some way defective, viz., those that can't fly.

To digress into the vernacular, cats is o. k.

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 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editor — FRED POWLEDGE
Managing Editor — CHARLIE SLOAN
News Editor — RAY LINKER
Business Manager — BILL BOB PEEL
Sports Editor — LARRY CHEEK

EDITORIAL STAFF — Woody Sears, Frank Crowther, Barry Winston, David Mundy, George Pflingst, Ingrid Clay, Cortland Edwards, Paul McCauley, Bobbi Smith.

NEWS STAFF — Clarke Jones, Nancy Hill, Joan Moore, Pringle Pipkin, Anne Drake, Edith MacKinnon, Wally Kuralit, Mary Alys Voorhees, Graham Snyder, Billy Barnes, Neil Bass, Gary Nichols, Page Bernstein, Peg Humphrey, Phyllis Maulsby.

Night Editor — Cortland Edwards
Proof Reader — Ben Taylor