

# Ivy League Clothes Are Unjust Scapegoat

Much comment has been lavished recently upon such terms as "The Silent Generation," such labels as "Cautious Young Men," such description as "conformists." Nabbed as the scapegoat for this description is, primarily, mass media—television, periodicals and the like.

The trend is apparent; it is to be combated by allowing diverse ideas, differing ideas, without crucifying their proponents; but we do not see the necessity for hysteria.

Buckles on pants are not necessarily a symbol of conforming minds. Ivy League clothes, we contend, are both trim and pleasing to the eye and comfortable. A black leather jacket and pegged pants which prevent wind whipping up your leg might be warmer; but straight-lined Ivy League clothes are assuredly more appropriate and better looking.

# University's Tenet; Academics Or Lenoir?

"Freedom of inquiry, freedom of expression, freedom to differ, freedom from orthodoxy, freedom of students to think, decide and act for themselves—all under the influence of directed study . . . this is not mere training; it is liberation. It is the indispensable condition of learning. It is the meaning of Lux et Libertas." Dean of Students Fred H. Weaver.

The above is a powerful quotation with which to lead into comment upon the Lenoir Hall situation. But it is applicable.

Director George W. Prillaman is apparently an uncompromising individual. Though he has come under fire from the Student Legislature investigating committee and the Lenoir workers themselves, his policies remain unchanged.

We think it rather ridiculous that Lenoir Hall Operating Procedures should be loaded with such sentences as, "Bear in mind that your employment here is a benefit offered by the University," and, "we wish to impress upon you the fact that your employment here is a privilege granted by the University," and, "Anything short of full cooperation will be grounds for immediate dismissal."

Undoubtedly many students working in Lenoir Hall would not be able to attend our University were it not for such self-help jobs. But they should not be humbled

Further, willingness to pursue newly-created trends and fashions demonstrates, not necessarily conformity, but a liberality and readiness to progress. Conversely, failure to progress with this rapidly revolving atomic age demonstrates a reactionary mind without necessary adaptability.

We are not defending conformity; we are not condemning those who are reticent in both mind and fashion. To each his own. We should and must be tolerant.

But we would like to iconoclastically tear down a symbol which was unjustly, we feel, established as a scapegoat by anti-conformists—Ivy League clothes.

We believe, in actuality, the symbol was set up by those who were too reactionary to adjust to current trends.

And we believe they hid behind the symbol due to a slothful unwillingness to adapt and adjust.

to their knees in exchange for the opportunity to work in the dining hall.

Director Prillaman appears to constantly remind his workers that it would be much easier for him to hire a staff of outside workers who would not be harassed by a double obligation—University academics and a job.

The logical question is, from whence could Director Prillaman get workers with the college level mentality for \$1.90 a day?

More importantly, however, is another clause in the dining hall's operating procedures:

"Your immediate exam schedule is always subordinated to our work schedule here at Lenoir."

The primary purpose which thinking students have in mind when they enter this University's portals is to acquire an education, to strive for academic excellence which will better prepare them for useful citizenship in later life.

Such a preparation has the University as a whole. Academics are to be subordinated to nothing else—neither athletics nor socializing nor Lenoir Hall.

Subordination of our academic program to the Lenoir Hall "work schedule" is a blatant mockery of Dean Weaver's assertion: "freedom of students to think, decide and act for themselves—all under the influence of directed study—this is not mere training; it is liberation."

Director Prillaman may turn a deaf ear to grievances that "student workers feel they are not compensated adequately for their labor; that the administration of Lenoir Hall has been too arbitrary; that student workers want redeemable meal tickets or cash in lieu of straight meal remuneration which must be taken at the designated time or missed completely.

But when Director Prillaman begins treading upon the sacred ground of academics and subordinating them to Lenoir Hall's work schedule, then drastic steps should be taken.

The summation of our criticism against Director Prillaman is this: (1) The dominating philosophy behind employment of students in Lenoir Hall appears to be that a gracious and God-sent privilege is bestowed upon the few who are allowed such opportunity. Thus students should keep their mouths shut and forsake all else in humble submission—even academics.

(2) The management has apparently set itself upon an uncompromising pedestal from which the criticism of plea of student workers may not be heard, and from which no negotiation is possible.

We suggest that Director Prillaman make clear the business entanglements which he asserts will ensue transference from the present payment in meals to meal tickets. This would, at least allow students who missed meals at designated times to get their just recompense.

We also suggest that he revise his operating procedures to coincide with the University's philosophy, "academics first."

## WISE AND OTHERWISE:

### A Revolution? Prillokov And Wotery Vodka

By Whit Whitfield

Once upon a time before the Revolution, there was a state owned Stroganoff and Vodka Palace in St. Petersburg. It was operated by a cruel and heartless man called Anton Prillokov.

The profits from the Palace regularly lined the Czar's treasury with gold and he, of course, was very interested in its operations and its public relations.

He, nevertheless, only heard reports from Boss Prillokov. He had almost no contact with the proletariat workers.

The workers for the most part were students who were enrolled at a nearby university and needed the jobs badly to further their educations.

This Prillokov was well aware of, so he capitalized on it and life for the workers was miserable.

They worked quite often under extreme hardships and justifiable fear. Their conduct was carefully scrutinized. They were paid three times per day in watered-down Vodka and second-rate Stroganoff.

They were so fearful of Prillokov that they dared not speak up for their rights (which they had relinquished actually when they took the jobs).

Some student workers sold blood to buy texts and other necessities, while other wore dirty rags because they could not afford to pay laundry bills.

The braver ones spoke up for their rights one day but their arguments fell upon deaf ears.

Some of the workers requested they be allowed to share their Stroganoff and Vodka with roommates who were dying of starvation. Prillokov refused. Some of the starving students died but were removed quietly and caused little disturbance.

At about this point, Prillokov's kind heart began to show through. He ordered that each worker be given two cups of watered Vodka per day extra.

This was not enough to appease the workers.

Finally, they could stand the yoke of oppression no longer. They organized quietly, but expertly, and planned a revolution.

They decided upon the name "Bolsheviks" for their group. The rest is history.

Prillokov escaped to the United States where he was granted political asylum. Since that time he has been working in a like capacity at a well-known Southern plantation house, whose owners recognize his diabolical genius.

## FROM THE DUKE CHRONICLE:

### 'Dook' Battles With Segregation

(While other universities are witnessing the struggle for, or against racial integration, it seems our educational neighbor is still harassed by an entirely different problem—segregation of the sexes.—Editor)

The first women students to attend classes at Trinity College did so with a screen to separate them from their predatory male counterparts. Times have changed, and women are common occurrences on the Gothic campus.

However, the currents of modern philosophy in education have not swept from the corners in Allen and East Duke the vestiges of the old tenets, that is:

that coeducational classes are detrimental to students of both sexes, the reason being obvious, and the less said about them the better . . .

We refer to the administration's policy prohibiting coeds from taking classes on West campus which are offered on East, unless there is a schedule conflict. The policy applies equally to men students, but its restriction is not so severely felt, as more courses are offered on West.

The reason given for the policy is that it saves students the time, expense and trouble of trekking to the other campus.

We fail to see that it does anything but deny coeds the time and trouble they would choose to take if they had the choice. Expense—who takes the bus? . . .

However, the most serious objection to the ruling lies in the fact that it coldly disregards the student's preference in time and professors . . .

Yet educators and the educated advise students to choose courses for the professors, because the value of any course depends 90 per cent on the professor. In denying a student this opportunity the administration steals \$650 . . .

## GOETTINGEN LETTER:

### Fraternities In Germany Viewed

Dan Southerland

(Southerland, like John Raper, is a University student currently on exchange with the University of Goettingen in Germany.—Editor)

After the second World War there was a great deal of opposition to any sort of German nationalism and consequently opposition to fraternities, which had had nationalistic tendencies. Therefore as fraternities began to appear again in 1949 after the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany, although they claimed no attachment to the old fraternities except for the names, they were forbidden by the universities and not allowed to wear their identifying colorful caps and bands at university grounds or buildings.

Today the fraternities are again active, but have no influence in politics such as they had earlier. They are not recognized by the universities, but are tolerated.

About 35 per cent of the students at Goettingen are members of 37 different fraternities. Law and medical students are most active. There are few science students or humanistic majors such as language or history majors in fraternities.

The method of rushing and pledging is similar to that in the United States. The big difference is that the German fraternities are not dependent financially on fees from each new pledge class in order to meet the coming budget. They are strongly supported financially by the Alumni, the "Alte Herren," "old men" (translated literally). As a result pledge classes are much smaller, usually with about four or five pledges and at the most ten or fifteen.

Rushing last six weeks at the beginning of the semester and is at first a bit hectic and confused like our rushing.

The pledge or "Fuchs" gets through a one or two semester trial or pledge period. During this time he runs errands and does small jobs for the brothers. Then he is initiated and becomes an active "Bursch". He must remain active for three or four semesters which means he is required to take part in all fraternity functions. The "Alte Herren" are the graduates who still have an interest in the fraternities after graduating and attaining a respectable position in the world. On a summer day at the market place, you might see grey-haired gentlemen at beer-laden tables wearing their caps and bands and singing and drinking with the younger fraternity members. They contribute largely to the support of the fraternities and are especially known for supplying the "beer money."

When you see a student with one or several scars on his face, the identification of the German student in the old days, you know that he belongs to one of the fraternities which have the "mensur" or fencing. More than two-thirds have fencing. In the Catholic fraternities it is forbidden. Members are not required to fence in some fraternities; in most, one to four times are required. The "Fuchs" practice regularly on dummies and with masks under the direction of an older member.

The traditional fencing is supposed to be a test of courage and a chance for the brother to fight for his colors against another fraternity's man. He does not know his opponent until the fight begins.

Most of the "frei Studenten," not in fraternities, are opposed to them, although perhaps not as strongly as just after the war.

Their main criticisms are: (1) that the more radical fraternities are still nationalistic; (2) that they hold too much to tradition and are trying to live as people did in the "old days"; Fraternity men claim they treasure traditions realizing their meaning in their time; (3) that the Alte Herren give preference to fraternity men seeking jobs after graduation. It is known that fraternity men don't need to worry about finding a good job especially in the professional fields; (4) that fencing is morally wrong and they contend that some fraternities continue dueling in secret; that many are proud of their scars and purposely do not let them heal properly in order to distinguish themselves; (5) that the fraternities are trying to create an academic man's class which is better than the common man, the sign of this class being the scar from the "Mensur"; (6) that they are not politically active and take no stand. Fraternity men deny this saying that collectively they do not take a stand, but their leaders do.

The strong feeling of the free students against fraternities came out in 1950 in Goettingen. One sunny Sunday morning, two or three hundred Corps students had a "Kneipe" in public for the first time in front of the Rathaus at the Market place where they sang and drank.

Free students paraded to the Market with donkeys wearing fraternity caps and bands, accompanied by a combo playing American jazz to drown out the fraternity songs. It finished in what is known as a "Schlaegerel" or brawl. In 1952, there was another such occurrence.

We recently had student government elections for parliament. Someone came to a friend of mine and asked him to run with other free students in order to keep the fraternity students from getting the majority in the legislature.

At the last Studentenrat (parliament) meeting, the fraternity members sat on one side of the hall and the free students on the other, divided 50-50. With almost every issue, it was one group against the other. An hour was spent arguing over a complaint that scholarship committees were asking candidates if they were "corporati" (fraternity members) or not. They considered this an unfair question.

One thing can definitely be said in favor of the German fraternities; they are the only large group, with the exception of a very few student homes and clubs, which bring students in contact with one another and provide some kind of community life at the German university. Whether they are going about it in the right way or not, they are trying to meet a definite need.



## THE STUDENTS' FORUM:

### Susie Q. Sorosis Speaks Out

Editor:

We would like to call attention to the spirit of the Valkyrie Sing. When entered into with the right attitude, the Sing does, as it is supposed to do, provide fellowship.

This spirit of fellowship is, however, lost in one division—the sorority division. And for these girls, the true purpose of the Valkyrie Sing is lost.

As the merchant has exploited Christmas, so the sorority has used to its own advantage the

waste of time. The motivation for this waste of time is nothing more than sorority status. If a sorority is rated on the basis of its vocal cords, heaven help it.

Whose fault is this? Aloof, inert Panhells? The individual sororities? We think that it is primarily the fault of the senior sorority members who have climbed these ropes before.

Our hats are off to the one sorority which did not enter.

Disustedly,  
Susie Q. Sorosis

### L'il Abner



### Pogo



### By Walt Kelly

Editor \_\_\_\_\_ NEIL BASS  
Managing Editor \_\_\_\_\_ CLARKE JONES  
Associate Editor \_\_\_\_\_ NANCY HILL  
Sports Editor \_\_\_\_\_ BILL KING  
News Editor \_\_\_\_\_ WALT SCHRUNTEK  
Business Manager \_\_\_\_\_ JOHN C. WHITAKER  
Advertising Manager \_\_\_\_\_ FRED KATZIN  
NEWS STAFF—Graham Snyder, Edith MacKinnon, Pringle Pipkin, Bob High, Ben Taylor, H. Joost Polak, Patsy Miller, Wally Kuralt, Bill King, Curtis Crotty, Ben Taylor, Sue Atchison.  
EDIT STAFF—Whit Whitfield, Anthony Wolf, Stan Shaw, Woody Sears.  
BUSINESS STAFF—John Minter, Marian Hobeck, Jane Patten, Johnny Whitaker.  
SPORTS STAFF—Dave Wible, Stu Bird, Ed Rowland, Jim Crowner, Ron Milligan.  
Subscription Manager \_\_\_\_\_ Dale Stavey  
Circulation Manager \_\_\_\_\_ Charlie Holt  
Staff Photographers \_\_\_\_\_ Woody Sears, Norman Kantor, Bill King.  
Librarians—Sue Giehrer, Marilyn Strum  
Night News Editor \_\_\_\_\_ Bob High  
Night Editor \_\_\_\_\_ Bill Weekes