

Fraternities

Many people have asked why is so much written on fraternities. Why, if you are opposed to them, do you not write that they should be abolished and have done with it. The answer is simple.

There is nothing inherently wrong with fraternities. Fraternities have the potential of being one of the genuinely creative organs on the campus whereby intellectual development is encouraged and a social outlet is provided.

The problem is that on the UNC campus for the most part fraternities subordinate the first for the second. This must be changed.

Instead of being the driving intellectual forces on the campus by virtue of their desire and ability to pledge intelligent people, fraternities are in the main conformist, sedentary, and inert with the exception of social activities.

Instead of demanding individual excellence, they largely demand that the individual be pleasing.

Instead of driving towards campus improvement, they drive toward fraternity protection and campus and world disinterest.

Instead of providing leadership, they provide reaction.

It is not necessary that they do this, but the present system with its encumbrances of archaic ideas and practices denies the creativity that fraternities can possess.

There is not one person on the campus who does not need a social outlet, and no one can really say that a Saturday night party even if it is a complete debauch is not healthy to relieve pent up tensions. It is only when people live from Saturday to Saturday that the trouble begins. By that token nothing is basically wrong with drinking, except excessive drinking, and part of this is bred by some of the rules that fraternities have to live under.

To better fraternities several things are necessary.

The first and most controversial is deferred rush, not as a complete upheaval, but coincident with a new student union, campus programming, and a year for fraternities to financially prepare for the switchover, in order that they may take such measures as are necessary to keep the house from bankruptcy.

The program is necessary for the rushee in that he can make an adequate appraisal of his academic responsibilities, that he can be settled in the extra-curriculars of his choice, that he can be sure of which fraternity and why fraternity, and so that he will have adjusted to Carolina life. For the fraternities this would be advantageous in that they would be dealing with a greatly matured product, that they would be able to know the boy and what he could do and be, and that they could be sure of his resolve.

If the IFC wants to assume a role of prominence, it can do so by bringing this about and implementing the appropriate procedures so that for six months or a year fraternities would not be rushing boys every night. Ideally, a year's delay with a stipulation that an individual can only visit a fraternity once during that time, with a not-so-rigid silent period, and with a limitation on fraternity spending would be the best program to have. If the IFC wants to assert itself, this is an area where it can do fraternities and the campus a great deal of good.

The IFC can also help bring about an atmosphere of freedom and individual respect in fraternities by eliminating forms of compulsion. Compulsory parties or compulsory study halls have no real benefit except that they heighten the drive to conformity, by imposing social standards of dress and manners, including social technique on people who might want otherwise and who would want more freedom to choose their companions of the opposite sex, and 2) by inflicting study habits unnatural to some, making study a drudgery rather than a joy. A forthright stand in each individual house or by the IFC on these matters would alleviate at least some tension.

The IFC could further take a firm stand on discriminatory clauses. There is no reason that a rush list should be marked with the letter J, next to a Jewish boy's name. Who knows, a Jewish fraternity might pledge a non-Jewish boy or vice-versa, and the idea of discrimination might have a chance of breaking down. A simple process of elimination of the letter J would help insure that each boy would more likely be judged on his individual merit than on a superficial designation such as religion. Further, those fraternities which have discriminatory clauses in their charters can work to take these out and if necessary, as happened recently at Amherst, disaffiliate from the national office, until the national accepts them with this change. This in no way denies any individual the right of choosing his own associates, but at the same time gives all students the opportunity to be judged on their own merits without the criterions of race, creed, and national origin entering in. It is inconsistent with the idea of equal opportunity on the campus, for a large segment of a great campus group to erect these petty bars to individual interchange.

The IFC and the individual fraternity can do much to better the pledgship of each individual. They first can insist on a sane pledgship — a pledgship in which adjusts the pledge to the other members of the house without making him accept the values of the other members of the house. This pledgship should be as mild as possible so that acceptance can come from mutual respect rather than individual subservience. This does not mean that occasional hell should not be raised, but that it be the exception rather than the rule. The pledge should be encouraged to seek his own values to differ on major things while conforming on the minor ones, and to do any of these things only as it is true to those principles which he has come to accept as true. The "big brother" should be a friend, not a mother.

The fraternities should encourage scholarship, not with the end in view to have the highest house average on the campus, because a C-plus average with some of the brightest boys on campus is not much of an achievement. They should encourage love of learning and open horizons of knowledge for the individual rather than closing them through superimposed competition. Scholarship, as most things are, is individual, and individual stimulation is the order of the day.

See FRATERNITIES on Column 7

Letters

Miss Combes:

In a letter published on page 2 of the "Daily Tar Heel" on 1 Oct. 1958 you stated your opposition to birth control. This is, of course, your privilege. It is not your privilege, however, to deny to others who do believe in it such information as may be had concerning birth control and contraceptive devices and techniques, and the right to practice contraception. This, ever by the remotest conception, only a majority of the voters in the U. S. could have any right to deny, and since the majority do not oppose birth control, the N.Y.C. Board of Hospitals took the only honest course open to it. To have done otherwise would have been the right of a minority to rule — and against that Western history records a long series of wars.

Secondly, you wonder how many New York women will need further medical aid to relieve them from the nervous tensions suffered by millions of Roman Catholic and other women, who, not being married to millionaires, can afford only so many children, who live in dread of marital relations lest they produce another child for whom they cannot properly care, or those thousands of women for whom just one more pregnancy could be fatal — and who may thus be exposing themselves to leaving motherless growing families whom they love and who need them? What about their mental state? Are they first of all intelligent, responsible human beings, with a duty toward those whom they can safely bear and properly care for, rear and educate, or are they merely anthropoid cattle, glorified breeding stock for political causes, autocratic or theocratic? In the million years of mankind on this earth, I should hope that we have made at least a little progress from the purely animal level.

In the book of Genesis (Roman Catholic Bible), chapter 1, verse 27, "God created man in his image. In the image of God he created him, Male and female he created them." Man (including the female of the species), created in the image of God, has, within the limits of this world, powers of thought, reason and creation (in the image of his maker), to enable him to better his lot on earth, to set himself above the purely animal level with some degree of security.

Animals have virtually no control over breeding and procreating, as they have no control over food supply and as only a few have over shelter. Man, however, has learned to build houses, plant crops, irrigate land, etc., to assure a more stable existence. Why not also with his progeny? In the past human population was kept down by plague and pestilence, as well as by war. When Genesis 1:28 was spoken, the world was underpopulated and so continued up to even a few short centuries ago. The command was given to the Hebrews at a time when they were a small folk having a hard time raising an army to survive against the Canaanites. That day is over. Antibiotics and sanitation have reduced plagues and pestilences to the point of mere nuisances, and population in the past hundred years has swelled enormously, so much so that only 21 percent of today's world population are adequately fed, and at best, were the population static, we could scarcely be more than double that percentage at the present time. Food supply techniques have not kept pace with procreative capacity.

Do you advocate that we, like the rabbits on the little California isle a generation ago, senselessly breed ourselves out of existence by completely outrunning the food supply? Or would you have us abandon sanitation and antibiotics, to bring back cholera, Black Plague, smallpox, childbed fever, etc.? Or were it more compatible with our God-given capacity to use our reason to control our own destiny, at least in part, and our godly duty to use this capacity to the best of our ability (to do less is to insult our Creator; by misusing His gifts) for the purpose of making the world a little more secure for our descendants that we found it, just as our forebears strove to do for us?

It pains me, but I must characterize your attitude concerning birth control, that of the Roman Catholic Church, as foresightless, unreasoning, reactionary, unjust, inhuman, irresponsible and irreverent.

Albert Gminder

Teamster



MAULON
Copyright, 1958, The Pulitzer Publishing Co., St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Out Of Joint

March Wind

The hippiest character on this campus is an evil little genius who spends his spare time contemplating: (1) his navel; (2) Quemo-Matsu; (3) Jim Tatum. Last week however, while recuperating from half a dozen ridiculous viruses, this character got on to a much more therapeutic kick than the three I have listed above. In the belief that we have all been doing too much thinking about Mr. Dulles and his mad adventures that will probably kill us all, I'd like to share this new kick with you.

When I visited my friend a few days ago he greeted me with this shout: "GIDDY UP, GIDDY UP, GO WAKE THE CITY UP!" Naturally, I looked bewildered and I stayed that way until my friend played a new LP that he had just purchased and, in the vernacular, was flipping over. I flipped too.

The album is titled, "Sing a Song of Basie," and is on the ABC-Framount label. It is a collection of extraordinary vocal arrangements, copied note for note, from the old Count Basie standards, and reproduced via a multiple recording technique so that three singers sound not like a chorus but like a big band. Even the solos have been duplicated note for note. To give you some idea of the effect, this is a portion of one of the lyrics titled, "Little Pony."

REEDS: Hurry up, dig a little pony I know.
BRASS: Say that's so.
REEDS: I said, hurry up, dig and little pony will blow.
BRASS: Ride, ride, ride.
REEDS: Giddy up, giddy up, do me the ditty up. Giddy up, giddy up, go wake the city up.
BRASS: People pass word, he's the last word. That's the mass word, they don't dig till he's big—then they wig.
SOLO: Want to say a lot about little pony. Want to celebrate the night pony booted up the big beat. I can't stop telling what he was doing to blow as though his heart was in it every minute—Singin' with a pretty kind of sound really giving every

word never acting like the greatest oat around. Everybody dug and he had them really drinking, like they did a lot of swigging from a gallon jug. Little pony went a riding, illustrating what a horn is really for, had them comin' back for more, when they added up the score, joy galore.

SOLO: Anywhere you go, they gotta saddle Little Pony with a solid reputation. People think of Little Pony as a real King, and his playing is a pleasure-giving thing. Blowing a horn and riding got t'gether and forever give the kind of thrill a lot of people never wanna end. But dig me telling about it, baby. And I'm merely going through it. He can figure it out and do it.

The guiding spirit behind this fantastic production is a jazzman named Dave Lambert who first became a cinder in the public eye in 1944 when he did a pop vocal, "What's This," with the Krupa band. He next appeared around 1947 when he coached a vocal group for Stan Kenton; this was the group that did "Across the Alley from the Alamo," and other well-remembered hits. In 1950 a Lambert group recorded four interesting sides for Capitol, and one of the girls in this group went to France and later organized the Blue Stars. In other words, Dave Lambert is an extremely important, though little known, figure in the world of jazz vocalizing. He has the reputation; this album should bring him the fame. Lambert of course must share the kudos with his talented associates, Jon Hendricks and Annie Ross. Hendricks was the cat who burned midnight oil for a year to write the lyrics.

Speaking of the lyrics, as I departed my friend was talking on the telephone with one of the cuter members of our faculty (Lorraine by name) to suggest that she give the following lecture to her freshman English class: "Here's a bit you should know. Yes, you love her so I know—I know that you love her so. But what you don't know is this. Your kind of loving is the kind women never miss." He thought the freshmen would be pleasantly surprised by the great flexibility and vitality of the English language, especially when used by hip people. (Freshmen are notoriously un-hip.)

Well, if you twist Kemp's arm hard enough, he'll order a copy for you. "Sing a Song of Basie." We're not kidding—DON'T PASS THIS ONE BY.

More Readers Write

EDITOR:

I was rather amused by Mr. William Cheney's letter in the Wednesday Daily Tar Heel reveal that he had been "jarred" by Anthony Wolff's reference to B.B. as a kissing existentialist.

Surely Mr. Cheney is aware that while existentialism does not mean eccentric haircuts, turtle neck sweaters, oversized medallions, loud inferior jazz, and free love, this is what the term has, unfortunately, been perverted to symbolize to many of the intellectually sloppy among us as myself.

Although by no means a disciple of Mr. Wolff, I thought his analogy was particularly appropriate if, however, a bit trite.

I am impressed by the fact that Mr. Cheney is either a serious student of philosophy or is very adept at manipulating a Diction-

ary of Philosophy.

May I suggest that Mr. Cheney come down from his sanctimonious, pedantic position and familiarize himself with the contemporary situation, however, distasteful this situation may be to him, before continuing to enlighten us in matters philosophical.

WILLIAM N. ROGERS

EDITOR:

On reading Nancy Turner's letter criticizing Cort Edward's article advocating polygamy the following question comes to my mind. Why is it that around here the moment anyone even breathes one word about sex everyone feels it is their moral obligation to righteously object? Don't people have enough of a sense of humor to regard Edward's article as a witty piece of satire without feel-

ing that their moral attitudes and codes are going to be uprooted? A number of years ago Swift modestly proposed eating the children of Ireland to get rid of excess population. The Irish, as far as I know, didn't run to their cook books to look up recipes for Human a La King or Homo Sapien stew. Do you suppose that all male students at UNC will start buying 2 or 3 fraternity pins? Hardly.

One trouble with students everywhere is that they don't know how or what to think. Once in a while there come along students, such as Edwards, who do come out with new ideas. One meets, instead of friends, squawking individuals who will not be moved from their own fixed ideas. I guess this is better than silence. It's time all of us woke up.

Name Withheld by Request

Sidelight

Ed Rowland

This column will be old hat information to upperclassmen and may seem a little exaggerated to most of the freshmen. But when the activities of rush week are over and each fraternity is celebrating the addition of their new pledges, the boys who went through rush will see that this is true.

Possibly half of them will have made mistakes.

This observation is not intended as support for any plea for deferred rushing, because the setup now is conducted at its logical time in the year. Neither is it anti-fraternity, because these organizations perform a valuable service to the campus and the students.

Rather I favor a modification in rush week, one that might keep the feelings of fraternity men and pledges from being hurt through hasty decisions. The haste and rush (literally) that characterizes the week is perhaps the weakest link in the chain that is fraternities at Carolina.

Rush should extend over a two-week period, with parties being conducted every other night. This plan, which the Pan-Hel council has adopted to some degree in sorority rush, would allow time for study by both the brothers and the rushees, and it might keep some freshman from making a decision that he will regret for four years here.

It is obvious that fraternities can make mistakes in a boy's character during rush. Later, when the boy is balled out of the house, he is hurt. Another circumstance that often occurs is when a boy's intelligence is over-estimated and he fails to make his grades and then drops out of the fraternity if not out of school. Spreading out the activities of rush week probably would prevent these from happening.

The Interscholastic Council may oppose this idea and possibly they will be able to give excellent reasons why it won't work. On the other hand, if it is even considered, a big step forward will be taken.

The IFC is too conservative and hesitant at present. It is in the process of being shaken from its narrow view, but in the meantime the whole system of fraternities is deteriorating because its rush organization is poor and less effective than it could be.

Education At University

Fred Weaver

(This is the final part of a five part presentation of Dean Fred Weaver's talk to the freshmen at Y camp.)

He is a man who has come to love the truth and to live by it, he has learned how to learn and has acquired a real appetite for disciplined inquiry; he is a man whose learning has bound him to the common good and has loosed him from his natural bad habits of pre-judgment. He is a man whose courage lifts him above conformity to the crowd and compels him to a creative maladjustment in any "normal" society, and whose intelligence is the instrument of his love. He belongs to a family, a race, a class, a land, a nation—but he loves all these within a higher loyalty to God and the greatest good. He is a man whose morality springs from a source higher than his super-ego and flows up from a deep love of the right beyond mere calculation. This is what our schools are for: to furnish the nation and the nations with men and women of this spirit and this mind. This is what our churches are for: to call men of reason to the life of faith and to "unite the pair so long disjoined, knowledge and vital piety."

The most important question before you now is whether your school and your church have prepared you for the Time Being and the crisis at its further end.

Now, to summarize, I have made three suggestions: read, think, act. I have said that if you do these things diligently something will happen to you whereby the meaning of education will reveal itself to you and you will know what the purpose of education is. That is a marvelous thing to have happen. And I think you have come to a good place to have it happen to you.

Fraternities (Cont.)

The IFC could further benefit the campus scholastically and judicially by advocating the abolishment of quiz files and term paper files. Existing as they are, they are an encouragement to short cuts rather than an academic stimulus. A real academic community cannot be built on short cuts.

Participation in activities should be encouraged not to bring glory to the house or to protect fraternities or for the individual's glory, but rather for the knowledge that may come from that participation especially in some of the non-elected positions.

Finally, the fraternities can engage in some programming for themselves. Discussion groups, speakers, panels, musicians, and other forms of intellectual stimuli can be had, and a major project of the IFC and of fraternities in general might be to have a program committee to bring the issues of the present day world and the issues that have been with people from time immemorial to the focus of fraternity members. To increase their awareness and stimulate a curiosity that may never be stimulated unless this type of action is taken, would be one of the greatest projects the fraternities could undertake. They might build, instead of destroy, constructive leadership on the UNC campus.

The administration can help also. They may help by ridding the fraternities of such regulations as the drinking rule which make hypocrisy an inevitability. This rule alone has done more to undermine the campus judicial system than any piece of legislation, and makes something forbidden out of something that might be taken naturally and in moderation, thus bringing on a desire for drinking to get drunk rather than drinking or non-drinking for the sake of personal enjoyment and for consistency with an individual's own personal scruples. Morality cannot be legislated.

Fraternities want to expand, but the administration should have an obligation on their shoulders to keep from aiding in their expansion drive, until the fraternities do something to better their own conditions, then making for expansion of a valuable part of the campus, rather than expansion of a campus parasite.

Fraternities are filled with great opportunities. They at the present time may be described as possessing potential, but very little kinetic. It is hoped that their potentialities may be realized.

A perfect system needs good men to be really effective. But an imperfect system with the best of men cannot work. The need for improvement is obviously there.

Employees

Over a period of 170 years student government has carved out a small area where it is autonomous. This area has been fought for over and over again with the administration coming to the rescue on some occasions.

This autonomy is being threatened again, this time by a ruling of the attorney-general which places student employees in University employee status, and in its effect denies the hiring and firing power of student paid employees to the students.

No one in student government questions the ultimate say-so of the administration or the Board of Trustees, what students are fighting at the present time to preserve is the measure of autonomy they now have.

A Dean Fred Weaver will not always grace the chair of the Dean of Students office to see that student freedom is protected, for men like Dean Weaver are called upon to assume even greater roles of responsibility.

Hence, to perpetuate student autonomy there needs to be a certain separation of student paid employees from University employees, for with a man with less sensitivity to student needs than Fred Weaver, the system could degenerate into an administrative control of student finances.

The grounds for separation are clear. Students pay these people and students levy the payment upon themselves. With administration backing a ruling favorable to the students probably could be found.

It is hoped that those in the administration, particularly the Chancellor will be able to recognize the educational value of student autonomy in that area where students are fit to govern and see that this is perpetuated.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Sunday, Monday and examination 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: \$4.50 per semester, \$8.50 per year.



Editor	CURTIS GANS
Managing Editors	CHARLIE SLOAN, CLARKE JONES
News Editors	ANN FRYE, BILL KINCAID
Business Manager	WALKER BLANTON
Advertising Manager	FRED KATZIN
Asst. Adv. Manager	JOHN MINTER
Sports Editor	RUSTY HAMMOND
Associate Editor	ED ROWLAND
Subscription Manager	AVERY THOMAS
Circulation Manager	BOB WALKER
Arts Editor	ANTHONY WOLFF
Coed Editor	JOAN BROCK
Chief Photographer	BUDDY SPOON