

## Honor Council

The Women's Honor Council bipartisan selection board has made its selections, and have left questions. Answers cannot be given unless one wants to resort to McCarthy-like tactics, but the following questions should be raised:

How come out of 45 girls, only 9 were deemed capable?

How come out of the nine, three were from the same sorority?

How come that three out of four applicants of the same sorority were chosen?

How come the same sorority has had many members of the Council before and has had the chairmanship for the past two years?

How come this sorority was represented with three students on the selection board, while every other organization was either not represented or had only one member?

There may be some legitimate answers to these questions, and if so they will be printed. In the meantime, a reminder should be made to those who did not get selection board endorsement, that a petition of twenty-five students submitted to the chairman of the election board will enable them to run, and if they feel that they are qualified, they should. The editor will personally sign a petition for any he deems qualified to run.

## University

Yesterday, this column discussed the necessity for commitment to education. Today, it is necessary to point out the problems of growth as it affects the University.

From projected figures, one can see that the University will have a student population of something in the vicinity of 14,000 in 1970.

This type of growth, practically doubling the present enrollment, will radically alter the character of the University. It will necessitate perhaps twice as many faculty members and double the size of the town of Chapel Hill.

Moreover, statewide higher education will be in the same dilemma.

At present, although the University has plans for meeting the future physical needs of the University with regard to facilities, it will not be able to come to grips with the problem of the altering personal nature of the University.

Carolina, as many other schools have done, may very well go down the road to the situation where the student is no longer an entity but rather a number, where the faculty is devoted to research but not to teaching, and where education is a machine made tool.

It can happen very easily unless some planning takes place now. There needs to be planning on the state level to zap off some of the excess studentry into lower colleges, making the University of North Carolina in its three branches the apex of education in the state. This means planning for more colleges and expansion of some of the smaller colleges.

Moreover, the criterion of selectivity has to be more rigidly enforced at the University so that it can truly be the superior school in the state system. Perhaps, this type of limitation of attendance here, coupled with expansion of attendance at schools in other levels and the needed expansion of facilities may more properly insure for a maintenance and raising of standards at the University.

Going back to the need for a commitment to education, a solid faculty, in part, depends on the amount of money available for salaries, and only a wholehearted commitment can provide for the caliber professors necessary to place the University on the top level. To those who pride themselves on the quality of North Carolina education, it must be noted here that the University ranks quite low on the ratings of the American Association of Universities. This deficiency needs to be cleared up, and progress must be made.

On the student level, the character and nature of student government will have to be radically altered in order to meet the demand of a huge student body. Necessary facilities such as a large student union, recreation areas, and improved dormitory structure will be necessary, for the case may well be that the fundamental unit of student government may not be the campus, but the dorm and student center.

Administratively, the problem will be exceedingly complex, unless the administration completely negates any control over student action. The problem of knowing 7,000 is an almost impossible one, but the problem of knowing 14,000 students with a limited staff will be impossible.

If nothing else, this should prove how great the necessity of a commitment to education. If something else, it should ask the question of the value of a University, its purpose, and its role in transition. It should point up the question of whether growth on the scale that the University is growing is desirable, and whether basic values will not be altered in the process.

It should be a request for some adequate planning before education becomes that corruption called mass education. Planning is necessary nationwide, statewide, and locally. This must be done soon.

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except 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  
Business Manager — WALKER BLANTON  
Advertising Manager — FRED KATZIN  
Night Editor — O. A. LOPEZ

## An Address

Marion A. Wright

(The following is the first part of a speech made Sept. 16 before the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Council on Human Relations)

You will recall that Stephen Leacock wrote an essay on Oxford University. He began by saying, in effect, "Ten years ago I spent a day at Oxford. Recently I spent another day there. So the reader will see that what I have to say about Oxford is based upon observation extending over a period of ten years."

Just one year ago I made a talk in Charlotte before this same group. Here I am again tonight. So, anything I may say about Charlotte is based upon observation extending over a period of one year.

I don't know whether Mr. Jones has a genius for getting me here in times of crisis in school affairs or whether crisis has become a normal condition. When I was here a year ago integration was taking its first timorous step in Charlotte schools. Tonight we meet in the wake of the Supreme Court decision in the Little Rock case. Both events may well become historic.

I hope it will not harrow your feelings if we recall the situation which prevailed here a year ago. For a brief and unhappy moment Charlotte was in the world's headlines. With the faculty which the press sometimes exhibits for exploiting the sensational, certain events which occurred here were blazoned abroad. The ugly face of the mob was unmasked for all to see. An erect and poised girl who bore an ordeal with surpassing dignity was on every television screen.

Well, I venture to remind you of those events in order to point a contrast. A week or so ago your schools opened without the slightest echo of last year's turbulence. The city took the event in stride, turning aside with deserved contempt the inflammatory exhortations of John Kasper. (By the way, can you think of a more stupid approach to winning friends and influencing people than to go to Charlotte and attack Billy Graham and Harry Golden?) The apostles of violence were soundly rebuked; Charlotte set an example to the rest of the South. No one, I think, may doubt that the peaceful token compliance with law is but the prelude to later actual and thoroughgoing observance of the court's decrees.

Those of us on the outside merely see results. But surely those results did not automatically occur. In the past year there must have been intelligent planning and dedicated effort of many people, of many minds and hearts, to produce this profound change in community sentiment. One knows, without being told, that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Council on Human Relations has played a significant role. From occasional reading of your newspapers, from watching your TV stations and listening to your radio, it is evident that all have fully discharged their historic and traditional function of furnishing intelligent and responsible community leadership. Religious and other concerned groups have used reason and persuasion.

No one, I am sure, will be disposed to rest on his laurels. There will be no occasion for resting until the last vestige of a segregated school system has disappeared and the national promise of equal opportunity has been fulfilled.

So, the Charlotte school board's decision of a year ago was historic in the life of this city. The Supreme Court's decision of September 12 was historic in the life of the nation. We are still too close to the event and the excitement of the moment is too intense for one to gauge its full effect. But it would seem that even now at least a part of its significance may be appreciated.

1. There is to be no compromise in the national effort to give an equal chance to every American child. The nation is resolved that there shall be no such thing as second-class citizenship, second-class education, or second-class childhood.

In only the narrowest sense did the court declare the law. In the broadest sense it declared the national will and spoke the national conscience. Insofar as the President is the nation's voice, his prompt appeal for faithful observance of the decree also reflects all that is best in American thought. The participation of the Justice Department, while grating upon the tender sensibilities of our politicians, is applauded by the nation as a whole. Remember, it is a Justice Department. What is it to do if it does not seek to secure justice for every American citizen?

The forces, economic, social, moral, spiritual, which have thus far given the movement for equal rights its resistless momentum, will not abate. On the contrary, they gain strength throughout the world. The South has become a small fortress in a state of siege. If the beleaguered garrison fought for an honorable cause, we might applaud it for its heroism. But, when the cause, stripped of its tawdry pretensions, stands revealed as an effort to preserve a caste system within a democracy and to embalm a part of the dead 18th century within the living 20th, those who defend the citadel become not heroes but objects of scorn.

2. The decision further means that there is to be no surrender to mob action. Just as you here in Charlotte turned back the threat of violence with firmness and resolution, so, the nation, speaking through the court, has met that threat on the national scale.

It required granite-like strength of character to meet the Little Rock challenge. How persuasive must have been the argument that, unless you retreat from a high moral position, there will be violence around Central High. This is, of course, judicial blackmail, the effort to control and shape a judicial decision by placing a court in terror.

Everyone, of course, hopes there will be no violence. But consider the alternatives. Endure violence or declare for all Americans—particularly children—that the law is supreme, that human rights are sacred and that surrender to a mob is anarchy.

(To Be Continued)

## A Television Program

Nick Bagdasarian

The recent CBS television program, "The Plot to Kill Stalin," has been much in the news lately for two reasons. One of them has been because of its excellent production and the other, the one which has made world-wide headlines, has been its fraudulent attempt to reconstruct history.

In 90 minutes of the most deceptive acting in the annals of the theater, CBS further severed U.S.-Soviet relations by charging that several high Soviet officials assassinated Stalin in his sick bed.

Directly after the show was over, a report emanating from Moscow claimed it was "a filthy slander against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government." In addition, the CBS correspondent in Moscow was politely "asked to leave the People's Republic."

Indeed, although the idea of communism has never appealed to me, this is one time my hat goes out to them.

By its actions CBS has cast an unerasable black mark on the pages of American history. When the only way we can glorify democracy is to shatter another country's reputation (as dreadful as

it may be), then there is something radically wrong with our system of government.

Newspapers, magazines, and a most important of all, government officials have so distorted present-day Russia, that one cannot help associating horns and fangs with a certain Mr. Khrushchev.

Granted that the Communists distribute more, much more, propaganda than we do, it is still not in accordance with American tradition for our government to "invent" history to suit itself. And, since CBS has received no official reprimand from Washington, it can safely be assumed that the nation's leaders fully agreed with the television version.

This "hate the Reds" campaign has now reached its full force in this country. Perhaps it is an admission of our own inadequacy to keep up with the Soviet's growing might. Whatever it is, things couldn't get any worse if we spent a little more time cleaning out our own closets.

However now that television has entered the mud-slinging racket, it's been rumored in the streets of Moscow that a popular Red T.V. program is casting actors for its version of "The Scheme To Poison Roosevelt's Chicken Noodle Soup!"

## "You Fellows Serious This Time?"



## 'Do What Mother Says'

Dot Dotson

Liberal traditions and individual freedoms which have been the strength and fame of our University in recent years are in danger. Freedom is already being eaten away and apparently a lot of people aren't going to realize this until the freedom is gone. Perhaps by then they won't even realize what has happened.

At this point it is going to be hard to check this erosion. It will be said that something is a problem—a threat—and leaders will give loud voice, protesting that, "This is the way we want it." "We were elected." "What does this have to do with loss of freedom?" "What you propose will result is chaos."

This I believe: There are people on this campus who are aware of the current problem and they are concerned. There are others who sense that something is wrong, but they don't know what it is. Some have given up hope of improvement.

This summer I participated in discussions of an up-to-date, unified judicial system for this campus to replace our present patchwork of councils and courts. There were outstanding campus citizens interested in this plan because of the need for an effective, efficient, representative judicial system. This was a plan that would be fair to all—BUT—you can't do things like this. There will always be some hot shot legislators who weren't consulted or didn't get their way and they'll pull every string, play any trick, or say anything to satisfy themselves. There will be a few people who will lose their jobs because the new system will have found a more efficient way to handle their duties. There will be that ever present army of people who "just can't imagine a carriage without a horse pulling it." Perhaps you can think of a few such people. They won't offer anything better, but they will shout down any idea that isn't theirs.

So what happens? Some try to work these things out piece by piece—a bill here, an amendment there—and the patchwork quilt becomes even larger. In fact, by the time a good bill gets through, you often can't even recognize it as the one it started out as. What happens when you suggest a change?

You contact somebody for a comment and what do you get—silence. Sure, they're against it—for their own reasons, apparently. I grant that nobody has to say anything—the people who answer, "5th Amendment" to "What is your name?" don't have to say anything—and I will defend their right—but I will not be satisfied to be ruled by such shut mouths.

I guarantee that there would be a lot of shut mouths if a new system is proposed. For some obscure reason they'll be against it—no matter how good it is.

This message is not addressed to these people. This message is not addressed to these people because nothing short of an act of God is likely to change their attitudes. This message is not addressed to campus "leaders" in general, because they do not have the power necessary to remedy the situation which exists.

If you fall into one of the following categories, you won't do much to remedy the situation either: if you are willing to let your sorority or fraternity direct you and decide for you, you don't have much to offer this University. (If you continue to be a

face in the crowd, you won't ever have much to offer.)

If you are willing to allow the existence of a council with the power to dictate to you the clothes you are to wear—at an age when many high school graduates are completely on their own—at an age when you are old enough to vote for the President of the United States—your ideas are miserably behind the times.

If you get a personal satisfaction out of dividing the citizens of this University along class divisions of one year, you should go back to prep school for a few more years.

If you believe that legislation, execution, and justice function along a division by sex, you might find some support in elementary schools.

If you would not be willing to give up your job in favor of a better system, you might just as well admit who you are out for.

These are the kinds of people who are eating away at our liberal traditions and individual freedoms. Right now they are the people who are running the show. Name them over in your mind. Maybe you voted for one of them. Maybe you didn't have much choice. Maybe you didn't know how much difference it made until you found out that last year the Women's Residence Council had pushed through rules discriminating against freshmen—in the wake of overwhelming opposition from the student body—in spite of the traditional "no discrimination by class." Maybe you didn't realize that the people you voted for were people who believe that the dictates of a personal sense of good taste in university students must be supplemented by the dictates of the Dean of Women and women's councils—to even a standards committee.

To what point have we come that we would look to higher authority for such detailed personal directions? Are we to model our University after other schools, or will we be a leader in freedom, independence, and maturity—qualities lacking in many schools in the South.

This is not a finishing school. It never was intended to be a finishing school. Such a purpose is superficial indeed compared to the functions of this University.

Perhaps you didn't realize the implications of your choice for legislator, councilman or representative. You should now. Student government makes this school much of what it is. Those in authority have recognized the fact that university students should learn to take care of themselves. This is a compliment to our liberal and progressive heritage. It is a great challenge and a wonderful opportunity—yet we have elected people who have taken our freedoms away and are even threatening to destroy our individuality.

Before you vote for one person, be sure that you are not voting for someone who is seeking to play the role of your mother or father. If you have been voting by party, stop. Vote for people who will be progressive, unselfish, and above all—advocates of individual freedom. If there is no person running who suits you, run yourself.

In the meantime, voice your opinions. Talk about these things with your friends. Find out what your representative is doing (and has done). Big Brother may be watching you. Big Sister already is.

## Letters

Monday, Nov. 3, 1958

To the writer of a letter in Sunday's Daily Tar Heel:

On Tuesday night, November 4th, Dr. J. W. Staley, an assistant professor in the Department of Physics, will speak informally to the DKE fraternity concerning current scientific advances in space, the likelihood of reaching the moon in our lifetime, and the relative positions of the Russians and Americans in this regard. Dr. Staley was invited this fall in the unanimous eagerness to continue a program which was begun last winter. This program operates simply and effectively: a faculty member is invited to have dinner, deliver a few introductory remarks on the subject chosen by his hosts, and submit himself to a "question and answer" session which may last twenty minutes or three hours. This is education in the finest sense. The boys present are not in a noisy group in the house bar; they are sitting individually, thinking individually, and, most important, acting individually.

Your letter of October 31st which appeared in the Daily Tar Heel is a source of wonderment and curiosity to me. You lament the lack of concern, the over-abundance of complacency in our University, and especially in the fraternities where the students are too involved in Thursday to Tuesday weekends. I want to make it perfectly clear that I heartily agree with you in your lamentation—on a general scale. Complacency and lack of concern are far too prevalent among the students here; but why single out fraternities about which you plainly know so little?

I know of very few boys who missed classes over the weekend and I know of none who will not arrive in Class until Tuesday. To be sure, there are some who personally all of what you say. There are "gathered clients" in bars who never hear the question. There are some who could not be convinced that a problem exists. There are even some who do not restrain on Wednesdays. But, happily, these comprise the minority. And let's not be unfair to ourselves—this minority does not exist solely at Chapel Hill, but at every college and university in the country.

Surely the importance here is not that we use our editorial page to criticize the minority; rather it is that we take action to save newcomers from joining the minority and to encourage everyone to think and act as an individual, to be concerned about the world in which we live. We believe that we are doing something about this—how about yourself? Incidentally, if you're not busy Tuesday night, you're welcome to join us in our discussion.

Robert Hastings Perry

Editor:

On the morning of November —, 1958, the sun rose over a saddened campus. The dawn had brought with it the promise of a grand day, however; the weather went unseen on the unhappy campus. Classes went on, but they were not accompanied by the cheerful hustle and bustle of other days. Saddened expressions clouded the faces of men and women as they trudged to class. All over the locality hundreds of students choked down their coffee and doughnuts. The food had no taste on this morning, for what student of Carolina could bring himself to enjoy his traditional breakfast, on the day free parking on Chapel Hill's main-drag was to become part of the past.

Yes, become part of the past as have Carolina's fabled formal Germans.

J. S. Fletcher

## Variations

Gail Godwin

Sooner or later, each person—no matter who they are or how old they are—has a rude awakening. This awakening may occur because of something the person read, because of someone the person met, or simply because his shower water was too cold.

In this moment, life stops as suddenly as a moving picture film stops when the projector breaks.

And the last strip of film is smacked indelibly upon the on-looker's mind. He must look at its image because the movie has stopped and it is dark.

In this moment, the spectator is forced to look at his own life as objectively and as coldly as if it was someone else's. He may not like what he sees.

But what he does about it after this cruel gift of insights comes is what makes up the drama of all mankind.

He can do one of three things: he can close the book, say goodbye to the person, or adjust his shower water to "warm" and resume his unsatisfactory life, forever fighting down the gnawing dissatisfaction which eats chunks out of his heart.

Or he can vacillate from that moment on between decision and indecision. He can do this for the rest of his life.

Or he can make a clean break. The person who does this is as rare as the person who gives up smoking in one day and as rare as a beautiful flower growing out of a barren rock.

Everyone is marked for a release date—the date of the terrible insight. Everyone is the college student who plods through years of classes to discover one day that he is absolutely sure of nothing. Everyone is the man who has been working in an office he hates doing a job he finds boring only to realize that there is still time to get a different job in completely different surroundings. Everyone is the man or woman who has been living with someone he or she cannot live with and one day wakes up and asks: "Is it really necessary that I live with this person another day?"

As previously mentioned, there are three alternatives from which to choose when "the hour of decision" comes.

The everyone who chooses to remain vaguely irritated with their lives consist of the bulk of humanity. Their choice has made it possible for the world to continue flowing. All cannot make the break or civilization would most certainly collapse.

The everyone who snap back their necks and stop in their tracks and cut the rope are the ones who make the chapter headings in the history books. They are the ones who start the revolutions—good or bad—and they are the ones who give the rest of us courage to THINK about making the break when our day comes.

God! The water is cold.