

# The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-eighth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Richard Overstreet, Chairman.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff, and all reprints or quotations must specify thus.

NOVEMBER 29, 1960

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 60

## A Move In The Right Direction

We, along with a great many other North Carolinians, were very pleasantly surprised to learn that Chancellor William B. Aycock, in a move unprecedented at this University, has recommended that the contract of football coach Jim Hickey be not merely fulfilled but extended for another three years.

Inasmuch as Hickey's football warriors have experienced a less than pleasant season—though, for the second year in a row, they bounced back to win their last two games—a good many devoted supporters of victorious football were after the coach's neck.

But it is encouraging to see that the Chancellor and, as was later shown, President Friday do not believe that winning is the ultimate goal, that a loss or tie well taken is of equal value not only to those who play on the field but also to those who cheer, or moan, in the stands.

Coach Hickey has, to many of us, exemplified many of the things we have found so wanting in most of the nation's coaches. He is not a blustering fanatic who finds gloom in defeat, happiness only in smashing victory. He realizes the value and exhilaration of victory but knows it is not the reason his team has been assembled. His personal conduct on and off the field has been that of a quiet, modest man; one whom this University or any other would be proud to claim as its representative in any field.

To recommend the extension of Coach Hickey's contract an additional three years is, in effect, to recognize that how you play the game is considerably more important than how the final score turns out. And it also recognizes the fact

that just because Coach Hickey has had two seasons out of the top ten he will not necessarily constantly produce losing teams.

A couple of weeks ago the University of Pittsburgh, in a move even less precedented than Aycock's, hired Coach Johnny Michelosen on a lifetime basis. His teams have not been consistent winners, though he has turned out a few powerhouses from time to time.

In the statement released to the press, the University said that Michelosen had become a member of the community of as much stature as many of the professors and that it would like to be sure that he would always be in Pittsburgh.

Michelosen, on his part, was elated at the news and told reporters of the encouragement the new contract gave him and of the security he felt upon its being signed.

We wonder why this University could not, in light of the movement toward an enlightened athletic policy, do the same for Coach Hickey? He, too, has proved himself a popular and valuable member of the Chapel Hill community. He does his job, which is to coach football, well; or so the members of his team would have us believe.

Chancellor Aycock and President Friday have made great progress in a matter of hours; the University will grow as a result of their conscience and thoughtfulness. We would suggest that this be carried to its logical fruition in the signing of a lifetime contract with Coach Jim Hickey and his acceptance as merely another member of the faculty.

## Kennedy Comes To Japan

Except for the sipping of green tea and occasional little polite bows to the Japanese TV audience, pro-American candidate and victor Prime Minister Hayado Ikeda, brought in many of the aspects of this year's U.S. presidential campaign. We are not concluding that the Americanized approach brought pro-American results, but the similarities interestingly enough exist.

Although the favorite candidate, John F. Kennedy, wasn't running, Japan was alive with signs of his popularity. One Japanese bar celebrated Kennedy's victory by serving free beer to all males who could prove they were 43—the same age as the President-elect.

Some impressionable young Japanese women hinted they would not vote at all, because the Japanese parties lacked "a handsome candidate, like Jack Kennedy."

Besides taking advantage of the American TV debates, victor Ikeda made American-like promises. Convinced that it was the "New Frontier" that has won for Kennedy, Ikeda promised: "My Liberal Democratic Party will have precisely such a New Frontier program in Japan."

The American influence and pro-American outcome brought sighs of relief last week when we discovered that the election results gave Mr. Ikeda's party 296 of the 467 seats. His conservative coalition held 283 in the pre-election legislature.

This outcome pleased the west in many ways—it first of all condemned the left-wing riots which prevented President Eisenhower from making his visit to Japan; it secondly reflected Japanese support of the Japan-U.S. treaty.

We were disappointed in the failure of the Liberal Democrats to gain the coveted two-thirds majority which is necessary to revise the Constitution. Although the Socialists and Communists did make gains, the overwhelming victory of Kennedy-loving Ikeda leads us to believe that some of the trite aspects of our own campaign weren't as useless as we thought.

M. S. B.

## Parlance— Coming Soon

Parlance, the new campus magazine, will publish its first issue two weeks after Christmas vacation, announced Editor Carroll Raver today. The magazine, sponsored by the "Y", seeks an introspective look at campus life and values, and plans articles on all aspects of student life.

Parlance began as an idea last spring, under the auspices of the YM-YWCA Executive Board. The Board agreed that there was a need at the University for a magazine that looked critically at student institutions. This fall, "Y" President Lewis appointed Carroll Raver as editor of the publication.

"Considerable progress has been made on the magazine," noted Associate Editor Bob Silliman, "but our main concern seems to be writers that won't write."

A staff meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 1, at four o'clock, at which time a deadline system will be arranged. "Our goal is to have twice as much copy as we need for the first issue," explained Carroll Raver. "In this way, we can condense the essence of each article, and bring to the students a broader spectrum of campus opinion."

Raver concluded with this remark on Parlance: "The first issue of our magazine must be a success. Everyone working on the magazine believes that our project will be an asset to the formulation of student opinion. By presenting our ideas to the campus, we hope to stimulate student thinking on University institutions."

## A LETTER TO 'ESQUIRE'

# Jerry Wald Defends His 'Sons And Lovers'

(The following letter was written to Esquire Magazine by Jerry Wald of "Sons and Lovers" fame in response to a Dwight Macdonald review of that movie. We reprint it here because the letter seems to us a particularly stirring and valid defense of the mingling of art and commercialism in the American motion picture.)

—THE EDITOR

Dear Mr. Macdonald: I have been reading your lively and outspoken film criticism with interest since you started your monthly column in the pages of Esquire. Having, in my time, received for the films I've been associated with almost every kind of criticism from the most damning to the most flattering, I am able by now to absorb it all with a certain equanimity. I am naturally pleased when the criticism affirms that I succeeded in what I set out to do, and try to profit from any perceptive comment that points up my mistakes. I don't believe in quarreling with a critic, because one assumes that his opinions are offered in good faith and he certainly has a right to voice them in public prints.

In the case of your review in the October issue of Sons and Lovers, however, I am somewhat perplexed. You start out by saying that it's "hard to say what's wrong with" the movie. You feel it just doesn't "add up." Later, you admit that it observes a "literary fidelity" to the novel, but at the same time fails to capture the novel's spirit. Surely this latter statement may at least be taken as an acknowledgement on your part that we made an honest effort to be true to our source in transferring this complex novel to the screen. Damning with faint praise?

You make the point of the fact that we are "trying out" the film in both commercial and art theatres, but you feel that it will please neither. Yet if the general critical and box office response is any indication, the film is actually doing a great deal of pleasing in both camps, and I am proud to be able to say so.

I also believe that it is not an ignoble ambition to want to make films that will have something to say to a wide segment of the public, especially if you do it without "playing down" to an imaginary low group intelligence.

If I have any quarrel with your point of view as a critic it is that I often don't feel you take in to full account the actual circumstances under which films are made. You can't divorce a product from its source. I think you would agree that Sons and Lovers represents a departure

from the tritely run-of-the-mill commercial effort at film making. Yet no producer working for a major company can ignore the fact the motion picture is entertainment to the masses, that films are produced primarily for profit, and that some pretty inane films have made a great deal of money. Still there remain a great many producers in Hollywood who continue to make a sincere and honest effort to turn out films that will not be an insult to the intelligent viewer, and I count myself among them.

I say the above with all due humility. I'll match my bad pictures with the worst, and at the same time ruefully admit that I never tried to make a bad picture. Most often it's a compromise that fouls you up. And the temptations to compromise in the commercial film business are so numerous that I would hesitate to try and list them.

In attempting to bring works like Faulkner's *The Hamlet* (which became *The Long, Hot Summer*) and *The Sound and the Fury* and Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* to the screen, we are really looking for material that will stretch the boundaries of the screen and stimulate the audience's imagination. I think a kind of revolution has taken place in the world of film making since the definitive arrival of television and that the only direction for the motion picture to go is up—in terms of quality, imagination, originality. The "B" picture, the soap opera, the formula western—all this and much more is henceforth and forever after enshrined in the homes of America in that little box. I feel that film makers should make their peace with this fact, and get on with the business of making better films—films that explore human experience more deeply, more honestly, and that use the cinematic medium with creative imagination.

In relation to this creative art of film making, the producer is often in an ambiguous position. Few people, including film critics, seem to have a very fair idea of just what he does. The praise or blame for the success of a film is often times a hard credit to place, unless it is the rare one-man job of an Ingmar Bergman, Jean Cocteau or Robert Bresson. In the theater, the play's always been the thing and playwright is held primarily responsible. The function of the producer and director are quite easily held in perspective. But in films, although admittedly the director most often takes precedent as the creative mind chiefly responsible, the situation is different.

Having been in the business of producing films for over twenty-five years (Johnny Belinda, Key

## "We're Almost Ready To Take Off Again"



## DeGaulle— Last Chance?

How vulnerable a position has General DeGaulle placed himself, in by calling for a national referendum on a new "Algerian Algeria?"

There is no doubt that voters in France will stand behind him in this new program. But the real sore spot is within the ranks of the French army both in France and Algeria.

If the referendum is approved, a program providing for provisional new executive and consultative legislative bodies in Algeria will be installed.

The real purpose of the plan is to take the Algerian question out of the domestic politics of continental France and place it in Algerian domestic politics. The French president wants to throw the burden of the current difficulties on the shoulders of the Algerians themselves—the Arabs, Kabyles, Europeans, French Loyalists and rebel nationalists.

If the provisional regime proves strong enough, DeGaulle hopes, that it will attract Moslems of independence and stature to its service; this leadership might tempt the rebel organization in Tunis to seek a cease-fire that would permit its leaders to participate in the construction of the future.

The question of DeGaulle's success depends almost entirely on how the million Europeans in Algeria and the French army will react to this relaxation of ties with France. It is within these ranks that DeGaulle's vulnerability lies and the results of his gamble will only be told by the future.

bert and Jack Cardiff, the director, were at this time relatively unknown and untried talents. Lambert had shown great ability as a film critic, formerly editing the British Film Institute magazine, *Sight and Sound*, and Cardiff had directed two low-budget films that I felt showed great promise. I mention this because I would like you to know that we are making an attempt to give an opportunity to younger talents—for this is the only way in which the vitality and health of the future of motion pictures can be assured. There is, in Hollywood, no lack of talent—only a lack of that executive insight to find that talent and make proper use of it.

That is, in brief, the history of

how *Sons and Lovers* came to be made. We shot it, incidentally, in Lawrence's own home town—Wales, as you erroneously state in your review. (Where did you ever get that idea?) Also, does it really help in elucidating your opinion of a conscientiously made film, whatever its shortcomings may be, to descend to repeating a hoary canard about its producer?

Yours for more in the way of responsible, perceptive and illuminating criticism. For those who love motion pictures, both for their past achievements and their infinite future promise as a creative medium, this means a great deal.

—Jerry Wald

## Jean Kerr's Latest Book, Perceptive And Hilarious

*The Snake Has All the Lines*, by Jean Kerr. Doubleday, New York. Fall, 1960. \$3.50.

Jean Kerr is a girl who sees things. Her mind works like the trick mirrors at the amusement parks that take true images and throw them back at us looking hilarious and sometimes maybe just a little petty. Mrs. Kerr rides herd on five sons, and when she gets out of the saddle every evening, she writes about them, her husband, status seeking, an afternoon at the beach, show business, Queen of the May, and whatever else comes into her kaleidoscopic mind.

Jean Kerr's sense of satire can be gently amusing or devastatingly uproarious. About the beach: "Speaking about dead crabs, I have found it advisable when presented with any species of marine life, no matter how advanced in decay, to assume that it is still alive. In this way you can appeal to the children's nobler nature. I have stood, as close as my nose would allow, over the ghastly carcass of some unlovely denizen of the deep (now clearly past the reach of all wonder drugs) and muttered sagely, 'The thing is, darling, he seems dead because he's scared.' (He's scared?) 'He's just lonesome, so why don't you put him back in the water and let him play with his brothers and sisters?' It's better this way, really. Otherwise they would take him home to bury him, which would be all right if they buried him."

It is this ability to note all of life's little foibles with the air of an indulgent if confused grand-

mother that makes Jean Kerr so fascinating. She is telling you things about yourself. Her favorite target is everything of, by, and for Suburbia. This subject has been attacked often enough before, but never by one who was both the "hunter and the hunted." Her tales are fashioned around the most simple routine items: lunch money, school plays, notes to the teacher: "This will be complicated by the fact that I don't know his teacher's name (Sister Mary Arthur was his teacher last year, but that's no help) and I will have to address the note, 'Dear Teacher,' which reveals not only that I am woefully out of touch with my son but clearly without the most rudimentary interest in the fine young woman who is moulding his character."

Jean Kerr's first book was *Please Don't Eat the Daisies*, also a perfect comment of our society's comedy of errors. But there is nothing sharp or wrist-slapping about her writing—it is more in the tone of helping her readers to laugh away their sorrows. Sample sorrow: "Now, I buy underpants the way some people buy gin—recklessly, extravagantly—and I secrete them at various key points throughout the house. As a result, I can always find eleven clean pairs of underpants in size eight."

Jean Kerr constantly has the attitude and innocence of an Alice in Wonderland, with time out for bits of sparkling sophistication. It is this widely-varied spectrum of entertaining and revealing essays that make *The Snake Has All the Lines* well worth reading.

—Chris Ferrara

## The Daily Tar Heel

JONATHAN YARDLEY  
Editor  
WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER  
Associate Editors  
MARGARET ANN RHYMES  
Managing Editor  
EDWARD NEAL RINEY—  
Assistant To The Editor  
HENRY MAYER, LLOYD LITTLE—  
News Editors  
SUSAN LEWIS—  
Feature Editor  
FRANK SLOUSHER—  
Sports Editor  
KEV FREEMAN—  
Asst. Sports Editor  
JOHN JUSTICE, DAVIS YOUNG—  
Contributing Editors  
TIM BURNETT  
Business Manager  
RICHARD WELSER—  
Advertising Manager  
JOHN JEVET—  
Circulation Manager  
CHARLES WHEEDLE—  
Subscription Manager

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4 per semester, \$7 per year.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.

Published by the Colonial Press, Chapel Hill, N. C.