

Scarlet and Black

GRINNELL COLLEGE
Grinnell, Iowa



A weekly newspaper published each Friday of the college year by the Grinnell Committee on Student Publications, Richard S. Westfall, chairman. Represented for national advertising by National Advertising Service, Inc., College Publishers Representative, 420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Grinnell, Iowa, under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rate \$3.50 per school year.

Signed articles and editorials do not necessarily reflect the opinions, or policies of this newspaper or of Grinnell College. Unsigned editorials reflect the opinions of the editor.

Editor Doc Davenport
 News Editor Alida Snyder
 Copy Editor Marilyn Kelsey
 Feature Editor Nancy Pogel
 Picture Editor Lou Hieb
 Sports Editor Dale Furnish
 Proof Editors Patrick Huber, Mary Jane Watts
 Business Manager Pete Lysne
 Assistant Business Manager Paul Vandivort
 National Advertising Manager John Boyles
 Circulation Manager Joe Owens
 Layout Manager Lorin Epp

About The Demonstration

In a letter to the editor in this issue, a reader, quite understandably, asks for some positive action by the group who demonstrated against armament last Saturday night at the Military Ball.

But then he goes on to say, "If the demonstrators cannot implement their opinions, their display of Saturday night stands open to condemnation as at best useless and at worst childish."

We do not believe that this particular demonstration of opinion, regardless of future implementation, was either useless or childish. Freedom of expression is a right guaranteed by the Constitution. The Constitution is hardly based on childish or useless concepts.

But we would call childish—or pathetic—the behavior of some of the observers Saturday night, including that of an officer of the United States Air Force. These people, showing their ignorance or indifference toward American rights and problems, displayed actions much more contrary to American philosophy and belief than did the students they heckled with cries of "commies," "save your rubles" and "queers."

These observers self-righteously labeled themselves "loyal Americans" and then proceeded to demonstrate not against disarmament but, by their observable action, against the peaceful advocacy of ideas.

This type of action is nothing new for America. There have been such Janus-faced people in every generation. But we are angry and ashamed that such base ignorance, prejudice and indifference exists at an institution devoted to the advancement of truth through education.

Convention Is Rare Opportunity

The mock convention this weekend is probably as good a chance to put an abstract, liberal education to practice as any of us will get before we graduate.

Every semester we take our courses in history and humanities, government and literature, science and sociology. Sometimes we find ourselves wondering what good all of this fact and theory will do.

In our opinion, if everybody lets themselves get involved in the convention, we will see how textbook learning and assigned reading can be put to use.

Getting involved in the convention does not mean turning it into a farce as are most of the Student council conventions. It means approaching the various issues, developments and problems as a person with a wide background of knowledge. It means seriousness and reason. It means a respect for rules of procedure and conduct.

If it is approached in this way, the Mock Political Convention will be an experience worth a semester of classes.

Let's Have More Editorials

In a report to Student council two weeks ago concerning the conference in Washington, D.C., dealing with the segregation problem, Dick Mullins said, in relation to the struggle of the southern integrationists, "They deserve all the support and help we can possibly give them." Then Mullins paused and in an apologetic voice said, "I guess I'm editorializing."

Mullins need not apologize. The work done by the committee headed by Jill Dennington not only justifies editorializing but merits recognition by this newspaper and the student body. The knowledge and insight gained by Ron Gault and Mullins on their trip to Washington has been and will be a great help as Grinnell formulates its course of action in the situation.

We hope that there is a great deal more "editorializing" or voice of opinion, for if there is, we are sure that action of a positive, result-achieving nature will follow.

The Other Side Of Segregation

Segregationists should be asked to visit and speak at colleges like Grinnell, according to Gilbert Cranberg, editorial writer for the Des Moines Register and Tribune. Cranberg emphasized the possibility of doing this in a Scarlet and Black interview following his speech here April 22. He said there would be no problem in finding an appropriate southerner willing to come here and defend segregation.

President Bowen, when asked to comment about this last week, said he thought it would be all right. He added that money from a lecture fund could be used to finance such a program.

Among the many benefits that could result is the greater interest on the subject that would be likely to develop. At Grinnell we most often hear ideas supporting integration. Listening to a strong defender of the other viewpoint could not help but stimulate our thought on the subject, regardless of whether we are integrationists or segregationists.

This suggestion is not a reaction against the present civil rights movement at Grinnell but rather a supplement to it. The integrationists here are too sincere in their actions to be afraid to hear their opponents. The administration should at least give serious consideration to Cranberg's suggestion as soon as possible.

Patrick Huber

Notes From The Underground

by Naida Tushnet

"And they shall pound their swords into plowshares and study war no more."

Last Saturday night I was one of nearly thirty students who walked in a circle making a path for peace in front of Darby gym. It was cold, we got tired and there were a few hecklers who tried to get us down, but we kept our tempers as we sang.

There was no attempt to keep anyone from entering the dance (although we understood a few couples wouldn't go in out of sympathy for our ideals). Nor did we try to start any trouble. We simply believe in the end of the arms race, the end of a militaristic attitude in America, the end of ROTC on a liberal arts campus.

The cadet said we were spoiling his fun. Well, if this is the only way we can get people to think of what the course we, as a nation, are taking, leads to—sickness, destruction, death—we're sorry, but we want our children to live happy, healthy lives more than we want to preserve our fun.

A red-faced athlete said we were in "poor taste." It seems to me that the morals of a nation are above matters of taste! And it's a comment on our times that "poor taste" is the most expedient way to get people to think!

Frankly, I'm not so sure we were out of taste. We were organized and not rowdy, our songs were appropriate (although sometimes a bit off key) and we knew why we were there.

A group of boys in hall jackets, shouted, "Goddamn philosophy major Reds!" By actual count there were only two philosophy majors among us. As far as being "Communists" because we are for peace is concerned—what nonsense! It is precisely because we love America and support its ideals that we marched on. We want our children to be able to live in a free and peaceful land.

(A small aside: on the one hand we are filled with stories about how much the Russians provoke war, and then when we want peace we're called Reds. Hey, communications, get your stories straight!!)

We are not anti-social. We like to dance and had it been any ordinary dance, we probably would have been inside. But it wasn't. It was a military ball, and the fact that people could attend it without thinking of the implications of any sort of

back to the fold

On the whole, it is easy enough to ignore the various "peacockish" aspects of Grinnell life.

We can accept the jocks and their bright red sweaters, the journalists with their pencils behind their ears, the scientists with slide rule hanging from belt, etc., etc., etc.

But in recent weeks I have observed (how could anyone with eyes and ears help but observe) two ego-parades which seem rather unnecessary.

The first is the Mortar Board costume parade which drags on for the better part of the week, complete with gold tin-foil sledge hammer for the president. The second is the circus on legs staged each year by Women's Honor G, this year complete with tin cans (if you don't see them, you will hear them).

Recognition is a wonderful thing, but do these costume parades bring the type of recognition worthy of membership in the organization.

Perhaps we should have the new CofHP and AWS board walk around blindfolded, carrying a portable justice-scale for a week (this would not be a contradiction—it would be a contradiction). And the Friars could walk around in frocks and hoods for a week. The new Student council president could carry a "Roberts' Rules" and an NAACP handbook around his neck for a week. And the student auditor could drag an adding machine behind him for a few days.

Mortar Board and Women's Honor G are mentioned as examples only because of the timeliness. There are others—too many.

Have you ever seen a Phi Bete or a Danforth winner or a talented pianist or artist decked out and paraded? Of course not. Because their recognition comes in the achievement. That is usually the case with real achievements.

Doc Davenport

militarism shows too clearly just how far a dangerous frame of mind has penetrated. The "cold war" is a threat, and such organizations as ROTC help continue the cold war, so we are striking against ROTC.

As far as the accusation that we were jags showing off—you try showing off in cold weather for four hours!

We marched Saturday night to create awareness and discussion on campus of the dangers of ROTC, bombs, wars and apathy to it all. I think we succeeded in that. The next step is to mold the awareness into action, and in doing this "we shall not be moved."

PAROLES

by Al Stanley

The role of criticism in the liberal arts college is by no means an easy role to define. In this discussion we will confine ourselves to criticism as it has been present with concern to theatrical productions and hope that from such a discussion analogies may be drawn to other fields to which the topic may pertain.

The place to start, I suppose, would be with the very basic question of whether departments of the college should allow students to criticize their work at all.

For instance, the music department at Grinnell does not allow the reviewing of their concerts on the basis that there are no students here qualified to review them. Likewise, with the barrage of badly written and naive reviews that the theatrical productions have received in the past two or three seasons, there has been talk of a similar move in the speech department.

No action has been taken, however, and at present there seems to be no possibility of such action to prohibit continuation of the present set-up.

Here then it is clearly seen that the responsibility is placed squarely in the lap of the Scarlet and Black and members of its staff. This is the very heart of the matter. We must examine the reasons for the concern of the fine arts departments.

We must discover the dangers and realize the problems of criticism. And finally we must set about to develop a new set of standards from which to work if that criticism is going to be any more than nonsense.

First, it must be understood that the main objection to the reviews that have appeared in the S&B is not that they have not praised the shows to high heaven, but rather that in the process of their criticism they have pointlessly thrown "everything in the book" at most of the actors (especially those who are appearing on the Grinnell stage for the first time) and have judged the entire production of a personal fancy for professional standards.

I would be equally ridiculous if I were to say that the actors at Grinnell are the greatest ever to grace the stage, but we must remember that Grinnell productions are serving a dual purpose, which will be discussed later.

The really bad part is not the affirmation of certain lacks that the actors or productions may have, but it is rather the brutality with which it is often done.

For instance, people with no previous acting experience try out for a play; the director sees promise in a few of those individuals and casts them. They work like hell trying to learn whatever they can, and then they are mercilessly ripped apart by some Grinnell student suddenly turned God.

Of course, when judged against professional standards, the actors and the production probably don't "measure up." But the primary function of the educational theater is not to entertain, the college but rather to teach those people who participate in its productions something about the theater and its problems.

Now what place has the kind of review that was given the recent productions of "Macbeth" or "The Thumb" in this set-up?

Don't misunderstand me! I am the very first to uphold the "right to review," but I am also the first to say that if the S&B cannot find more knowledgeable, tactful and less prejudiced reviewers, it would better print an extra editorial on the "sad state of Grinnell social life."

Next week: college standards for criticism.