The Michigan Daily

Seventy-Fifth Year

Where Opinions Are Free, Truth Will Prevail

EDITED AND MANAGED BY STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN UNDER AUTHORITY OF BOARD IN CONTROL OF STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

420 MAYNARD ST., ANN ARBOR, MICH. NEWS PHONE: 764-0552

Editorials printed in The Michigan Daily express the individual opinions of staff writers or the editors. This must be noted in all reprints.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1964 NIGHT EDITOR: JOHN KENNY

America's War Spirit: Pre-Empting Basic Priorities

THE UNITED STATES is now able—and will continue to be able—to "ensure the destruction of both the Soviet Union and Communist China, under the worst imaginable circumstances accompanying the outbreak of war," according to Defense Secretary McNamara.

Logically, it seems that would end the matter. Unless we want to be able to destroy the rest of the world as well, there's not much more the defense establishment can do. Having reached the penultimate utopia, it might take a deep bow, pre-set all those missiles to go off in the event of attack, and just disappear.

After all the defense workers had been relocated, there would suddenly appear an extra $47 billion in the federal coffers and an unimaginably massive weapons industry without work and ready to be put to better purposes.

And as soon as Russia (and probably France) had reached the same superpowerful point, the whole nuclear cold war business might suddenly lose much of its childish glitter.

THE REAL WORLD rarely operates according to one's peculiar logic, however. And so the game most likely will go on. Basic needs will continue to be shortchanged, and tensions will continue to mount.

Critics of Soviet and Chinese so-called totalitarianism often charge that Russia needs a constant war threat to keep its people dedicated to the state. While the economic system staggers along, depriving everyone of freedoms and comforts, attention is diverted by the external "enemy." No one minds very much not having decent food, clothing and shelter, or having few avenues for political expression.

Those critics would do well to reflect on just how eager the United States has been to make more than verbal forays toward peace, on just how much our economy depends on the defense industry, on just how frantic the government attempts to convince the constituents that it is fighting a noble war for freedom against an insidious international plot.

THEY MIGHT WELL conclude that this nation is just as determined as its supposed enemies to obscure its basic structural dysfunctions in a patriotic war cloud. They might find that the government—once having started along the spiralling road to a growing military establishment—now cannot ignore certain deeply vested interests and pursue rational policies.

It is hard to believe that grown men could not, by this time, have reached reasonable solutions to the world power struggle. There has been an amazing paucity of sincere efforts to reverse the arms race through arms control or disarmament. This sluggishness cannot be attributed to a lack of viable, intelligent alternatives; for thinking men have been investigating, recommending and demanding alternatives for as long as the threat of nuclear explosion has been hanging over the cold war.

There have been only laggard efforts—if any at all—to settle differences in situations less imminently nuclear. Our policies in Viet Nam are a prime example. We seem to be imposing a war there—and all the deprivation of civil liberties which accompanies war—on people who are unenthusiastic and bewildered by the whole affair. And in pursuing that war, we have consistently ignored the challenge of negotiating a viable and rational settlement.

AT THE SAME TIME, we have shown a shocking disinterest in opening meaningful channels of communication with other nations. We pompously cold-shoulder Cuba, refuse even to recognize China and East Germany, open only the smallest trickle of trade with Russia while trying to seduce her satellites, support dictators in many nations and deal highhandedly with the many underdeveloped nations which depend heavily on our aid. These actions illustrate just how sincerely we want world understanding.

But even more frightening than the specific policies pursued are the social attitudes which generate and need those policies. More frightening because the strength of those attitudes bodes ill for the re-ordering of priorities that is so essential.

LISTENING TO SEN. Goldwater, one hears the manifestation of a pervasive, blinding fear that America's precious vital fluids will be dried up into vile-smelling clay unless our shores are constantly and imposingly impenetrable. Moreover, that fear is not limited to Goldwater and the numerous reactionary groups; in a less vocal form, it underlies the emotions of an indeterminately large majority of the population.

Like so many fears, this fear of weakness in the face of the Communist menace sustains itself because it is actually soothing to those whom it grips. By reducing reality to a finite set of absolute goods and absolute evils, it does away with both the ability and the need to perceive what is really troubling the nation. Without fear, the mass of nonthinkers in America would be lost in the unnerving sea of society's fundamental contradictions.

Out of men's fear grows the defense establishment, and from the combination of those two grows our tremendous unwillingness to dismantle that establishment. Taking simply the relation of the defense budget to the Gross National Product—without considering the endless multiplying effect of the money spent by the defense industries—a good 10 per cent of our production and employment is devoted to military purposes. The calamities experienced whenever even one defense plant relocates indicate, in miniature, the critical role of war in our economy.

IF THIS NATION sincerely wanted it, there is no reason why the adjustment to a true peacetime economy could not be made. There is certainly no lack of viable methods, and there is certainly no lack of other things to do. Yet to stop building nuclear arms is to destroy the necessary physical manifestation of the war spirit. Eventually it might become impossible to ignore the folly of avoiding peace, when the arms race had ended with its inevitable whimper. Eventually we might have to relinquish our comfortable fears.

After the Second World War, it took America one year to dismantle a military structure over twice as large as the present one. But then the nation wanted peace. Now it would take—as one conservative estimate goes—at least three years. Plus a radical psychological upheaval.

People would have to think about the implications which automation has for unemployment, inequalities in income and the basic organization of the economy. They would have to face the crucial futures of civil rights and education. They would have to take a hard look at poverty in America. They would have to consider the future of our cities.

THESE PROBLEMS manifest basic paradoxes between American ideals and realities. We cannot continue to place them second to a trumped-up need for military superiority and to deal with them in token gestures. Only if our minds and our finances are freed of the fears which require our foolish militarism can this be done.

McNamara's revelation seems to open the door for freeing ourselves. But little is likely to happen until the American people step out from under their war-cloud and start thinking.

—JEFFREY GOODMAN

Illogical

AN ENGLISH PROFESSOR has recently come out against the use of alphabetical order in systemization, claiming (among other things) that alphabetical order is illogical. He needn't worry. If progress continues at the rate it's going now, we'll all be arranged numerically in the not-too-distant future.

—S. HALLER

The Michigan Daily

H. NEIL BERKSON, Editor

KENNETH WINTER, Managing Editor — EDWARD HERSTEIN, Editorial Director

ANN GITLITZMAN ..... Personnel Director
MICHAEL MATTHIES ..... Associate Managing Editor
JOHN KENNY ..... Associate Managing Editor
DEBORAH MARTIN ..... Associate Editorial Director
LOUISE LEVITAS ..... Assistant Editorial Director in Charge of the Magazine
BILL HOLLARD ..... Sports Editor
TOM ROWLAND ..... Associate Sports Editor
GARY WENER ..... Associate Sports Editor
CHARLES TOWLE ..... Contributing Sports Editor

Business Staff

JONATHON N. WATCH, Business Manager

JAY CAMPBELL ..... Associate Business Manager
JUDY GOLDSMITH ..... Finance Manager
DEBORAH JOHNSTON ..... Personnel Manager
SYDNEY PARKER ..... Advertising Manager
RUTH ROSENBLATT ..... Circulation Manager

Published daily Tuesday through Sunday morning. Subscription rates: $9.50 semester by carrier ($5 by mail); $17 yearly by carrier ($9 by mail).

Second class postage paid at Ann Arbor, Mich.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Union Allocation Isn't Repaid

To the Editor:

FOR FIVE SEMESTERS now, the University has been surreptitiously allocating a portion of my tuition toward the support of the Michigan Union. I don't mind. It wouldn't make much difference if I did. And besides, every time I consider the benefits that accrue from my semi-annual enforced dues payment, my senses reel. I am allowed to

—walk up the front steps

—buy magazines at the front desk

—spend my money at the MUG, dining room, pool tables, and bowling alley.

—cash checks (a privilege granted to parents only or female students only)

—look up out-of-town phone numbers in the Union phone books.

* * *

WHY SOMETIMES I walk up to the desk and buy a Bus Bar Bill 35 (more to myself that I—little old 3567302—can get one just by putting down my dime. Sometimes the employes are even civil.

* * *

This morning I gathered all my courage to ask if I could reserve a room for my parents on the evening of October 16, so that they could end their prolonged absence from their eldest son.

"The Union is the place to do it," I said to myself. "After all, it is the organization for providing facilities for Michigan men. It says so right on their match books!"

I was, however, politely but firmly informed that all rooms at the Union are held for alumni on football weekends, whether or not they have asked for reservations yet. If I would come in four days before my parents are to arrive, on the off chance that there were any rooms left, the Union would deign to rent me one.

* * *

NOW IT SEEMS to me that the Union's prime responsibility is toward the men attending the University now. I have been informed, in effect, that I cannot reserve a room there until May, 1966, at which time my need for such a room will be minimal.

It is possible the Union's policy in this respect is the result of financial support from the Life Members, but the Union should be informed that this policy at least quartered any monetary return the Union might ever have expected from me.

If the Union expects me to support it, maybe it should get around to supporting me.

—Richard J. Weiland, '66

Featherbedding

To the Editor:

SHOULD the University ever be so concerned with its budget that an austerity campaign is deemed necessary, I am suggesting that the Plant Department be closely examined as a possible stronghold of featherbedding and waste.

HAMLET:

Try New Technique

At the Michigan Theatre

JOHN GIELGUD'S production of "Hamlet" completed a two-day run at the Michigan Theatre yesterday, as part of a nationwide experiment called "Electronovision." Outstanding acting and the honest simplicity of the presentation afforded the audience an exciting evening of Shakespeare.

Richard Burton plays a Hamlet of vigorous manhood, a Hamlet disillusioned with life, yet with an urgent desire to live. The range of Burton's voice makes the passionate soliloquies intense and gripping and the philosophical lines direct and meaningful. In voice, in gesture, in facial expression, Burton establishes himself as the dominant figure on the stage.

In the role of Polonius, Hume Cronyn gives Burton the most notable support. His consistent interpretation keeps Polonius a pretentious old man and never allows him to appear wise.

Eileen Herlie is an appropriately sensual mother for Hamlet, but Alfred Drake (Claudius) commits an error of emphasis. The intensity of his acting in the praying scene highlights an otherwise lackluster performance, giving Claudius rather more of our sympathy than he properly should have.

* * *

THE HONEST simplicity of the production consists in the relatively bare stage, the plain dress, and the straightforward filming of the play. Initially disturbing, the lack of costume soon seems an asset to the production, providing the least possible distraction from the speeches of the actors. The bare stage has a similar effect.

"Electronovision" is billed as "the theatre of the future." It is not. The production lacks the immediacy of a live performance. It does provide a means for extending vast audiences to a palatable approximation of theatre. But then one wonders if a lesser play than "Hamlet" would enable us to forget how far away the actors really are.

—Lee Carl Bromberg

For a one hour and fifteen minute period yesterday afternoon, I observed one unusually brawny looking employe do absolutely nothing on University time. He did nothing for ten minutes in front of Mason Hall, nothing for twenty-five minutes behind the hedge in front of the General Library, nothing for the eight minutes it took him to walk from the library to the University Museum, nothing for the five minutes that he stood there smoking a cigar, nothing for the six minutes it took him to walk to a small white building in back of North Hall, and nothing for the thirteen minutes during which he spoke to one of his constituents in front of the building.

* * *

FINALLY, the two men entered a door marked "Rogues," and emerged eight minutes later in street clothes (at 3:43), ready to "call it a day" which most likely was scheduled until 4 o'clock. At $4.50 per hour, a little simple arithmetic will yield substantial figures over a yearly interval, calculated at one and a quarter hours wasted per day per man, which is, I think, a conservative estimate.

—John Yarrison, '65

AFECIGGE

To the Editor:

THIS LETTER is in response to Mr. Bremer's letter explaining AFECIGGE. I do this on the premise that it is a person organization, fully intending its avowed policy of obtaining Canadian citizenship should Sen. Goldwater be elected. This is what Mr. Bremer would have us believe, although many people, I'm sure, find it hard to swallow.

AFECIGGE epitomizes a state of affairs for which Democrats have been falsely railing against Republicans for years. That is campaigning against ideas rather than for concepts. AFECIGGE is a genuine example of such a situation.

How can people who would so readily renounce their U.S. citizenship be called loyal Americans? It would seem that their loyalty to whatever country can offer them the best deal. In subscribing to the principles, its members are, in effect, declaring that they are poor losers and that they have no confidence in our system of government, a system that has functioned without destroying the United States or the world for some 185 plus years.

TO BELIEVE that the election of one man would spell disaster is pure lolly.

Just another evidence of the irrationality of AFECIGGE is the belief that merely moving a few miles to Canada would alleviate all the supposed hardships of American life. What reason is there to believe that if the United States was in the throes of economic and political disaster, life would be better anywhere else?

I do not support Goldwater or Johnson at this moment, but I'm not condemnating any drastic change of life, should either become President.

—William R. Ader, '66E

Rockwell

To the Editor:

ONCE AGAIN I must commend the Michigan Union's Special Projects Committee for its intentions, but not for its actions.

Maiden undoubtedly is outside the memory of most of the University's students, but George Lincoln Rockwell is not the proper person to inform these students about it. He does not truly represent National Socialism, but has only borrowed its name for his own brand of racism, hatred, and for-soldiers fanaticism.

It would be far better to invite a reputable historian or political scientist for the Union's purpose than to provide a forum for Rockwell's hate-mongering.

—Michael S. Nash, '68

TODAY AND TOMORROW:

Goldwater's Campaign: *A Contradictory Dream*

By WALTER LIPPMANN

SEN. BARRY GOLDWATER has been telling the country that the President has become too powerful and that this very powerful President has been much too weak to win the cold war and stamp out crimes of violence in our city streets.

The senator has based his campaign on the thesis that the powers of the Presidency must be reduced and that then a smaller and weaker President can and should go away with the most troublesome problems at home and abroad.

This central contradiction is the hallmark of Goldwaterism. The senator finds it easy to believe that a smaller, shrunken, much less costly government can oversee the Communist nations lointly and severally, can command the West German Alliance and can put Latin America in order. In Barry Goldwater's mind, a cheaper government could act more strongly, a weaker government could see that the cities are successfully policed.

* * *

HOW, ONE MUST ASK, can we run the world and yet pay less? The fact, to be sure, is that to do what Senator Goldwater wants to have done demands a much more powerful government than we have today.

Why does he think it doesn't? The plain truth, I submit, is that he is a dreamer, that when Barry Goldwater talks about public affairs he lives in a world of fantasy. His dreams that all things are possible. For it is only in the world of dreams that weaker Presidents can do gigantic things, that great results can be achieved at little cost.

This unworldliness is a part of his personal attractiveness. In his world everything becomes possible when you have said that it should happen. There is no clash between the theories and the facts. The hard realities do not really exist. It was the boy who has never grown up fully who said the other day that when he was President he would install the man who sat in the White House and would then be able to talk to a number of heads of state.

* * *

THIS UNWORLDLY divorce from reality is not always charming. Many dreams can be quite cruel, and when Senator Goldwater talks about the poor he can be very cruel. He has been making much of our common worries about the increase of crime. And exploiting this worry for political purposes, he has been claiming that he, Barry Goldwater, can stop the crime which Lyndon Johnson is, so says Goldwater, promoting.

How is President Johnson promoting crime? By backing the civil rights act and by sponsoring Social Security and welfare measure. These, according to Senator Goldwater's Minneapolis speech, are causing "a breakdown in private responsibility" and in "respect for law and order."

The senator asks that "if it is entirely proper for governments to take from some to give to others, then won't some men be led to believe that they can rightfully take from anyone who has more than they?"

This must be about the first time in 200 years that any public man has argued that charity corrupts the characters of the poor.

* * *

IT IS NOT ONLY charity that is corrupting the poor. The search for justice is also corrupting the rich. The cruel theory that the civil rights for Negroes is that by enacting laws about these rights the Negroes have been incited to demand these rights. According to one of his leading supporters, perhaps the most distinguished intellectual in the Goldwater camp, Prof. Milton Friedman of Chicago University, the civil rights act "has directed Negro resentment against whites."

Thus, it is not the grievances that incite the Negroes. It is the effort to redress the grievances.

The campaign has been under way for about two weeks, and it begins to look as if the real issue to be decided is not whether this or that policy of this or that piece of legislation is sound, but whether Barry Goldwater is fit to be President in the hard world of reality.

WAR AND PEACE:

Third APA Season Begins with Tolstoy

THE ASSOCIATION of Producing Artists inaugurated its third Ann Arbor season last night with the American premiere of Piscator's "War and Peace." APA brilliantly realized this dramatic conception of Tolstoy's novel in what may be its finest production here.

The play itself succeeds in being what few would have thought possible—a remarkably true dramatic version of the novel. Piscator has unerringly distilled the essence of "War and Peace": its scope, its characters and its philosophical point of view.

Some scenes expand (Natasha's introduction to the Old Prince); some contract. (The opera scene and the abduction scene); some scenes are realistic, some expressionistic (the death of Andre). Piscator eliminates many of the minor characters, as well as Helene, wife of Pierre. Yet the essential remains. For instance, the quests of Pierre and Andrei, frequently interactive, remain the axis of the play.

* * *

UNFORTUNATELY, the character of Natasha (Rosemary Harris) does not completely survive the transposition from novel to play. This occurs probably because two scenes fundamental to her character development are missing from the play: the ball scene (barely suggested) and the hunt scene.



—Daily—James Kasson

Pierre observes Andre at war

In some respects, however, the play improves upon the novel. The whole unconvincing treatment of Karataev and his revelations to Pierre has fortunately been stricken from the play. Tolstoy's philosophy, often expressed in tiresome digressions, which impede the flow of action and character, is absorbed in the play accurately and without residue.

Advance publicity threatened that Piscator had revised Tolstoy's novel to express a contemporary message. Fortunately, this amounts to only a few introductory and terminal remarks by the Narrator, who appears for an end to war.

* * *

ELLIS RABB has meshed a variety of staging techniques and styles into a dynamic synthesis. For instance, Andrei's wounding at Austerlitz, a pivotal scene in the novel, received stunning visual treatment by means of a tilted screen, which symbolized Andrei's focus on the sky. This screen, when Napoleon appeared behind it, conveyed the hate through which the wounded man saw Napoleon. The retention of the tilted screen in the subsequent contrasting scene of Dolokov's cruel remarks about Andrei lent a visual accusation to that voiced by Pierre.

The battles were handled in several ways: exposition by the Narrator or messenger reports. The Battle of Borodino, played much like a game of chess by Pierre and the Narrator, was well conceived but lacked the visual clarity important to its success. Other scenes, by means of effective diction, a few soldiers and flags, good sound effects, evoked whole battlefields with amazing success. The technique of showing a huge map of Europe against the stage wall could have been utilized more effectively and for longer durations.

* * *

THE NARRATOR of the play (Clarion Corrastie), like the narrative voice of the novel, supplied exposition, assumed small roles or sardonically commented on the proceedings. The comments of the Narrator, who appears in modern dress, made the multiple transitions less abrupt and coordinated the many parts of the play.

APA never reached such a uniformly high level of acting in its previous productions. In particular, Ronald Bishop gave a masterful portrayal of Pierre; Sydney Walker played the Old Prince superbly.

—By Richard B. Sheldon

On Tour

