

Wisdom vs. Salary

Judy Yakey

TODAY there is no incentive for intellectually superior people to cultivate their minds further after graduation from college. Although these people with a liberal arts degree have no difficulty in finding work and in executing their jobs well, they seldom do anything to completely fulfill their potential. Basically, these people have been taught to think; but in the business world of today there is little opportunity for creative thinking. It is a question of salary versus wisdom. The things people do now benefit only themselves. The emphasis is on profit and volume of business. Few individuals consider the creative side of life—the philosophic. The chief outlet for the ability of the intellectually superior person is teaching. Here he has a chance to be creative, to think, and to benefit others with his wisdom.

But what if he does not want to teach? A friend of mine, who is a graduate, cum laude, of Indiana University school of Liberal Arts, an English major, and a member of Phi Beta Kappa, is now working for a finance company as a collection agent. Originally, he intended to be an English teacher and was for a year. But he found he was not suited for teaching. He could have gone back to school to get his Ph.D., but he had a good offer of a job with the finance company, with excellent opportunities for advancement. He accepted the position with the company because of the opportunities for promotion. Here is a good example of the suppression of expression of the genius and wisdom in a person because of the lack of remuneration.

Businesses today require their employees to have higher intelligence, be graduates of college, and outstanding individuals, yet they waste these talents in the practicality of the business world. There is no place in the world today for the philosophers, the leaders—creatively, or the individuals of great intellectual ability. We do not recognize or give credit to these people. In our present practical, business-like system, the geniuses must either starve to death, or go into business, for there is no reward for their intelligence and wisdom.

A Step Backward

Harry Weaver

THE Federal Communications Commission is, at present, reviewing requests for the inauguration of pay-as-you-see television. Programs sponsored by pay-TV would appear on the television screen as a picture puzzle with the pieces in the wrong places. By de-

positing money in a decoder attached to the television set, the picture could be unscrambled. The possibilities of unscrambling the pattern without depositing money, a thought that might occur to a person of doubtful integrity, would be practically non-existent since it has been estimated that there is about one chance in one hundred thousand that a person would be able to find the right combination. The impetus for pay-TV has come from promoters who assert that a greater number of major events could be brought before the eyes of the public by this method; but they do not state that, at the same time, they will be picking the public's pocket figuratively speaking. The situation seems to me to be analogous to that of a person who buys a car with the understanding that he will be able to operate it for just the expense of repairs, and is then told that a new fuel has been invented that will, eventually, make obsolete his present free fuel. Further, this fuel will have to be purchased from a gigantic, profit-making organization.

I am strongly opposed to any such system. It is true that if pay-TV were to be the mode, there would be no commercial; but, of the many commercials presented during a regular evening of televiewing, I find several that are not only informative but pleasant to watch. When I also consider that the alternative to watching a few commercials is to pay almost fifteen hundred dollars a year to enjoy an amount of television comparable to that which I now see, my opposition becomes even stronger in the light of my limited financial resources. Further, the monetary gains which could be derived by the promoters of pay-TV seem to me to be disproportionate. For example, if a one hour pay-television program were to be seen and paid for at the rate of twenty-five cents by the owners of every American television receiver, the show would gross almost ten million dollars. It is doubtful that this precise situation would occur, but it seems irrational to promote for one hour of entertainment to almost equal the enormity of the history-making contract between Buick and The Jackie Gleason Enterprises for eleven million dollars for the two years covered by the contract. From this comparison, it is only natural to assume that within a short time after the advent of pay-TV, all the regular networks would lose their best performers to the lure of the little money-making, decoding machines stationed in every home; only the mediocre would be left to be seen on the regular, commercial TV programs.

It appears to me that the development of television along its present lines is the more advantageous course for the American public. Television is similar to wine, in that as it ages it becomes better. During the early life of TV, programs were not exceptionally good but a combination of improved methods and substantial outlays of money by sponsoring companies has created a great, new communications medium. Presentations such as "Peter Pan" and "Cyrano de Bergerac" have markedly increased the cultural value of television; and programs featuring entertainers like Steve Allen, Jackie

Gleason, Ed Sullivan, and a host of others, have brought many hours of entertainment to the public. Present-day television has provided entertainment in the home for many children who might, otherwise, be roaming the streets. It seems axiomatic that the limited resources of the average American family would deprive them of many of these advantages and the daily use of the television receiver would, once again, become a "rich man's luxury." I do not believe that this result is in conformity with the American tradition of development of mass communication media. Newspapers, magazines, and radio have always relied upon advertising to pay the majority of their expenses, thus enabling them to present their material to the public at a cost in line with, or even below, the average economic level of the American family. This system has resulted in widespread dissemination of news, cultural events, entertainment, and public education. I believe that this policy should be the governing factor in the development of television, rather than placing the use of a public communications medium on the same level as other commodities.

Harlech Castle

Howell Lloyd

I WAS in a jovial mood, for it was the day that I was to view my first medieval castle. With my parents I boarded an early train for the seacoast in the little Welsh village of Llanbrynmair. The railway, first edging its way under overhanging cliffs and then leisurely rolling along the broad expanse of Estweref, followed the River Dovey down to the sea. Hills and meadows, blurred on a background of mist and haze, passed the coach window in an unending pageant. Cattle drowsed in the fields and sheep scurried away at the sound of the approaching train. Slate-roofed stone cottages clustered along the river in the valley, and over-hanging clouds made inky shadows on the mountain slopes. We were soon in view of the ocean, and shortly the railroad was threading its way along the coast. The smell of seaweed tainted the ocean breeze. Across the bay of Cardigan the gaunt purple steeps of the Snowdon range appeared.

As we suddenly rounded a bend, my father said, "There is your castle!" Strident on a rocky cliff stood the edifice that was Harlech. Before us reared its majestic countenance, heroic and shelterless to the four winds. Full of majesty, invincible to the storms and hurricanes of the Atlantic, the castle seemed to defy the elements and was beautiful even in its desolation. Our train came to an abrupt halt in a small station sheltered under the rocky eminence upon which stood the castle. The sea practically surrounded the rock, and we could easily perceive how impregnable was its defense. A few stunted shrubs clung desperately to the face of the cliff as if they were elbowing their way to the summit. Ivy, green and vivid, edged through the cracks. Clustered about the base were the picturesque