

## An Editorial

The Charlotte Observer, if conservative in its viewpoint, is usually mild in its presentation. However, somewhere it slipped up this week when it editorialized on the promotion of Hyman Rickover.

Admiral Rickover won his promotion largely for the creation of the atomic submarine, and although the Observer grudgingly granted Admiral Rickover the fact that he deserved the award, they proceeded in a paragraph to run his character into the ground.

This is not the place to discuss Rickover's merits as a person, and they are many—more than most of the cooperative individuals the Observer loves so well. What was particularly appalling in the editorial was the last sentence of the paragraph which after giving Rickover's character a beating in several sentences concluded "and besides he is a Jew."

In this era of race and religious prejudice reaching a high point, it could be hoped that responsible journalism would not fan the fires of prejudice and bias. It could very well have been a mistake of the editor who did not delete the sentence from the editorial writer's copy, but if this is the case both men should be fired.

Anti-semitism in the South does not need another advocate. It can only be hoped that the Observer could offer an apology.

## Right To Know

Unless something miraculous happens, the Student Legislature will not consider the bill concerning jury trial revision, the most significant proposal to be considered by the legislature. Moreover, Honor Council Chairman Hugh Patterson does not seem to want to tell the public his objections to the bill until the legislature has acted upon this.

From this one can gather that there is not very much wrong with the bill, apparently Mr. Patterson's objections are not adequate to meet the public's scrutiny. The ways and means committee should take this into consideration when it hears Mr. Patterson's objections.

According to a report, the bill will be held in committee in order to find a "more realistic" method of selecting jurors. It seems hard to find many people who are acquainted with the United States very well, for if they were they would realize that jurors are selected at large from the entire populace. Indeed, in any democracy, and the campus is a democracy, each citizen is charged with the responsibility of seeing it work, and contributing to it. Hence, it is only right that the entire campus be used in the selection of a jury. It needs not mentioning further why permanent jurors should not be in the jury system. Suffice it to say, that with permanent jurors, the jury trial system is not a jury trial system.

Finally, a word ought to be said about the public's right to know the reasoning behind the objections to the honor council bill. The public votes in the end of November for legislature. This undoubtedly will be an issue in the campaign, and the public has a right to see both sides of the issue. It is too much to expect that the introducer of the bill will speak against his bill if he is for it. Hence, the people who are opposed should suggest what is wrong. To withhold this from the public is to withhold the necessary facts for the campus to make wise choices at election time.

In order to acquaint the campus with those who will not give the public the information that they need at the time they can have it to make their will felt on their representatives. The Daily Tar Heel will run "refused to comment" stories on those persons who will not give their viewpoint on these issues. It is hoped through this process the public will be able to separate the sheep from the goats.

## N.S.A.

There have been several articles about the National Student Association in The Daily Tar Heel. Yet, many people seem to be in the dark as to how the organization works and what it stands for.

It is the only organization through which students can voice their views on a national level. For more about the National Student Association, attend the meeting tonight. The more campus participation N.S.A. can get the better off and the more representative of student opinion throughout the nation it will be.

## 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, \$9.50 per year.



## Letters From Many Readers

## More Letters

Dear Mr. Greene:

Sincerely in the spirit of friendship-for as you so rightly suggest, hate-mongering is despicable—may I ask you some questions? In your first 20-odd years, how deeply imbedded have your customs and traditions become? Have you not had occasion to change your mind during them? In your next 20 or 40 years, do you think you will have occasion to change or modify any of your present views?

If the majority of southerners is against integration—and this is perhaps debatable—what about that major majority of the nation and of the civilized world? Much as we might like it, it is not possible to discount the also deeply imbedded views of the rest of our country and of the rest of the world, that social or economic discrimination on the basis of color is violently anachronistic, and morally and socially and intellectually wrong. (Governor Faubus and segregation were the first topics we were questioned about from Copenhagen to Istanbul, in trains, schools, private homes, all during the autumn months of last year.) You understand, I know, the part white "superiority" has played in the post-war surge of nationalism among colored peoples of the world, which has resulted in the sometimes bloody, always costly overthrow of white colonial rule.

And it is not that the colonialists never did anything for their natives. They raised considerably education and health levels, they brought to backward areas the fruits of higher European civilization. They even took promising youths out of the jungles and sent them to Paris, Amsterdam, London, and gave them excellent educations. But somehow the proper gratitude and complaisance did not appear, even after all this, when these colored recipients of white generosity were told, that while they had much promise and many fine qualities, they were not quite ready to associate freely with their benefactors.

May I ask you Mr. Greene, sincerely and without sarcasm, have you ever tried being devil's advocate? Have you ever put yourself in the place of a young college-educated Negro living in the South, say in Chapel Hill? Have you ever been kept out of a place for a reason you considered invalid? Have you ever been jeered at because of some unremovable characteristic you were born with? What must it be like, Mr. Greene? How can we possibly know? Of course we can't—but because we've never been in the Sahara doesn't mean we doubt that we'd fry there, in August.

As for your conclusion that not integration but states rights is now the primary issue, I am forced to feel doubt. Your very placement of reasons seems to indicate that your prior concern, Mr. Greene, is really integration. And it then seems too possible that the states rights issue is a morally less controversial blind behind which to shelter your intentions to maintain the status quo.

You rightly say, "If integration is to come, it must come slowly." But, Mr. Greene, it must come. "Overnight?" It is almost 100 years since the idea was stated as law. I am genuinely sad to think this, and perhaps I am mistaken, but isn't it possible, Mr. Greene, that what you and other honestly-intentioned and moderate Southerners mean and want by "slowly" and "time for acceptance of this sudden change" is after your generation, and after that of your children? A change is a change. The future state will not be as the past. And it may seem "sudden" and shocking if it is never been considered a real possibility for you yourself.

So we don't like it. So it does take effort. It is not necessary—or a law of nature—that we like everything we do. Though it may have come to seem so to us who have grown up in this fortunate blessed country—to us white people, that is. It may be that in doing something distasteful, but something which very many people in many different places and for many years have decided is right, will prove to be less horrible than we feared. But we will never learn to do it if we continually put it off or shove aside until "later."

One last thing. To bring this discussion out of theory into actuality, may I mention the follow-

## "Did I Hear Somebody Kne"



## Even More Letters

Editor:

"A few of Mr. Greene's recent criticisms of the intolerance of liberals, almost approach the truth. But I refer here to certain statements he made that are not so close to the truth. He says that Faubus "was forced to defend his and his state's actions and beliefs" when the Supreme Court denied the people of Little Rock time for acceptance of this sudden change," and that, consequently, "he (Faubus) sent in the National Guard, not to kill integration and defy a court order but rather to keep peace and order until integration would be accepted."

In the first place, the Supreme Court was not, in September 1957, figuring in the Little Rock matter. The first court actions, those instigated by the local White Citizens' Council, were decided in Chancery. And the next decisions came from a single Federal Judge.

Sandwiched in between the passages quoted above is the state-

ing incident, which occurred this week, and which brought me up face to face with reality. And can we not agree, Mr. Greene, that at the least it was regrettable? A European graduate student here on one of the most highly selective U. S. scholarships, went to a new Chapel Hill restaurant with the girl across the hall. They enjoyed the meal very much, and after it the European student went back to talk with and congratulate the owner, whose forbears came from her country. He was pleased, but asked her not to bring the girl with her in again since she was colored. That she was an attractive, well dressed, accomplished UNC graduate student was immaterial; she was a Negro and therefore her presence might enlanger his budding enterprise.

Do you feel, Mr. Greene, that since UNC students can tolerate the presence of Negroes in the room next to them in the dorm, or in the seat next to them in class or at the table next to them in Lenoir or Danziger's, that it is morally, socially or intellectually wrong to tolerate their presence at the next table in Antonio's or any other restaurant in Chapel Hill? And what do you suppose the European student thought as she steamed out of the restaurant swearing never to go there again? And what will she tell of the demagogic US when she returns to her home to talk with her friends and teach other university students there in a country where the Communist Party has fairly strong representation?

With the genuine wish that some meeting point between your views and mine may be found, I should like to hear your answers to these puzzling questions.

Margaretta Eldridge

ment that the integration program was "well under way, and no one had raised any objections." This is almost true, but it lends no support to his argument. Actually there were some objections (by the White Citizens' Councils within and without Little Rock, and by a few others), but these did not represent the Little Rock people. The very fact that there were few responsible objections tells us that Faubus was not "forced to defend his and his state's actions and beliefs." And whether Faubus meant only to "keep peace and order until integration would be accepted" will be seen in due time.

But let us look beyond September, 1957, in Arkansas for a moment. In 1955 when Faubus won re-election, one of his principal opponents was a certain Jim Johnson (now, with the direct or indirect help of Faubus, an Associate Justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court) who, with his single plank-platform "let's keep them out" amassed about 60,000 votes. It was the renewal of this defeated movement by some plantation farmers (not from Little Rock), a Baptist minister, a local politician, and the White Citizens' Councils, all working in conjunction, which was truly the force that prevailed upon Faubus to summon the Guard.

This group was forming around the Attorney General, a Mr. Bruce Bennett, who, in the summer of 1957, was making overtures to it that he would gladly accept its backing as a candidate for the next Governor's race. While this was developing, the Mayor and the Police Department of Little Rock and the School were continuing the plans, which had been in the making for two or three years, to integrate 9 students into a school which usually enrolls over 2,000. What were the people of Little Rock doing? They probably were not paying much mind to either side.

And what was Faubus doing? He was becoming worried about his political future. He was afraid, though needlessly I believe, for he probably would have been re-elected anyway, since the people of Arkansas were not then giving much notice to the fire-eaters' yells—he was uneasy that if he did not appease this segregationist faction it might, with its cotton money, put Mr. Bennett in the mansion and he would have to go back to Huntsville. (If you had ever seen Huntsville you would know why Faubus wanted to stay in the mansion.) Therefore, when he sided with the segregationists, he lowered the sails of Mr. Bennett's political chances and those of any other segregationist because he left them no rallying point. Besides, they no longer

needed one.

Was Faubus, then, forced to defend his people's rights? He was forced by one commanding desire—to remain governor. If he had been forced to defend States-Rights he had plenty of earlier chances to call the Guard—at Fayetteville, Van Buren, Hoxie, and at other Arkansas cities which have integrated since Faubus became governor and before Little Rock.

Faubus has always avowed, like a good politician, to do what the people want. Now the question in the Little Rock case is "what people?" Mr. Greene says the "state's actions and beliefs." Rather, was it not the city's "actions and beliefs" which were paramount? In Faubus' earlier political speeches he said that he would not force integration upon the local school boards, but would leave it up to them as to whether they wanted to integrate or to remain segregated. Thus, he was speaking of local rights, not "state's-rights." The question is whether Faubus left it up to the people of Little Rock, represented by the School Board, or whether his action was selfishly directed.

When I returned to Arkansas (about a week before "black Monday" the first Arkansas Gazette) I saw had an editorial and a special front-page feature describing the anticipated smoothness of the opening of the integrated classes the following week. There had been attempts to prolong the matter, as I said, but they failed when Judge Davies refused to controvert the School Board's plans.

It was evident to many even before this time that Faubus was siding with the segregationists in their attempts to stall the opening of school. He would not make a public statement that he would support the School Board's plan. Mr. Virgil Blossom, the Superintendent, said in his later testimony to the FBI that he and the School Board had tried on numerous occasions throughout the summer of 1957 to get Faubus to state publicly his support or his non-interference with the integration plan. Mr. Blossom related that on each occasion Faubus refused, and that at their last meeting two or three days before the Guard was posted he tried again, but Faubus again refused. The Governor then said that integration would probably succeed without any trouble, but that he still was not going to let them do it—integrate. He told Mr. Blossom that he was already committed to some people. Winthrop Rockefeller quoted Faubus as saying that he had to do "it" in order to be re-elected. As far as I know Faubus has never denied making this statement, one that has been attributed to him by people other than Rockefeller.

Is it any wonder then that one could simply not give any credence to Faubus' statements that there was imminent danger to the safety and welfare of the Little Rock school children, especially after one considers all that happened before and during the time in question. I did not believe it then as I sat listening and watching the Governor justify himself by saying that great caravans were converging on the city and that people (implying the Negroes) had been buying inordinate numbers of knives, guns, and stiletto-umbrellas. Nor have I believed it since. The FBI found that fewer weapons had been and were being bought than usual; and, as to those caravans, I do not think they have got to Little Rock yet. It was all too plainly a political fairy tale.

Now you might ask: Does he not now have the support of the majority of the people of Arkansas, and of Little Rock? Quite so; he does. But any reasonable person in Arkansas knows that he created that support. Witness the recent Van Buren fiasco; this is a school that integrated peacefully; but when invited to demonstrate, it willingly obliged. Even most of those whose dormant emotions he aroused are not really fooled by Faubus. If some are they probably wanted to be.

Yet the question arises whether those emotions, which needed to be demagogued forth in order to express themselves, were really very seriously held in the first place. The passivity of the people prior to Faubus' initial action attests that either this "social pattern," as Mr. Greene calls it, was dying out, or its holders were giving it up as a bad thing.

And there are other reasons why the Arkansians supported Faubus in such great numbers. One friend of mine said he voted for Faubus, not because of Faubus' supposed beliefs, but because he (the friend) did not like the Northern liberals and their, to him, insulting magazines and newspapers. Others found in Faubus a hero who was fighting the big Northern elephant. It did not matter about the cause he was espousing so long as he was fighting and making headline history. The cause, well, that would die down, but in the meantime Arkansas was niching its notch.

No, Mr. Greene, Faubus was not forced; he was not maintaining law and order. He was making himself the third-term governor and a little history to go with it. Many people in Arkansas expected Faubus to begin to look for a way out of his dilemma after the July primary this year; that, with his main objective obtained, he would not interfere with the opening of school this past September if he could give in while making it look like a victory for himself or the fault of someone else. But this did not happen. Why? Well, Faubus apparently is not one to count birds in bushes while he has one in his hand. Although he was in effect re-elected in July, there was still the usually perfunctory November general election. This was perhaps in his mind when he closed the schools this past September. Now he is already shrewded. Of course, it could be, too, that Faubus said that he did not go into anything without knowing what he was doing. For once I want to believe him."

O. B. FULMER

To Mr. Fred Hariburt:

This is in answer to your letter of October 28.

I express some deep concern on this matter for I, myself, am a member of the Episcopal Church that you were in doubt about.

I do not know you, but I wish I could, for glancing over your article, I noticed that there was a series of questions about our church.

As far as any weakness in our church, I would like to state that the fact that there are some weak spots and confusion in our church makes it all the stronger.

In criticizing our church you automatically criticize the members in it. Such is true in any group. But what about George Washington and the greater percentage of our Presidents who were Episcopalians?

I would like to add, Fred, that if you are even mildly interested in our church, we have a study group every Tuesday night at 7 o'clock in the Parish House. The group would welcome you and I, personally, would welcome you.

Hubert M. Riddick

Dear Editor:

I'm not mad at you or anyone. The day has been too beautiful to include soapboxes of reform. I've been walking about the campus, scuffing leaves, being late for class, talking with whomever has the time to talk back, and just generally enjoying this small world we have here at UNC.

As I crossed the campus here and there, an article in the DTH, printed a few days ago came to mind and made me want to laugh. It ended with something like, "You, snobs! Would it hurt you to crack your icy faces and smile!"

I'm quite satisfied with the status quo on this smiling issue. My under-graduate college demanded a big smile and a loud, "Hi!" from everyone. Our catalogue insisted on our friendly informal spirit. Nothing made me more homesick those first freshmen weeks as knowing I would have to place an insidious grinning mask on my face if I wanted to get to my classes without undue comment. After four years of this hi-and grin-and bare-the-lips habit, I had numerous repercussions in New York (not all good) before I learned to discard it.

Now someone wants the coeds here to put on a uniform facial expression along with their collegiate—dress uniforms.

Being a girl, I say I prefer the present state and have found the stare-em' back in the eyes the best technique—for casual attractive approaches there's a certain flicker about the eyelids that tells you very delicately if you've made contact. Perhaps it is less friendly than the wide grin, but who ever proclaimed sex friendly?

In this interesting war between male and female, I refuse to be a conscientious objector and smile, damit, smile (except, of course, on a day as beautiful as this).

NANCY COMBES

Editor:

I wish to offer some suggestions regarding the DTH policy on publishing "letters to the Editor," particularly as regards letters similar to the recent one from a Mr. "Phillip S. Malone, Sr."

Several things should first be noted:

First, this Mr. "Malone" is not a student at UNC. The Central Office of Records, in response to two separate inquiries, can find no record of him.

Second, a letter identical (minus DTH misspellings) to that appearing in DTH on October 24 appeared in the Durham Morning Herald on the previous day. It was postmarked in Greensboro.

Third, these letters were sent to newspapers just prior to "Communion Sunday," a Sunday on which members of other denominations are expressly welcome at Episcopal services.

Fourth, this type of letter has been frequently employed by a particular lunatic fringe in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in order to either spread their own rather peculiar beliefs or to gain some prominence for themselves. It can be recalled that such letter provoked a flurry of letters to the DTH last year.

These four things considered, I am inclined to doubt the "Real Presence" of this Mr. Malone. The letter seems rather to be part of a not-so-clever little propaganda campaign, a campaign which embarrasses many members of the Protestant Episcopal Church and which offends many members of other denominations.

The DTH policy has long appeared to be one of publishing all letters, written in good taste, which were signed by bona fide students. This is the implication of many past editorial statements. Frequently faculty and townspeople have contributed letters, but I can recall no occasions when they have been responsible for letters which did not to some slight degree pertain to previous DTH articles or to university affairs.

Such letters may be useless, but they fall far short of the Mr. "Malone" class. A policy of printing similar wierd letters from non-students opens the DTH to all varieties of cranks, crackpots and fanatics. I doubt seriously that this will contribute to the quality of the DTH, and feel assured that most of the students do not wish to subsidize the publication of such material.

These things considered, I suggest an editorial statement to the effect that only letters from students will be published, excepting letters from non-university persons only when they pertain directly to something associated with the life of the university. And please use discretion in making these exceptions.

NAME WITHHELD BY REQUEST

Editor:

Several members of the Editorial Staff seem to be totally unconcerned with whether or not their reviews and appraisals are fair or unfair, accurate or inaccurate, honest or dishonest. As controversialists they attempt only to foster a reaction, any reaction, in order to "stimulate thought." This is a questionable policy in itself, and in the hands of such immature writers it becomes reprehensible.

Our immediate reference is, of course, to Mr. Wolff's review of the Playmaker's production of "Oklahoma!" It goes without saying that the Playmakers is an outstanding amateur theatrical company, and to anyone not expecting a production equal to Broadway standards, their production was far more than adequate.

We feel that a critic has responsibility as well as authority, and Mr. Wolff failed to exercise any responsibility whatsoever when he tossed his words around as derisively as he did in his review. We question whether he is competent to review as many fields of artistic endeavor as he does, and we suggest that he at least be honest enough to acknowledge fairly the efforts of others.

MIKE ALEXANDER  
FRANK CARLISLE