

Hickey's Hanging

Reader's Repository

The hanging of Jim Hickey in effigy by a group of Carolina students after the Miami loss is not only in the upmost of poor taste, but also a most uncalled for act.

As on most campuses, Carolina has its share of Monday Morning quarterbacks. A number of them are now screaming for Hickey's scalp. It seems that too many of them believed the absurd pre-season rating of this Carolina squad.

Only twice has this team been beaten badly. The first was by Notre Dame in the second game of the season by a 28-8 count. The other time was two weeks ago by a great Tennessee team by 20-7. The first of these can be checked off as a bad day for the entire team. In the second encounter, Carolina played well, but fumbled at crucial moments.

Certainly the Carolina-Clemson game will live on in our minds as a great demonstration of football by two good teams. The difference was an extra point. Clemson ranks number 11 in the nation at this time.

Carolina mauled a good South Carolina team. They topped a very fine Wake Forest team in a close one.

Indeed this season is a disappointment. Certainly we have looked very poor at times. On other occasions, we have been good. We are firmly convinced that whoever was coaching this Carolina team, the record would be the same.

Hickey is too nice a guy to admit that he has taken a "bum rap." But, the simple fact is that he has. He has been the unfortunate victim of having to accept responsibility for a bad season. If it had been a great season, Tatum would have gotten the credit. Thus, Hickey is taking a "bum rap."

Hickey is a good coach. Ask his players if you don't believe us. As for students who would like to grumble about him and about the team, they are welcome to write letters-to-the-editor, that is if they have enough guts to come out in public.

Hanging a person in effigy is a cowardly act.

Dear Editor:

I had wrongly hoped that the Daily Tar Heel was above making a martyr out of The Great Pretender, Charles Van Doren - was perhaps caught up in the schemes, struggles, and unrealities of "show business," but he is still a man who has strongly violated the principles of honor and truth; if not in a legal, certainly in a moral sense. He was almost overcome by emotion when brought to investigation, but we seem to have forgotten that his expressions of despair, anguish, and concentration, carefully rehearsed before appearance on nation-wide TV, were no less convincing. His confessions proved that he has a definite concept of integrity, but are we to believe that he would have given way to truth had his situation not been exposed? Let's face things; for The Pretender, honesty is the best policy only for the ends of a policy, when there is no other way out.

No doubt Van Doren possesses a brilliant mind, and would be a valuable addition to the English department. Carolina would also obtain much attention by offering a position to such a nationally infamous figure. But what kind of reputation do we want? Certainly not that of a school which snatches up and excellent teacher who has also been living on over 100,000 dollars and a great lie for the past three years; who can no longer remain at his former college. As for his reception here, any controversial proposal which Van Doren presented to others would always be doubted, for this man has a reputation for once having rationalized his way from truth. Academic and social integrity cannot be divorced.

One of the highest principles of this University is the faith placed in the Honor System. And if students are "on their honor not to cheat, steal, or lie, and to report any violations of this code", how could we consider hiring a man whose name has become synonymous with the word "dishonor" during the past few weeks? We would thus be condoning the action of a man who has sacrificed principle for worldly gain, and who told the truth only when forced so to do. Or are we to sacrifice the Honor System, maintaining that it applies only to students at the University of North Carolina. The final and greatest irony could result when Van Doren reported a student for plagiarism.

I wish to congratulate the Daily Tar Heel on their policy in which their eagerness to abandon principle for the glorification of the intellectual is superseded only by that of Van Doren himself, and whose broadmindedness has been so successfully aroused by the Great Pretender's appeal to sentimentality. I would also like to suggest that an invitation be extended to Caryl Chessman to become an instructor in criminal law, in which to use your own words - "He could impart great knowledge to the young student."

Bill Bell

Dear Sir,

I would like for you to print the following in the Tar Heel:

I am becoming a little sicker each day of this widespread publicity of the case of Charles Van Doren. The reason I am sick is because the American public is acting like a little child pitifully crying because they found that their favorite T.V. shows were rigged. Well, it is a bit pitiful because the public was so gullible in the first place. However, this is not the point I would like to make.

The point I would like to make is that show business is show business. Rigging a quiz show is no more morally wrong than Bing Crosby's wearing a toupee. The same principle applies. I do not believe that the producers and participants in these shows thought that they were committing a sin such as the disgruntled public is screaming about today. In my opinion the only real wrong that they have committed is perhaps I suppose this was the result of the shock of finding that they were being investigated by a congressional committee.

I don't know whether you duped T.V. fans will believe this or not. I know from the beginning that these shows were rigged!

Joe McDonald



Herblock is away due to illness

Copyright, 1959, The Pulitzer Publishing Co., St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Legislative Roundup

Dave Jones

The proposed constitutional amendment which was discussed here last week has been dragged out onto its first battle field and shot at and defended.

The battle was lost to the opponents of the measure, but somewhere deep within the minds of the members of the Student Legislature there lies a master strategy. Already plans are whirling round inside the heads of our legislators for the next skirmish.

During the course of the week following the passage of the motion, David Grigg, the Second Highest Executive Officer in the student body, appealed to the Student Council to have the action set aside. His request was basically the same argument that the members of the legislature a few days before had refused.

However, the Chairman of the Student Council saw Mr. Grigg's appeal in a kinder light and told him that all would be taken care of.

A hearing on the question of the legality of the manner in which the legislature had gone about ordering the elections board to call a referendum was scheduled for Thursday night, November 5. The author of the appeal was told he didn't need to appear. The defendant was never notified of the hearing.

However, when you have a defendant that is a body of fifty active people you can't keep such things secret, and the Legislature recessed and later adjourned so that its leaders could go to the Student Council meeting and defend their position.

They might as well have saved their breath.

This column charges that the Student Council had already made up its mind what it was going to do and was not interested in anyone's arguments, much less those arguments put forth by Gary Greer which laid bare all of the vice president's original points.

The council members ignored the by-laws of their body and ignored the Student Constitution and ran roughshod over the legislative branch of Student

Government as though they were superior to it.

This action, and the very obvious biased and belligerent attitude held by the Chairman and members of the Student Council, points up some very definite needs for change in the current, clumsy over weighted judicial system.

But the first change must be made, not in the area of reorganization or redefining of jurisdiction, but in attitude. Somehow it is difficult to imagine what went on in the Council meeting on Thursday, November 5, 1959 as taking place under the heritage of English Common Law, the U. S. Constitution, and evolutionary UNC Student Government.

Now there are two courses of action left to the legislature in its fight to get an issue before the voters:

First, under the heading of "Surrender", it could gracefully accept the decision of Mr. Fuller and his court and go about handling the measure in the manner which complies with his wishes. This would be a complete surrender. Under the same heading, the legislature could change the words in its by-laws to make its action O.K. in the eyes of the Council.

Second, under the heading of "Action", the legislature could trim a few sails along judicial row, starting at the top.

This possibility, and the need to have introduced to the voters other constitutional amendments, (particularly the ones concerning the preservation of the jury system and a campus wide Venire) has changed the cast of the problem and changed the name of the issue being fought over.

It has likewise changed the battleground back to the floor of the legislature.

I wonder if the very same cast will not be present at the next round with the shoes on different feet. Mr. Grigg playing referee, Messers Nobles, Greer and Miller on the offensive and Mr. Fuller and his friends playing defensive roles.

DAVID A. JONES
(This is my work, done in compliance with the UNC Honor Code.)

Side Swipes

Rusty Hammond

Crownover was deposed and Norton was kicked out by the SP. Pretty soon if two guys show up, the SP will have a quorum.

It's time again to praise to the skies Chuck Erickson and Eddie Cameron, Carolina and Duke Athletic Directors and other responsible parties. These are the guys that sold their student bodies down the river so the Duke-Carolina game could be on TV, and on Thanksgiving. So now most of the students cannot attend the game. Much of the great rivalry has been killed. Sure, money talks to some people; but to these guys, it screams.

Greensboro Daily News says the newest quiz show should be tagged: "From Rigs to Riches."

Free Flick this week: "Inside Europe", with Luther Hodges and his Tar Heel troopers.

The 129th Annual Baptist Convention in Greensboro has adopted as its theme song: "I Could Have Danced All Night."

"Football Team Loses Again, Has 3-5 Record." Perhaps its time to print some "Beat Anyone" buttons.

How long will it be until a third political party is formed on campus?

The Kingston Trio has a record out called "Sam Miguel". The other night a plastered student joined in, singing "Sam Magill" at the top of his lungs.

Former DTH News Editor Ann Frye was "arrested" as a prank for petty larceny. If they're gonna wait till we graduate to arrest us for things, yours truly better stay in school forever.

Much has been written about little-known men behind the scenes who supposedly control this country. Such men are James Hoffa, Paul Douglas, George Meany, David McDonald and James Haggerty. We have our own candidate. Who controls too much more than his share of the American scene? Ridiculously enough - George Gallup.

This era in our history will be known as the Age of the Wanderer. Heads of State and lesser lights are travelling all over the world as never before. Nobody's home. Everyone is visiting. And what if this fantastic international game of musical chairs were to suddenly stop and the leaders settle where they were? We should have Khrushchev ruling China, Ike on top in India, the president of Guinea in charge in the U. S., Nixon the leader in Poland, Luther Hodges ruling Germany, and a bunch of Iowa farmers ruling Russia. And, it might not be a bad idea.

GEMS OF THOUGHT

When the destination is desirable, expectation speeds our progress.

—Mary Baker Eddy

Uncertainty and expectation are the joys of life.

—William Congreve

With what a heavy and retarding weight does expectation load the wing of time.

—William Mason

Nothing is so good as it seems beforehand.

—George Eliot

What we anticipate seldom occurs; what we least expected generally happens.

Benjamin Disraeli

More On 13 Steps

Dear Editor:

I should like to point out to Theodore Crane, Junior, a few absurdities, fallacies, and general nonsensical conclusions in his "good" article of October 14, entitled "Thirteen Steps to Christianity. Let me preface my remarks with the statement that I have only recently decided that this garbled article was an effort to construct an attack upon Christianity. (I will not assume what he means by Christianity). I think I show some presumption in coming to this conclusion, for a logical, well constructed attack upon anything at all is missing in the article.

In the first place, Mr. Crane never bothered to define Christianity. To him it could mean worship of Krystis of Glocken or it could mean an orgy of bacchantes. To what or to where, exactly, does Mr. Crane propose to lead his readers? That one should define the subject of his attack seems too obvious to have to point it out to Mr. Crane. There are too many concepts of Christianity for a writer to assume that his readers know what is in his mind.

Secondly, precisely who are the "thousands of researchers" mentioned? At least one or two outstanding ones should have been named. And what have they written? The reader is simply told that "millions of words have been written, etc." by "thousands of researchers." If Mr. Crane is going to appeal to these people as authorities, he should be scholarly enough to indicate responsible objective individuals in the group whose reputations are sufficient to warrant this appeal to their authority. The present writer does not doubt their existence, but is simply pointing out one of Mr. Crane's absurdities. At least one reference could have been given if Mr. Crane is basing his article on their findings.

But the crowning outrage committed by Mr. Crane is his application of the conclusion of these identity-less researcher. "The researchers conclude," writes Mr. Crane, "that excessive worshipping indicates more than a 'weak will.' It indicates a sick personality, usually made ill by stresses that began long before the first communion was taken." In short, they conclude only that excessive worshipping denotes a "sick personality, usually made ill by stresses that began long before the first communion was taken." Mr. Crane, on the other hand, implies that Christianity, in its conventional connotation, produces sick personalities. The thirteen steps formulated by Mr. Crane would produce sick personalities, no doubt, and if Mr. Crane wishes to call this Christianity, why, then, one must admit that he is entitled to do so. In fact, he may call it Judaism, Mohammedism, Zen Buddhism, Zoroastrianism or even baseball. Of course, Mr. Crane would be a contemptuous ass if he labelled it with any of these appellations. Sick personalities may produce excessive worshipping, but one should take the fact for what it is worth only. To essay anything else is to insult the intelligence of one's readers. Excessive worship in an Australian Bushman may indicate a sick personality - certainly nothing remotely resembling Christianity in the conventional sense of the word. Heavens! The idea is too preposterous to maintain!

Now, After having said all this, let the present writer hasten to assure the reader that if Mr. Crane's attack was upon Christendom, the whole body of persons professing to believe in and to follow the teachings of Jesus Christ, an attack is not out of order. But let it be an orderly attack, logical, rational, and at least not insulting to the mentality of the reader! A splendid example of such an attack is Sroen Kierkegaard's "Attack Upon Christendom" which this writer urges - all the readers of Mr. Crane's "Thirteen Steps" to read. They will find him most exciting. Mr. Crane might read it also.

George Stevenson

Essay Contest

Subject: "What is wrong with America and what can we do to correct it?"

Requirements: All essays must be typewritten, double-spaced and signed by the author. Name, address and phone number must be included. Length: 500-1500 words.

Prizes: There will be eight (8) prizes:

1st Prize—one \$25 RANCH HOUSE Steak Certificate

2nd Prize—one \$15 RANCH HOUSE Steak Certificate

3rd Prize—one \$10 RANCH HOUSE Steak Certificate

4th through 8th Prize — one RANCH HOUSE Buffet Certificate

(These prizes have been donated by Cactus Ted's RANCH HOUSE of Chapel Hill, one of the South's most distinctive restaurants. The certificates may be redeemed as meals at the RANCH HOUSE on or before March 15, 1960.

Eligibility: All students, faculty members and employees of the Consolidated University of North Carolina and/or any member of the Chapel Hill community, excepting staff members of The Daily Tar Heel and Ranch House employees.

Judges: Dr. Alexander Heard, Dean of the Graduate School, UNC; Davis B. Young, Editor, The Daily Tar Heel; Frank H. Crowther, Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel. The decisions of these judges are final.

Deadline: All manuscripts must be received or postmarked not later than midnight, December 1, 1959. The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to print any or all essays. Winners will be announced on or before December 19, 1959.

Send all essays to: Daily Tar Heel Essay Contest, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

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 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester, \$7.00 per year.

The Daily Tar Heel is printed by the News Inc., Carrboro, N. C.

Editor: DAVIS B. YOUNG
Associate Editor: FRANK CROWTHER
Assistant Editor: RON SHUMATE



POGO

PEANUTS

BY KELLY

BY SCHULZ