

# The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-eighth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Richard Overstreet, Chairman.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff, and all reprints or quotations must specify thus.

FEBRUARY 26, 1961

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 108

## The Campus Chest Drive Begins: An Opportunity For Generosity

The Campus Chest drive, which gets underway tomorrow, is the only charity which encompasses the entire campus and is operated entirely by students. It employs not merely solicitation to raise its funds, but also clever entertainment functions designed to produce financial results.

This is the only time during the year that students will have a chance to contribute to a student cause that offers nothing in return except the satisfaction that comes from giving generously to a genuinely worthwhile cause.

Surely the areas in which student money will be used by the Campus Chest are of considerable importance; the Goettingen Scholarships alone offer individuals an

unexcelled opportunity not only to study and live abroad but also to carry to Europe some of the traditions and values of U.N.C. and its students.

We urge that every student give as he or she sees fit to this cause; as is often said, the amount of your contribution is of small importance when compared with the spirit in which you give it. If you feel that the causes which are being aided by the Campus Chest are of value, then contribute.

Every contribution is important, and every contributor is important. The Campus Chest depends on each student for his generosity and good will. This is a worthy cause, one which should be supported, this year, as never before.

## A Good Move By The IDC

Dorm residents are seldom given occasion to rejoice in actions taken by their representative governing body, the Interdormitory Council. The Council is viewed by most, often justifiably, as a policeman hidden in the shadows of the dorm, ready and more than willing to drag them into the IDC court for an infraction of dormitory regulations.

In the past, it is true, too much emphasis has been placed on the disciplinary functions of the body, and too little on really meeting the problems of dorm life, the most important of which is the marked deficiency of adequate social outlet. Dorm parties are a miserable substitute for really enjoyable and desirable social activity, chiefly due to limited space and funds, not to mention the cold hard stare of the administration.

Even the large dorms, such as Cobb, do not provide an adequate area for a dance or party, and lack of interest is the obvious result. Administrative controls on noise, drinking, and curfews, coupled with other taboos, make any on-campus affair a failure before it starts.

For these reasons, the recent decision of the IDC to hold an off-

campus "After Duke Game" party, with a combo, is a decided step in the right direction. Some of the animosity which some dorm dwellers too often hold for the fraternity man is due to feeling that fraternity men enjoy, by virtue of off-campus living, privileges not afforded to dorm students in regard to conduct at social gatherings.

Giving these students an opportunity to get off campus for a party removes this point of friction, and indicates that the IDC is beginning to realize one of its sought-after objectives. That body has a long way to go to tear down an image that it has unfortunately built up. The IDC at present lacks the respect and support of the individuals it seeks to represent. No person can be expected to support and act in allegiance to a governing body that it feels is inadequate, and the IDC has often been just that. It has sought to control rather than administer, to punish when its aim is to correct.

More consideration of the kind which prompted the Duke game affair will be an important step in providing a more nearly ideal governing body.

## Pick A Pair O' Six-Packs

Gadgeteers, engineers, inventors, Madison Avenue and a colossal national thirst have combined to make the U.S. a nation with the most ingenious devices for catching the eye of the dry-throated American.

Every joint that stocks a variety of premium beers is a-dazzle with blinking, flickering, flashing signs that feature waterfalls that appear to actually fall, skyrocketers that really rocket, cool streams that really stream, and myriad other gadgets that amuse, edify and amaze—not to mention making you thirsty.

The time-conscious drinker is catered to in almost every pub by a king-sized pocket watch hanging ominously over his dome as he sips his brew, reminding him of an Alice-In-Wonderland nightmare. The March Hare can be discerned also, after the tenth or so round.

Some of the blinking baubles urge you to drink because you're thirsty, or want to know the real joy of good living, or have a desire to get into the golden mood—something to appeal to almost every human urge.

All of which goes to prove that the Russians might get to the moon first, but we'll be the first Nation from Earth to get the bug-eyed monsters to go schlitzing with us.

Wayne King

## "This Little Kid's Got A Big Guy With Him"



HERBLOCK ©1961 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

## Campus Voice: Readers Express Opinions

### Letters To The Editor

#### CONGREGATION OR ASSOCIATION

To the Editor:

With reference to a recently published letter urging continued support of non-integrated theatres and signed by Messrs. Wilson and Gardner I offer the following:

I quote from their letter: "The right of freedom of association is basic to all freedoms." I certainly do not contest the truth of this statement. I find it entirely reasonable, and I do believe it to be one of the essential principles of democracy. However, to derive full benefit from the truth therein contained it is necessary that the statement be properly interpreted and that its terms be correctly defined. To that end I now direct myself.

First, let us consider the term "association." I do not see how this term can be applied to a theatre audience as we generally think of one. A theatre audience would better be described as a congregation, which is any group of people in close proximity to each other. Association is much more intimate than congregation. It requires a personal sharing in a plan or endeavor. To congregate, it is not necessary that people associate. When you attend a movie with someone by agreement, and the two of you enjoy the film together, or do not enjoy it, according to its quality and your taste, you have then associated with that person, but you have only congregated with the other movie-goers. If someone then asks you "With whom did you see the movie?", I shouldn't think you would try to learn the identities of all the people who were in the theatre with you, but simply repeat the name of your associate. If you go to the theatre without a companion, and you are later asked, "With whom did you see the movie?", I don't believe you would answer, "With a theatre full of people," but, "I saw it alone."

When you wait for a bus at a crowded bus stop, you are congregating with others. I don't believe that one is expected to shake hands with, or embrace, or exchange name and phone number with, or in any way associate with the other persons who are waiting for the bus. Of course you may, with the agreement of the person or persons with whom you wish to gain association, follow this pattern of behavior if you choose. This would be freedom of association, to which you have every right.

Now, what I hope I have demonstrated thus far is that one may go to a theatre, and therein congregate with people of any va-

riety of racial backgrounds, including Negroid, and never associate with them the very least little bit. With this much clarification, Messrs. Wilson and Gardner, I believe I can now convince you gentlemen that to remain in the graces of honesty, you must either resign your positions as segregationists, or give up the assertion that you are advocates of freedom of association. Follow me.

You state that you want freedom of association and you want segregated theatres. You cannot have both, not because I say so, but because it simply isn't possible. If you go to a theatre which admits only Caucasians, you have not free, but forced association, in that you are forced to associate, if you choose to associate at all, only with Caucasians. It does not matter whether you wish to associate with any other races or not; what does matter is that you are not free to do so. You have no choice in the matter. And what is much worse, in relinquishing your own right to choose, you deprive others of that right. This is indeed a serious injustice to democracy.

When you support segregated theatres you are not, as you say, exercising your right to freedom of association, but rather, I think, indulging yourselves to the point of selfishness and arrogance. When you cultivate this indulgence to the expense of freedom, you pay a dear price for a cheap commodity. Benjamin Franklin's story entitled "The Whistle" illustrates this thought much better than I can. If you can find the time, I believe you will enjoy reading it.

It should now be clear that integration does not require the association of persons of different racial ancestry, but only the congregation of them. It should be clear that freedom of association requires that persons of different racial ancestry be permitted, not forced, to associate with each other and that the only way this requirement can be met in a theatre is to integrate the theatre.

Carlyle Mason, II

#### ★ ★ ★ TOO MANY APES?

To the Editor: Judging from Mr. Goldsmith's column in a recent DTH, it is clear that there are enough lower primates running around loose already without releasing any more from the zoos.

Daniel H. Garrison

#### ★ ★ ★ AN INTELLECTUAL ELITE

To the Editor: You know, it has occurred to me that we here in Chapel Hill are going about this question of

segregation in the wrong way. The main point of those who are suddenly altruistic about the "right of the theatre manager to determine his own policies" is the premise that it is more unpleasant to sit next to a colored man than a white man in a place of public entertainment. Granted, the argument is cloaked in a self-righteous aura of "states rights," "manager's rights," "rights of association," and "majority rights," etc. ad nauseam, but there it is, with about the same amount of logic that it used in all demands for "white rights."

As it is anthropologically, biologically, and democratically illogical to segregate theaters on the basis of skin color, why not go about segregation in a scientific manner? For example, why not segregate on the basis of intelligence? Every person entering the university could be carefully tested and analyzed, and the results reduced to a number—an improved I.Q. rating—which could be printed on a card to be carried at all times. Admission to theatres, rest rooms and so forth could then be denied to those with a rating of less than, say, 100 irregardless of "race."

Much has been written about the childish conduct of Chapel Hill theater audiences—white students, it must be assumed. Such behavior must only result from a lack of intelligence in some manner or other; if these people were eliminated, would it not be more enjoyable to watch a film surrounded by the intellectual elite of both races? Most students would rather mix with reasonably intelligent people of two races than with the clods of one—a system which would be guaranteed by careful rating of individuals according to mental capacity.

One thing more . . . these rating cards would, of course, remain in effect throughout the holder's life. Perhaps the numbers could be tattooed on the arm. Certainly this would not be more unfair than the present segregation system.

Raymond L. Puffer

#### ★ ★ ★ THE PEACE CORPS

To the Editor: The recently successful efforts of University students in the Carboro-Chapel Hill communities on behalf of the Democratic Party indicates a potential that could be used in other areas. International peace offers a field in which youthful energy, idealism, and intelligence could be applied. The Kennedy Youth for Peace Corps would do just this. The Wall Street Journal has

#### ON EMPTY TRAYS

To the Editor:

Yesterday as I was eating at Lenoir Hall I noticed a youth, a few feet away, with his hat on. I had the urge to go over and take his hat off and tell him hats were not worn in Lenoir Hall. Something told me this was not a Carolina student, he just didn't have any of the earmarks of a Carolina student. A Carolina student wouldn't have had his hat on in the first place, and if he had, he would have thanked me for taking it off. I watched this young man as he made his exit down the aisle. His exaggerated ego was evident in his every movement.

Pretty soon, this same day, another male, not quite so youthful looking, brought his tray over, deposited it at my table, pulled off his khaki coat and scarf, deposited them on a chair at my table, without so much as a glance in my direction.

For once, I didn't say anything to him. He ate more rapidly than his friend and left the dining hall, with his swagger stride. I finished my newspaper and as I prepared to leave, I went over to the table and asked his friend who his companion was. "He ought to know," I said, "that we don't put anything on another person's table without asking permission." His friend seemed embarrassed. I said, "Is he a student?" The boy evaded the question. He said, "I am a stu-

#### More Letters

### More Opinions

dent, m'am." I said your friend doesn't look like a Carolina student and he doesn't act like a Carolina student. He said nothing.

There seems to be some kind of mob psychology going on at Lenoir of very recent vintage. A few days ago, I was eating my lunch in quiet and peace, when two girls unloaded their tray at the adjoining table. One girl put her tray on my table. I said, "Don't put your tray on my table, put it on the rack where it belongs." She removed the tray. Soon another girl came along. She joined the other girls and promptly put her tray on my table. I took my hand and brushed it on the floor. She picked it up and took it away. Very soon a young man came along and joined the girls. He put his tray on my table. I had about finished eating by then. I got up, handed him the tray and told him to put his tray somewhere else, not on my table.

He smiled and took the tray, but one of the girls said, "This is a free dining room; you don't own the tables." I said, "No, I don't own the tables any more than you do, but I didn't put my tray on your table." She said, "But our table is full." It never occurred to her that she could have found an empty table, or have put it on the rack.

I said earlier you could always tell a Carolina student by the way he acted. I am not sure that you can tell a Carolina Co-ed.

Otelia Connor

#### ★ ★ ★ ON STOCK ISSUES

To the Editor:

I always read the DTH editorial page with interest and it has been particularly gratifying to me to see all the comment on integration/segregation that has filled its columns of late.

However, I should think that there are enough students on this campus that it wouldn't be necessary to "smoke them out" to get comments, as the segregation issue has done. Intelligent students should have comments on other matters of urgency and pressing need.

The stock issues of integration, world problems, honor system, apathy, etc.—these have gotten their share of comment both from DTH editors and from columnists and letter writers.

The world is broader than these things. Let's look elsewhere.

Albert Campbell

#### ★ ★ ★ BILL HOBBS REBUKED

To the Editor:

We note, with fervent alarm, the latest exhortation (DTH, February 16, 1961) of UNC's beloved prophet of doom and despair, William (the student body is rotting from within) Hobbs. In his latest piece, Mr. Hobbs upbraids the student body for sitting on its apathy, oblivious of the present rendezvous with destiny it has. He urges us to act, act, act! Therefore, we shall act.

We are in favor of, and are concerned with, the human rights of men. Indeed, they are in danger and are being abused in our times, as they have been for centuries. Nevertheless, our society is based on a code of civil laws, which are charged with the maintenance of order. These civil laws, protecting the private rights of individuals within a community, are often in conflict with human rights, per se.

Within our orderly society, a theater-owner can restrict his clientele in what he considers his best interest, thus exercising his civil right even though he is abusing a human right. We uphold the human right of any individual to move freely within the law, but we cannot help sympathizing with another individual whose actions are protected by the civil laws of the land.

Personally, I abhor this blatant denial of basic human rights, and the host of other intolerant sores upon the national body. Yet surely, an "intelligent decision," supporting "mature action" would not dismiss as irrelevant the rights of a man to govern his business and administer his property as he sees fit.

We sincerely hope that Mr. Hobbs has considered this and does not "pity us for our supine stupidity" in doing so ourselves. Is it possible that other students hold beliefs similar to ours? Is it possible that these are constituents of what Mr. Hobbs labels the "thick, stifling fog of apathy?"

A. Fairchild

Bob Fuirelle

### The Daily Tar Heel

JONATHAN YARDLEY Editor  
WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER Associate Editors  
MARGARET ANN RHYMES Managing Editor  
EDWARD NEAL RYMER Assistant To The Editor  
HENRY MAYER, JIM CLOUTIER News Editors  
LEO LITTLE Executive News Editor  
SUSAN LEWIS Feature Editor  
FRANK SLOSSER Sports Editor  
HENRY W. LLOYD Asst. Sports Editor  
JOHN JUSTICE, DAVIS YOUNG Contributing Editors  
TIM BURNETT Business Manager  
RICHARD WEINER Advertising Manager  
JOHN JESTER Circulation Manager  
CHARLES WHEEDER Subscription Manager  
The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. pursuant with the act of March 8, 1950. Subscription rates: \$4 per semester, \$7 per year.  
The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.  
Published by the Colonial Press, Chapel Hill, N. C.