

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 this.

FEBRUARY 28, 1961

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 109

Climax Of Budget Deliberations: Hopes For A Better Tomorrow

The Joint Appropriations Committee of the General Assembly meets tomorrow afternoon to review the June 1961-June 1963 budget of the Consolidated University of North Carolina.

The work and worry of two years will be evaluated in one afternoon's consideration. All of the words and figures and reports and tables and speeches will be forgotten in another few hours; the climax of the agony of deliberation will, at least in part, be reached in Raleigh tomorrow.

There is still time, however, to remind ourselves and the members of the committee of some of the goals the University hopes to achieve, and to urge strongly their advancement.

The University exists to encompass within its confines the process of higher education. To that end, men have come to teach and boys and girls have come to learn. None of these can be forgotten as the University does its work.

The teachers must be well paid, or the University will suffer by their departure. Certainly they have not been, these past few years, martyrs at the feet of higher education, nor do we wish to make such martyrs of them. We do wish, however, to see that they are properly rewarded for their efforts. With such thoughts in mind, we strongly urge the ap-

proval of the extensive program for higher faculty salaries being offered by the University.

The students must grow, not only intellectually but as men and women ready to take their places in a challenging world. They must be given the opportunity and the facilities to learn some of the vital lessons that cannot be taught in the classroom. Among these are government—student government fills that need—and responsibility—almost every extracurricular fills that need—and they must have the opportunity to learn to conduct themselves in the society of other men and women—the entire compass of a good student union embraces this need.

Because they recognize these needs, the administrators of the Consolidated University have asked for a new student union for this University; because they also recognize the lack of adequate undergraduate library facilities on this campus, they have included such facilities in the union. Again, we strongly urge the adoption of this proposal.

Much of the fate of this University will be decided in a crowded committee room in Raleigh tomorrow afternoon. Because this University is so important to the state and to its students, we urge complete adoption of the Consolidated University budget.

Advertising And Editorials

The following letter, which we received yesterday, is similar in content to others that have come to us recently:

The Daily Tar Heel is hereby condemned for inconsistent behavior: the paper helps to publicize movie "attractions"—to use the term loosely—and yet advises student support of the pickets: i.e., "Don't go to the movies downtown, but just look at what is playing!"

Admittedly, the money from movie advertisements does your allotted budget necessitate these ads? Couldn't your advertising manager seek out the support of unprejudiced businessmen? Would the editor explain or hereafter ban movie ads from The Daily Tar Heel until the theatres integrate?

Kosmo D. Tatalias
Mr. Tatalias, and others who ask the same questions, are making an assumption that is incorrect: the

editorial department of a newspaper does not and cannot reserve for itself the right to interfere with the business department of the newspaper.

The reasons for this are quite simple. In the first place, editorial comment is the subjective observation of one or more people and is restricted by journalistic practice to the editorial page. In a good newspaper it does not interfere with the news department or the advertising department. To do so would be to endanger their independence as separately functioning parts of a business.

In the second place, this would open the avenue for business interference with editorial opinion, a consequence equally dangerous as the first. If The Daily Tar Heel editorial office were to order the advertising department not to print advertising from organizations it is editorializing against, by the same token the advertising department would be perfectly justified in ordering the editorial department not to comment unfavorably about prominent advertisers—for fear of losing income.

Apart from these considerations, such action would be as discriminatory as the theatre policy to which we object. We do not have the right to deny any business the right to advertise in this newspaper—which is as much a public convenience as the theatres themselves—unless the advertising is beyond the limits of good taste or is considered fraudulent.

To answer the other two questions: yes, the theatre advertising is a vital part of The Daily Tar Heel's advertising budget. No, the advertising manager cannot waste his time finding out whether or not businessmen are prejudiced. It would be equally valid to require that advertisers' morals meet an arbitrary standard.



Rip Slusser

Mr. Kennedy, Now Is The Time For Action

President John F. Kennedy said many times during his recent campaign that now is the time for action. In our diplomatic relationships with foreign nations, the policy adopted has usually been so slow that an appropriate title—for it would be "now or never".

Kennedy comes into power at one of the most crucial periods, not only of the United States, but of man. The atom bomb has made this time—this time of cold war, fear, negotiation, bickering, nothing. Capability of producing this daughter of destruction is beginning to multiply like a cancer cell that reproduces itself and if allowed to spread unchecked, can painfully destroy with death.

First the United States, then Russia, Britain, France gained this offspring of Einstein. Who will be next? Cuba? Israel? Red China? Maybe Red China will gain it soon with the help of its cousins, USSR. There is, according to all political scientists, a great possibility the Chinese will have this bomb within five years. Then, God only knows what will happen.

John F. Kennedy would help the so-called proponents of world peace and democracy (whatever that means) discover the answer if he acted through proper channels to seek the acceptance of Red China in the United Nations. We know nothing about this world power now, with her being outside the organization.

Actually, with Red China outside the U.N., it is doing the United States more harm than if it were inside, even with the power of veto. This is because Russia is using the present issue with great success as a propaganda weapon. And, also, what always comes up when Russia and the United States discuss the disarmament problem? The admittance of Red China to the U.N.

Our nation, diplomatically, at least, has clung to the Nation-

alist Chinese leader Chiang Kai-shek since the early 1930's and seen this popular man driven completely out of his country by its people. Adamantly we follow the same lines. But, what is going to happen when Chiang dies? Officials in Washington, looking through a maze of red tape, insist the United States would lose prestige if we accepted to allow the Reds into the U.N. At the

time we are going now, just how much of this wonderful thing called prestige do we have left, anyway? Let's stop kidding ourselves with this surreptitious democracy act. The world is changing. We cannot lag behind and live.

Yes, Mr. Kennedy, now is the time for action. Let's stop living in a dream world. Let's be realistic. Let's act. Let's see Red.

Jim Clotfelter

'The Southerner Must Listen To Criticism'

Cries of "Stay out of our business, Yankee" usually follow any editorial opinion which appears to disparage Southern institutions and traditions.

The Southerner appears to be extremely sensitive to outside criticism, particularly that which comes from Northern students attending Carolina. The Southerner can't bear to be told that he is wrong or that he may be wrong. This is understandable but not entirely excusable.

Because he can no longer refuse to listen to the Northerner, no matter how painful it may be. The South has reached the point where its people must listen.

Before the grits and sunshine boys begin throwing epithets... let me make this clear.

This is not an angry letter from an angry Yankee. Instead this is an appeal from a Southerner, "born and bred," who refuses to accept all Southern institutions merely because they are old and venerated and Southern.

This is an appeal to the Southerner, from a Southerner, to swallow his pride and take another look at his Southern customs and ideals.

He cannot continue to cry "scalawag" at those Southerners and "carpetbagger" at those Northerners who speak out against what he holds dear.

He must open his eyes and look around him. He must forget Nathan Bedford Forest and Jefferson Davis.

But what about the Northerner? By the rules of courtesy, the person who is attending Carolina is first seeing the South, should keep his peace and let others speak out on Southern customs.

He certainly has the right to voice his opinions, but should not do so until he has come better to know the Southern institutions which he is attacking.

The fact that some Northerners break these rules of courtesy is no excuse for the Southerner to completely disregard their words.

He should read the columns written by these angry Yankees and try to pick from the stories any truths such as they are, which may be present.

The Southerner cannot excuse his own sloth and forced blindness by pointing to some Northerners' lack of good taste. If the occasion arises, the Southerner

Segregationalists Present Outspoken Arguments

Mr. Ronald Byrnes, in a letter to the editor of the Daily Tar Heel, February 21, in a do-or-die attempt to refute valid arguments for segregation, was forced to retreat to attribute to us implications that were never made, and by grossly distorting the meanings of the statements we did make.

We cannot and will not allow these distortions to pass unnoticed when they are obviously intended to discredit us, the other fine segregationists on this campus, and those non-University persons who likewise prefer segregation.

We, Mr. Byrnes, did not state or even allude that we are qualified to decide for anybody how he should run his own business. In your zeal and haste to heap criticism upon us, you either ignored our text or distorted it beyond recognition to suit your own taste. Allow us, then, to quote certain passages whose meaning obviously escaped your searching scrutiny. First, "We believe that any property owner has the right to decide who shall be admitted on that property, and for what reason." Notice, Mr. Byrnes, we said that the property owner has the right to govern his property and its trespass policies; the only reference to ourselves here was that we support such rights, and will continue to do so.

"The right to freedom of association is basic to all freedoms. We personally feel that it is our right to choose our own associates." Mr. Byrnes, do you deny us the right to associate with anybody if we so choose? For instance, how would you feel if we and all our conservative allies decided to swoop into your home or your place of business? Would you have any right to refuse us entrance? Of course you would, just as we could rightly refuse entrance to you or anybody else for any reason. We would not take up signs calling you bigoted and unfair should you decide not to admit us.

Mr. Byrnes, you seem to have gotten at least one thing straight (which is both surprising and commendable), that being that we prefer segregation to your pseudo-utopia of integration. However, in a desperate emotional attempt to win the reading public to your cause, you resorted to the accusation that it is hatred for the Negro that makes us advocate segregation. This is the common charge of the "anti-bigot" bigots like yourself. Being so occupied in your "anti-bigot" crusade, you yourself are uncompromisingly bigoted toward those who wish to live by patterns that are legal, practical, sensible, and morally correct. Nothing teaches that we must integrate in order to love one another; only the Warren Court commanded that.

We are asked if we are afraid of all our beliefs and ideals being shattered if we should integrate. Mr. Byrnes, we do not subscribe to the contention of socialist George Bernard Shaw that "The only way to overcome temptation is to succumb to it."

We repeat: We prefer racial segregation and feel that we have a perfect right to insist upon that preference being honored within its rightful realm. We do not seek to make people love us; that is solely their prerogative. For those who dislike our society, we suggest that they not remain within it. We recommend a one-way trip to some point of interest where they can feel more "equal" and "accepted"; this is a wide, wide country and you can find in it practically any society you want—that includes, and rightly so, segregation and integration.

And we repeat again, we shall patronize the Chapel Hill theaters more willingly under their present policy of segregation, and we strongly urge others to do likewise, giving their moral and tangible support to this effort to maintain racial segregation. We also request that the thousands of segregationists on this campus drop a postal card to these theater managers and assure them that you support their courageous fortitude in the face of the organized integrationists. These integrationists have flooded the managers with their propaganda. Our duty is to show them that we aren't dead either, as was asserted by the misguided president of our student body. It only takes a three-cent postal card.

We urge the other Constitutionals in the University to unite with us in this fight to maintain our identity and our rights. Let us consolidate our efforts and crush those who would destroy us, our rights, and our cherished way of life. We can win!

Martin L. Wilson
L. Lee Gardner, Jr.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter to the editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is within the accepted bounds of good taste. NO LETTERS WILL BE PRINTED IF THEY ARE OVER 500 WORDS LONG OR IF THEY ARE NOT TYPEWRITTEN OR DOUBLE SPACED. We make this requirement purely for the sake of space and time.

The Daily Tar Heel
JONATHAN YARDLEY
 Editor
WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER
 Associate Editors
MARGARET ANN REYNOLDS
 Managing Editor
HOWARD NEAL REYNOLDS
 Assistant to the Editor
HENRY MATYER, JIM CLOFFEL
 News Editors
LYONS LITTLE
 Executive News Editor
SUZAN LEWIS
 Features Editor
FRANK SLOUSSER
 Sports Editor
HARRY W. LLOYD
 Asst. Sports Editor
JOHN JUSTICE, DAVIS YOUNG
 Contributing Editors
TYNE BURKETT
 Business Manager
RICHARD WEINER
 Advertising Manager
JOHN JENSEN
 Circulation Manager
CHARLES WEINER
 Subscription Manager
 The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879. 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.

Gary Dalton

How Just Is 80 Pct. Rule For Fraternities?

The 80% rule, is this justice? In an editorial Jonathan Yardley complained that fraternity houses must have eighty per cent of their members with a "C" average to keep from going on probation.

Mr. Yardley admits in his editorial that the fraternities are not making any effort to meet their academic responsibilities. He also says that an academic crackdown is due.

However, Mr. Yardley then says the University cannot afford to do this. It seems that the University cannot afford to lose a single house if it expects to have a bed in town for every student.

Yardley backs up his attack on the faculty committee by saying that its members do not have the insight to realize that a teacher should encourage, not condemn his students.

Finally, the DTH editor said the faculty is betraying itself in holding to the spirit of a "C" average. "The faculty committee might do well to decide whether a "C" is what is most important," he said.

I don't agree with Mr. Yardley. He contradicts himself, presents a trumped-up argument and fails to offer a solution, other than to kick the faculty committee.

I agree with the editor that the 80% rule is not fair, but only because it places the whole house on probation.

Why should the boys who make their grades be forced to suffer because some of their brothers didn't put out enough effort?

Why not put the guilty ones on probation and prevent them from participating in fraternity activities until they reach "C" level again?

This would allow the house to carry on normal activities including rush. Also, this would act as an incentive for frat members to make their grades.

We were proud, proud, proud of the University student body on Saturday afternoon.

For one thing, they conducted themselves as ladies and gentlemen throughout the course of what had to be a tense contest. And secondly, and perhaps sweeter than a victory over the Blue Devils, we were deeply moved by the united post-game demonstration for the members of the sports writing profession.

We hope they got the message, and got it big. WE WANT MCGUIRE, today, tomorrow, and years to come.

All the king's horses, And all the king's men Will never make us Read a certain paper again.

And good morning Jack Horner and Smith Barrier wherever you are.

Our nomination for the play of the year: Doug Moe driving

fight over Howard Hurt, shifting the ball from right hand to left in mid-air, and cramming it through the hoop late in the second half.

Plaudits also to Les Sutorius and his Dixieland combo for a great season's entertainment at home basketball games.

In the freshman game preceding the varsity tiff, we got a good look at Duke frosh sensation Jeff Mullens. He's everything they've said he is. He'll team up with Art Heyman to give the Dookies a potent one-two wallop next year. Look for Vic Bubas' squad to pose trouble next year despite the graduation of four starters.

Against Big Four opposition this season, the Tar Heels beat State twice, Wake Forest twice, and Duke two of three.