

## Bring Praise, Blasts

Books:

## Mailer Praises

## Self In 'Papers'

## Hickey Praised

Editors, The Tar Heel,

In November of 1960 I wrote a letter to the Editor of this newspaper criticizing UNC Head Football Coach Jim Hickey. Hickey, in his second year as Tar Heel mentor then was not even mildly succeeding in his post. I felt. As we all know, he had taken over the reins from "Sunny" Jim Tatum in 1959 and was having little, if any, success with the team that Jim Tatum was quoted as saying would be the finest he would ever coach (including his national championship team at Maryland in the early 50's). Carolina was losing consistently but perhaps even more discouraging was the type

of play—dull, unimaginative, lackluster football (with the exception of the 1959 50-0 rout of Duke, which can never be forgotten). A field goal in 1959-60 was reversed to be something that only the NFL pros could accomplish. When touchdowns did come they were rarely followed by the single point conversion.

The quarterback, although an able passer and runner, certainly did not have the varied offense which permitted him to run on the option play, pass short over center, throw out to the flanker or hand off on a draw play, for example. Instead, what yardage was gained was most frequently over the center of the line. Consequently, the play was boring and disappointing in most

cases.

Most of us then, I think, wanted a team that would command respect. We did not necessarily want a champion, but we did especially not want to be a patsy. It seemed, however, that the brand of football UNC was playing exemplified the administration's point of view toward athletics as Chancellor Aycock, at the termination of the 1960 season (a 3-7 effort, I believe) voiced complete confidence in Coach Hickey. Although there were apparent rumblings in student and alumni halls, the administration seemed to be saying, "This is what we want here at UNC. Successful athletic teams are not compatible with advanced academic programs."

Feeling drastically opposed to

such an attitude (our closest neighbor Duke is regrettably a prime example of compatible athletic and academic programs—and has been for years), of harboring ineffective coaching and unnecessary losses, I wrote my letter.

Today I would like to offer my sincerest congratulations to Coach Jim Hickey. I say this not solely in view of a 9-2 record, a conference championship and a most glorious post season victory. But, I say it with the realization that this coach, who recruited the Edges, Blacks, Willard's, Lacey's, Sigmon's, etc., has developed these very same men into a real football team. They pass, run, block and kick with precision and authority. They depend on each other and work together like a successful team must. What's more, Coach Hickey has given his quarterbacks a series of effective, varied plays that deceived opponents all year long.

Jim Hickey, in facing the TV cameras after UNC games, no longer need bow his head in dejection and diffidence. He is an established coach himself, now, and win or lose, he can now stand in his own sun.

Jim Noyes ('61)  
Marine Corps Schools,  
Quantico, Virginia

## No Tea Party

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Our Founding Fathers violated English law to gain freedom because it was the only means to that end. They founded a system of government known as democracy which provided the people with a means by which they might be heard. They provided a system of representation which gave to each citizen a voice in the laws that were made. We realize the form of government we have inherited is not perfect. Change comes slowly, but when change comes, it comes because all the people want and accept it.

There are ways to force and speed-up change. One method is through the use of violence. But violence, as a means to an end, often violates the laws of our system, the laws made by the people. If we condone violence, we are condemning the laws which violence seeks to destroy, and in doing so, we are condemning the system that created these laws.

I am sure that no citizen of this country wants to lose our system of democracy, but we shall destroy democracy if we try to by-pass its time-honored methods by advocating violence. The means to an end in democracy are often slow and frustrating, but they are justifiable.

Richard G. Elliott Jr.  
109 Aycock

## Bad Taste

Editors, The Tar Heel:

In the DTH of January 10, I noted with some perturbation a brief editorial expression entitled

"I'll Huff And I'll Puff And I'll Blow Myself Down"



"The Fascist Gun in the West." It was a very clever pun, but it was in very bad taste. I do not criticize your opposition to Senator Goldwater; you are free to be against him. However, the suggestion—even one lightly made—that his conservative ideas in any way liken him to a fascist is something very close to irresponsible name-calling. The far-right elements in this country, especially

the John Birchers, have soundly—and rightly—been criticized for their foolish tendency to brand anything to their left as "communist." Now you seem to be adopting these same Welchian tactics and launching them in the other direction. Practice what you preach, O Fuzzy-minded Liberals.

Charles Hall  
107 Everett

## Criticism, Analysis

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I was shocked by the news content of the Tuesday, Jan. 7, issue of The Daily Tar Heel. That edition certainly does not display the journalistic integrity and taste required of a responsible student press.

A brief survey of that paper reveals that one topic—local demonstrations for civil rights—was treated in over half of the news space and nearly three-quarters of the editorial space. These statistics gained added significance when I realized that a story which received statewide attention was allocated only one-tenth as much news space and one-third as much editorial mention as the demonstrations.

My approximate figures (see below) show that 59.8% of the news space (excluding sports) was occupied with sit-in news, while 73.4% of the edit space (55 of 75 column inches) was used in treating the same subject. Only 5.7% of news space was used for a story about the murder of Mrs. Frank Rinaldi. The same story was the subject of a reprinted editorial which occupied 20.0% of the edit space.

The one-sidedness of these figures is more than obvious, but when news values are interjected, the handling of news in that, the first issue of The Tar Heel after the holidays, is indeed shocking. Newspapers throughout the state consistently gave the Rinaldi case more "play" than the demonstrations; in effect, the state press rated the Rinaldi case as much more significant than the latter story. Furthermore, a murder story like the Rinaldi case merits more clarifying reporting than do the almost automatically recurring racial demonstrations.

I shall not comment on the use of the editorial page, since this space should be used to express the editors' views. It is alarming, however, to note that 60% of the news space was used for the same topic which occupied 73% of the editorial hole.

Even the copy in the news columns reflected bad taste on the part of you, the editors. One incident involving a waitress urinating on a demonstrator was mentioned twice in your paper. The same incident was reported by student correspondents to the state press, but professional journalists on the wire services tastefully edited it before it could reach their readers.

In addition, you played full-page a story which contained several blatant inaccuracies. I quote from "A New Kind of Christmas in Chapel Hill" by David McReynolds:

Chapel Hill is "... hiding ... somewhere between Durham and Raleigh. ... not even listed on most maps. ... The only way of getting into the town is by Trailways bus. ... The town is about half desegregated. ... The Pines (is) Chapel Hill's only elegant eatery ... As far as the town is concerned he (Pat Cusick) is simply red. ..."

The Daily Tar Heel has responsibilities as a student publication just as we have responsibilities as students. Speaking, then, as a member of the subsidizing organ of your newspaper—the student body—I would hope the materials present here can aid you in fulfilling these responsibilities.

Eddie Booker  
202 Avery Dorn

(Mr. Booker's content analysis follows.)

The Daily Tar Heel, Jan. 7, 1964

	Column Inches
Total news space (excluding sports)	423
Total editorial space	75
Space devoted to demonstrations (news)	253
Space devoted to Rinaldi (news)	24
Editorial space—demonstrations	55
Editorial space—Rinaldi	15
Percentage of news space—demonstrations	59.8%
Percentage of news space—Rinaldi	5.7%
Percentage of editorial space—demonstrations	73.4%
Percentage of editorial space—Rinaldi	20.0%

## Let's Arise And Act

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Praise Allah and the DTH! Your assaults against the "minority rule," "naked power grab," "tyranny of the minority," proposal for the little-federal amendment has finally gotten through to my inner-most core.

I guess I finally saw the light when I read that under the proposed amendment, 51 counties with 19 per cent of the population could rule the House. It really burned me up to think that anyone could be so "power hungry."

Then I began to think. What about the U. S. Senate? So I got out the trusty almanac and figured up that 26 states representing less than 31 million Americans rule that body. And that's only 15% of the U. S.! What an outrage! Why, that's 4% more tyranny than is proposed for N. C.

Furthermore, N. C. is among the larger 24 states of the union. Why that means that Senators from Rhode Island and New Hampshire and Nevada have just as much say-so about what goes on in this country as our Senators or New York's Senators. And those states have less than a million in population! What a disgrace to a "democratic" nation! That's a power grab if I ever heard of one!

I implore the crusading DTH to do something about this deplorable state of affairs immediately—before the tyrannous minority of Nevada and Rhode Island's power faction is allowed to hamper our progress and growth by their selfish indifference to our welfare.

Arise, ye people, and protest! It took us 180 years to wake up to what the framers of the Constitution put over on us, but we'll never sleep again! Taxation without representation! Tyranny of the minority! Down with the Stamp Tax and all that kind of thing! Democracy and equal representation for all!

Franklin Adkinson, Jr.  
358 Craige

some of these suggestions to

serve the term. Of the ones that do, the abolition of capital punishment is the most important. There is also a fascinating sidelight; if a state insisted on retaining the death penalty, they would be "allowed to kill criminals provided that the killing is not personal but personal and a public spectacle; to wit that the executioner be more or less the same size and weight as the criminal ... and that they fight to death using no weapons ... capable of killing at a distance." Thus moral responsibility and a sense of tragedy would no longer be vague, but embodied in a person whose face would be the face of the outrage.

Mailer's opposition to capital punishment is only one example of a more general theme that runs throughout the book: totalitarianism. No longer, he says in the introduction, to the ninth Paper, can totalitarianism be understood as a simple form of ideology or of government and the oppressed people, but a plague whose general tendency is toward dehumanization, toward abstract power. It is manifested in modern architecture, birth control, advertising, industry, in nearly every aspect of the nations' life. Mass society is divorcing us from our responsibility, from our past, and from our guilt by depersonalizing our lives. What Mailer wants is a return to human relations and human needs.

The "Existential Hero" essay, the story of the 1960 Democratic Convention, contains some of the book's best writing. To the millions of us who were puzzled by Adlai Stevenson's frigid response to the Convention's tumultuous welcome, Mailer offers the best explanation yet. Stevenson was beginning to be disenchanted with both the Democratic party and the American people. Although a year's hard campaigning might have won him the nomination for a third time, that year might have left him a worn-out man. "There is the possibility that he sensed his situation exactly this way, and he knew that if he were to run for president, win and make a good one, he would first have to be restored, as one can indeed be restored, by an exceptional demonstration of love—love, in this case, meaning that the Party had a profound desire to keep him as their leader."

Mailer's unpredictability keeps reclaiming our interest, and if we sometimes find ourselves laughing at, rather than with, him at least we're laughing. (It's hard to keep a straight face reading an essay on Jackie Kennedy entitled "The Existential Heroine.") Most often we don't laugh, but not because we're bored.

## What Makes School Ideal?

By LORRAINE MARTIN

What is an ideal university campus?

A University of Minnesota professor believes it should have "one or two Communist professors, a student Communist club, a chapter of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, a society for the promotion of free love, a League for Overthrow of Government by Jeffersonian Violence, an anti-automation league, and perhaps a nudist club."

Dr. Mulford Q. Sibley, a political science professor, was once voted the college's outstanding teacher of the year (by the alumni of the College of Science Literature, and the Arts.)

"American culture is far too monolithic for its own good," Mulford wrote in the Minnesota Daily. "We need students who challenge the orthodoxies." Sibley says if teachers do not bother to implant doubt and subversive thoughts in college, when and where will they be implanted. If seeds of doubt are never sown, moral and intellectual progress may not be the result of a college education.

Sibley calls himself a pacifist and a Socialist, not a Communist. He is faculty advisor to the Student Peace Union, investigated last summer to determine whether it and the university's World Affairs Center were Communist front groups.

Even if the organization were controlled by Communists, Sibley believes neither the administration nor the state should exert pressure on them or deny their moral right to exist.

Volume 72, Number 80

Tuesday, January 14, 1964

## The Daily Tar Heel

70 Years of Editorial Freedom

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news—933-1012. Business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Entered as 2nd class matter at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to Act of March 8, 1870. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.

Published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations, throughout the academic year by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc., 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is a subscriber to United Press International and utilizes the services of the University News Bureau.

## NO to Amendment I, YES to Amendment II

The 1963 General Assembly produced two legislative abortions that we know of, the Gag Law and the 'Little Federal' plan for redistricting the legislature. As voters, we can't do much about the Gag Law, except agitate and educate for its repeal in 1965. But there is something we can do about the 'Little Federal' plan. We can vote it into oblivion, from whence it came to where it should be returned with haste.

We can do this in the special referendum being held today, by voting NO to Amendment I.

Doing this—voting NO to amendment I—is right, proper and necessary. Doing so will prevent the small, rural counties from acquiring a stranglehold over all legislation. Doing so will assure equal representation to all North Carolina citizens.

But ... there is another amendment to be voted on. Amendment Number 2 is so wholesome it's not even controversial. As a result, many voters don't even know about it. This amendment is an attempt to give equal property rights to women. It should pass.

## One Jarring Incident Mars March

The civil rights pilgrimage from Durham to Chapel Hill Sunday afternoon was notable for many reasons, and one of the most notable was the relative absence of abusive language hurled at the marchers. They walked past such citadels of segregation as Brady's, Carlton's Rock Pile and the Frozen Kustard without incident, then up Stroud Hill through the residential section bordering Franklin Street and on into the heart of Chapel Hill.

And where did the first jarring note occur? As they entered the University community and walked past the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity house. For the first time epithets rang out and scatter-

ed obscenities welcomed the marchers to the University. And who were these few over-zealous ATO's cursing at? Ministers and ministers' wives, some faculty members' wives, students of both sexes and both races and many others interested in seeing that Negroes achieve equal rights.

Let us hasten to add that those doing the shouting were very, very few, and we're sure the ATO leaders will let them know, in no uncertain terms, that this is not the manner in which the house likes to be represented.

But still it seems a shame that the only reported incident of the afternoon should happen here on campus.

## As Terry Talked, Clarence Bit His Foot

(The Hertford County Herald)

While Governor Sanford was in Southern Pines recently he wrote out a statement praising state Senate President Clarence Stone. The same statement makes the probably justified allegation that Stone "has been treated unfairly by news media." The irony of timing placed Stone in Winston-Salem, again sticking his foot in his mouth, this same day.

With his blunt and obtuse manner Stone is an easy person to dislike for those so inclined.

This lack of restraint in Stone's public utterances has finally however served some useful purpose. Coming on the same day as the Governor's praise, his talk in Winston-Salem was noted more closely than might otherwise have been the case. Talking about the speaker's ban bill, Stone is reported to have said, "I have not noticed any professor leading any (anti-segregation) demonstrations in Raleigh since we passed House Bill 1395. If they would do more screening about who they do the teaching there

would have been no use for HB 1395."

As was reported at the time, somewhat unconvincingly, the speaker's ban bill was a direct outgrowth of civil rights demonstrations in Raleigh earlier this year. It was a way of expressing legislative disapproval of students and teachers from state supported schools, particularly UNC at Chapel Hill, taking part in race demonstrations. Stone's Winston-Salem remarks make this clear, if ever there was doubt.

This was a poor ground on which to base a law which makes North Carolina state institutions of higher learning unwholesome examples for the rest of the country of political control of academic freedom. Especially so when it is remembered that a law has been on the books since 1941 which bars Communists from preaching their doctrine in state buildings. It would seem the three major candidates for Governor are on firmer footing in all calling for amendment to the speaker's ban bill than were Mr. Stone and his cohorts who devised this vindictive way of "getting at" the University in the first place.