

In Our Opinion...

It Took LEADER To Show Where Football Problem Lay

The campus and Tarheel fans the world over are in the debt of the men from LEADER (Layman's Committee for the Evaluation of the Adequacy of the Director of Enthusiastic Rooters) for their keen analysis of what's wrong with UNC football.

Our gridiron eleven has, for some years now, had its trouble producing a winning record.

Disappointed fans have blamed it on the players, the coach and the athletic director.

Now, finally, the writers of the letter in Thursday's DTH give the real answer: "... for as every fan knows, a football team is but clay in the hands of its rooting section, and the rooting section can only be as good as its leader."

The letter asks the question, "Have you ever seen a big-time football game on TV and noticed the level of cheering section excellence?"

Our answer: Yes, we have seen many "big-time" football games on TV. And we have noticed the level of cheering section excellence—not very high.

The letter then asks; "Have you noticed the originality and seemingly unlimited variations of cheers emanating from major college cheering sections?"

Our answer: No, we haven't noticed any such thing. What

we have noticed, instead, is an almost universal preference among college students for short, repetitions, non-rhyming chants—especially chants that give them a chance to insert four-letter words.

So, we are happy that the men of LEADER have noticed things for us which we haven't seen.

We are happy that they pointed out the fact that our cheerleaders have not "done their part by dedicating weeks of hard work, sleepless nights, etc."

Oh, sure, the cheerleaders have organized big, successful pep rallies before every game. They have had posters made announcing the pep rallies and attempting to stir school spirit. They have distributed these posters all over the campus. They have had as many members of their squad as possible at every away game.

Yes, the cheerleaders have given the appearance of working. They've put on a good show—good enough to fool the athletes and the student body as a whole.

But they didn't fool LEADER. And, now that we've seen LEADER's side of the picture, it's all so obvious.

Our team has lost a few games. We lost our homecoming game. Of course the cheerleaders are to blame. Why couldn't we see that?

Is U.S. 'Obligated'?

Minnesota Daily University of Minnesota

Mistakes by the State Dept. in American foreign policy are an object of concealment these days. And most often they are disguised by Pres. Lyndon B. Johnson in patriotic, flag-waving terms which make it un-American to look deeply into the issues and oppose the war.

We are mistakenly at war with a principle, and we have chosen an ally country which is cut by civil war.

In the text of Johnson's Vietnam speeches, the words "commitment," "obligation," and "moral obligation" have become established ideas. When he is asked why we are fighting, the President answers that we are committed to a war effort because of policies in effect since 1954.

He bases his statement on two documents: Pres. Eisenhower's letter to South Vietnamese Pres. Diem in 1954 and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO) of 1955.

A look at both documents reveals that is no commitment.

Eisenhower's letter indicated that the U. S. ambassador would "examine" a program with Diem, the purpose of which was to help build a viable state capable of resisting subversion and aggression. No commitment was made, just an overture of economic and technical assistance, including military advisers, material, and training.

The SEATO treaty obligates the parties of the agreement in the case of "aggression by armed attack... to meet

the common danger in accordance with its constitutional process."

It also makes the distinction that when "the territory or sovereignty or political independence of any (covered area)... is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace of the area... the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measurements which should be taken for the common defense."

Since Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand cannot agree with the United States on a policy toward Vietnam, our position in Vietnam is not justified by the treaty. In fact, we are in violation of that document.

Where does the President find a "commitment" or an "obligation" then?

Our commitment is not to Vietnam, but to ourselves. Strategically we are committed to the war because we became entrapped. Richard N. Goodwin made the case simply. "We (the United States) looked cautiously ahead while the door closed slowly, ponderously behind us."

Johnson did not intentionally over-extend the United States in Vietnam, but he should admit to the American people that we are indeed in too far.

But the President insists on screaming unpatriotic at his critics. He makes black and white out of a war which is a confusion of gray tones.

As long as we feel committed to a course of action solely for reasons of national pride, as long as we look for justification rather than initiation in policy, as long as we are advocates rather than analysts of that policy, the course of war will not lead to a constructive peace, but a destructive holocaust.

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Fred Thomas, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Scott Goodfellow, Managing Ed.

John Greenbacker, Assoc. Ed.

Kerry Sipe, Feature Editor

Bill Amlong, News Editor

Ernest Robl, Asst. News Editor

Sandy Treadwell, Sports Editor

Bob Orr, Asst. Sports Editor

Jock Lauterer, Photo Editor

Chuck Benner, Night Editor

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.

Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

'Tough Break, Coach. It Was Those Darn Cheerleaders Again!'



Letters To The Editor

Cheerleader Praised

LEADER Attacked

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel: Nothing disturbs me more than to see someone unjustly criticized. Furthermore, when the criticism is leveled by a person totally ignorant of the true situation, then a grievous error and injustice has been committed.

I am referring to the letter written by the anonymous LEADER concerning the UNC cheerleaders, and especially the head cheerleader. Carolina will be most fortunate indeed if they can find in the future a better, harder working, more enthusiastic group of cheerleaders.

Obviously people don't know that the cheerleaders have made banners, cards, helped organize pep rallies, attended soccer games and cross country meets, and freshman athletic events, as well as the football games. The cheerleaders have been at the Field House to see the team off and been there when they got back.

Now I would like to turn my attentions to Dick Starnes, the UNC head cheerleader. It has been my pleasure to work with Dick for the past five months in an effort to build school spirit.

Many people have said that UNC has shown the best school spirit this year that they can remember.

One person deserves that credit: Dick Starnes.

Most people don't realize that Dick is taking a full work load, plus having a part-time job, and in addition is married and concerned with many other responsibilities. His time is precious, but he has devoted

more time to cheerleading than any head cheerleader I can remember.

Did you know that nearly every fraternity and sorority sent telegrams to the football team when they went to Michigan?

Have you seen the signs all over campus proclaiming a pep rally is going to be held? Have you wondered why Carolina's three pep rallies have all been successful when last year there were a couple of pep rallies where nobody showed up but the team?

Did you know that a petition wishing the Tar Heels luck at Notre Dame was presented to the team with over 4,000 names?

Hard work and enthusiasm by Dick Starnes has been the main reason.

One person has engineered this amazing resurgence of school spirit, and that one person is Dick Starnes.

Dick Starnes is not a professional entertainer. If you want a head cheerleader to tell jokes and come up with brilliant new cheers, may I suggest you invite Bob Hope to become head cheerleader.

But I imagine that even the sparkling personality of Mr. Hope could not do near as good a job as Starnes.

Cheerleading isn't confined to Saturday afternoons and being popular with the crowd. Cheerleading is hard work that requires time and energy that only a dedicated Tar Heel fan like Starnes will give.

And may I scold Mr. Greenbacker and the DTH for once again straying from their policy of printing letters without signatures. If this LEADER is too cowardly to print his name then the letter had no business being printed.

Once again may I say that this school owes Dick Starnes a debt of gratitude for the hard work and time he has gladly given to Carolina.

It's a shame that his fine job must be tainted by such letters.

Bob Orr, Pres. Carolina Athletic Association

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel: To ALL of you students who gave so generously of your time and your talents to assist with the work of the blood donor project at Woolen Gym on February 16 and 17, we want to say a sincere "thank you." It takes a lot of good people working together to accomplish so much. It could not have been done without you.

Your local chapter provided funds for the necessary expenses. Everyone contributed in the manner they could, and it was a great big whopping success—officially, 544 pints of blood collected.

How many ways can one say "thank you?" We wish we knew them all so we could say it in every way there is. Please accept our gratitude for your volunteer help.

Mrs. L. C. Neville, Executive Secretary

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel: I think it is ironic and perhaps sad that a man who believed in the Jeffersonian philosophy as strongly and as steadfastly as did Harry Byrd should reach the apex of his power at a time when the social stresses and strains of the twentieth century were providing that philosophy to be impractical. No longer was the United States merely a federation of semi-sovereign political entities which could be depended upon to take care of their own affairs; the problems of being a nation were growing simply too immense too complex to be handled by fifty different centers of authority. Furthermore, as rising prosperity created concurrently increasing demands

for governmental services from the populace, only by utilizing the resources of the nation as a whole could most of these demands be met. And the myth that a nation as immense and powerful as this one could for long, or with good conscience, remain disengaged from foreign affairs, was being rapidly eroded during the years of Harry Byrd, much to his dismay.

All this is not, indeed, to disparage the man himself, for few attain the degree of competence and single-minded devotion to their task that he did. His absolute and deft grasp of the mechanics of government, coupled with his loyalty to those principles in which he believed, made him a figure much respected and admired in the halls of Congress, and his easy-going geniality and courtly dignity made him many close friends on either side of the aisle during his 32 years in the Senate.

Time remains still for no man, Harry Byrd included, and the passage of time brought with it the repudiation in fact of much of what he believed. Today, and may God help us, we are in the sixth decade of the twentieth century of Christianity, and the doctrines and convictions of Harry Flood Byrd, though deeply felt, simply cannot meet the exigencies of society and man in society at this juncture in history. Men such as this one, great and eminently capable leaders of their times, must adapt their beliefs or step aside as time passes them by, to give room for the men ready to meet the needs of tomorrow.

We honor Harry Byrd in his passing for what he was—a gentleman, as astute, fearless, and dedicated leader of Virginia, and a guiding light and influence for his time. His time, though, is not today, and we must look beyond his legacy to find our guidance.

Bloody Good

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel: I think it is ironic and perhaps sad that a man who believed in the Jeffersonian philosophy as strongly and as steadfastly as did Harry Byrd should reach the apex of his power at a time when the social stresses and strains of the twentieth century were providing that philosophy to be impractical. No longer was the United States merely a federation of semi-sovereign political entities which could be depended upon to take care of their own affairs; the problems of being a nation were growing simply too immense too complex to be handled by fifty different centers of authority. Furthermore, as rising prosperity created concurrently increasing demands

for governmental services from the populace, only by utilizing the resources of the nation as a whole could most of these demands be met. And the myth that a nation as immense and powerful as this one could for long, or with good conscience, remain disengaged from foreign affairs, was being rapidly eroded during the years of Harry Byrd, much to his dismay.

All this is not, indeed, to disparage the man himself, for few attain the degree of competence and single-minded devotion to their task that he did. His absolute and deft grasp of the mechanics of government, coupled with his loyalty to those principles in which he believed, made him a figure much respected and admired in the halls of Congress, and his easy-going geniality and courtly dignity made him many close friends on either side of the aisle during his 32 years in the Senate.

Time remains still for no man, Harry Byrd included, and the passage of time brought with it the repudiation in fact of much of what he believed. Today, and may God help us, we are in the sixth decade of the twentieth century of Christianity, and the doctrines and convictions of Harry Flood Byrd, though deeply felt, simply cannot meet the exigencies of society and man in society at this juncture in history. Men such as this one, great and eminently capable leaders of their times, must adapt their beliefs or step aside as time passes them by, to give room for the men ready to meet the needs of tomorrow.

We honor Harry Byrd in his passing for what he was—a gentleman, as astute, fearless, and dedicated leader of Virginia, and a guiding light and influence for his time. His time, though, is not today, and we must look beyond his legacy to find our guidance.

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel: I think it is ironic and perhaps sad that a man who believed in the Jeffersonian philosophy as strongly and as steadfastly as did Harry Byrd should reach the apex of his power at a time when the social stresses and strains of the twentieth century were providing that philosophy to be impractical. No longer was the United States merely a federation of semi-sovereign political entities which could be depended upon to take care of their own affairs; the problems of being a nation were growing simply too immense too complex to be handled by fifty different centers of authority. Furthermore, as rising prosperity created concurrently increasing demands

for governmental services from the populace, only by utilizing the resources of the nation as a whole could most of these demands be met. And the myth that a nation as immense and powerful as this one could for long, or with good conscience, remain disengaged from foreign affairs, was being rapidly eroded during the years of Harry Byrd, much to his dismay.

All this is not, indeed, to disparage the man himself, for few attain the degree of competence and single-minded devotion to their task that he did. His absolute and deft grasp of the mechanics of government, coupled with his loyalty to those principles in which he believed, made him a figure much respected and admired in the halls of Congress, and his easy-going geniality and courtly dignity made him many close friends on either side of the aisle during his 32 years in the Senate.

Time remains still for no man, Harry Byrd included, and the passage of time brought with it the repudiation in fact of much of what he believed. Today, and may God help us, we are in the sixth decade of the twentieth century of Christianity, and the doctrines and convictions of Harry Flood Byrd, though deeply felt, simply cannot meet the exigencies of society and man in society at this juncture in history. Men such as this one, great and eminently capable leaders of their times, must adapt their beliefs or step aside as time passes them by, to give room for the men ready to meet the needs of tomorrow.

Peter Harris

Film 'Morgan' Seen As A Tragic Study

"Morgan" is howlingly funny," wrote Bosley Crowther.

"Morgan" is not howlingly funny, however, it is painfully tragic. It is the story of a true individual, perceptive and loving, who is incompatible with society. Morgan, the man, faces various antagonisms throughout his life in the movie, but none of them weigh hard on him until he loses his wife.

First, Morgan rejects communism, after being a fire brand in his youth. Although it is an unaccepted doctrine in England, communism points towards the greatest form of conformity; it is terribly antagonistic to the individual.

In rejecting communism, Morgan is, in part, rejecting his past and his mother. His use of the hammer and sickle is for shock value since he realizes how paranoid most people are when they see the red symbol. This tickles him.

Of course, Morgan is not accepted by materialistic society and he rejects the business world, too. The lack of free spirit and individuality is very obvious to him and the fact that his wife decides to marry Napier, the incarnation of the business type, this causes the ultimate frustration for Morgan.

Authority, as portrayed by the policeman, plays a peculiar role in the movie.

Morgan does not accept authority, but he does not really reject it either. This is because he thinks he cannot respect it until it defeats him.

The illusion in the dump yard, with the willing acceptance of the strait jacket (an object Morgan mentions repeatedly in the movie) illustrates this point.

The imitations and fascinations with the gorilla are a beautiful, artistic device used by the director. The gorilla symbolizes the basic qualities of man — he is lovable.

However, the gorilla is also a social animal who spends much of time and energy towards affiliative projects. This is where the discrepancy with life comes for Morgan.

Morgan, like every man, needs acceptance — of at least one other person. He needs his wife's love and companionship in order to feel compatible with life. As long as she remains, and understand his "insanity" (which is very sane), he will be able to continue as an individual.

It is here where the tragedy occurs.

Morgan, like Murray in "A Thousand Clowns", is a true individual. The tragic irony of perceptive individuals is that they are totally unique. They must act as they see fit, as they feel, with as few restrictions as possible.

However, it is impossible for anyone to fit into an individual's life pattern. He is too unique. This is frustrating for him because his affiliative instincts can never be totally satisfied.

Murray finally had to give in to society's demands. Even his kid was not immune to the same social demands that Murray was.

Morgan's wife can no longer live the spontaneous existence as Morgan's cohort. She decides to settle for a more stable existence.

Without his wife, Morgan is lost. All the antagonisms which have built up in his life come into full focus.

He dreams that he must prove he loves his wife, so he goes to extreme steps to win her back. He kidnaps her with Wally the Gorilla.

The Tarzan illusion points towards the fact that Morgan thinks he can woo her through means closer to nature.

The dump yard illusion shows all the antagonisms firing at Morgan — rejecting him. They include the workers of the world, his mother, and his wife.

Morgan perceives Napier to be the driving force behind his defeat, and Napier is in complete control of the situation. The nice cop finally is able to tell where it is at.

The final is too beautiful to believe. The initial camera shot shows Morgan plodding around in the garden of a sanitarium. He appears defeated and sedate.

Then his wife enters and Morgan just looks up. Morgan proceeds to ask her one question: "Is that my baby?" She laughs and nods "yes." She now knows that Morgan is in good shape.

There is still communication between them. Morgan merely smiles. It is left undetermined whether Morgan shall continue his desperate appeal as an individual, or if he has realized that he must capitulate to society.

However, as the camera reverses its zoom, we see that Morgan has cut the garden in to the shape of a huge hammer and sickle.

Morgan was never mentally ill; he was just temporarily defeated by the antagonisms he faced.

The move illustrates the tragic fact that a true individual cannot remain compatible with society. This leads us to the conclusion that Morgan had been defeated.

The final scene throws Morgan's future into confusion. We are not sure of how he shall satisfy his affiliative needs.

Whatever the future, the child is his, but he does not carry the responsibility of caring for it. Morgan is free to explore a new world, somewhere.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed and double-spaced. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.