

THE DAILY TAR HEEL

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is published daily at the Colonial Press, Inc., except Monday's, examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed \$4.00 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered \$6.00 per year and \$2.25 per quarter.

Thanks To Morehead

Truly great gifts to the University are those which will improve the quality of education in the state of North Carolina.

Such a gift is the Morehead Scholarship Fund.

John Motley Morehead's endowment is a present to the entire state. The money is being spent to enable our ablest students to continue with an education which might otherwise be curtailed. Through those individuals, the general level of learning in this state is being raised.

A long, loud thank-you from a state educationally poor is overdue to Mr. Moorehead.

by Fred Crawford

C. P. U. Roundtable

Amid all the conflicting opinion at UNC today, the one issue upon which all students and factions can agree, is the present inadequacies of The Daily Tar Heel. Many students moan over the degeneration of the Tar Heel in the past two years, especially those who would like it to be an accurate representation of total student opinion. Others lament the spelling and grammar errors, repeated crosswords, and inaccurate reporting.

The failures of the Tar Heel will not be alleviated by laying the blame on one individual or even on one group of individuals and then retiring into a shell of smug self-satisfaction. The Daily Tar Heel has many problems, but none which are insolvable, and the number of problems it has only increases the number of students it needs to help it.

Whatever else may be wrong, The Daily Tar Heel is suffering from an acute case of a widespread disease—lack-a-money-itis. The student body population has dropped some two thousand or more in the past two years and the Daily Tar Heel revenue has, of course, dropped proportionately, and advertising revenue, coming from local merchants, cannot be noticeably increased until the enrollment increases. Either revenue must be

increased, through raising the block fee or digging up advertising from somewhere, filling up back pages entirely, or else we must be content with the present size and concentrate on improving it with the same amount of space.

This improvement can be obtained to some extent by a new editor to supply fresh blood and inspiration to lift the level of the staff to avoid mistakes and to provide more interesting stories, but one person cannot do this alone, nor can it be done over a long period of time. Many qualified staffers are needed who have the will and talent for the job. Can the campus and staff supply such staff spontaneously?

The CPU will discuss tonight the possibility of the School of Journalism filling this gap, supplying experienced talented staffers, offering them credit hours in return for their effort, and providing continuous expert aid and advice. It may be that the present School cannot do this, but an ideal School of Journalism certainly should. The discussion will also examine the basic assumptions behind the Tar Heel, its problems and difficulties, and possible solutions. Editor Glen Harden and Professor Phillips Russel of the School of Journalism will be present.

by Dave Kerley
Their Deeds

Mr. Roberts' Thursday column illustrates the observation that some of the UP leaders seem incapable of evaluating policies in terms of their value to the campus. They can only interpret them in terms of their respective effect on the UP.

By careful gerrymandering the UP has succeeded for years in denying the Town Men an effective voice in the Legislative Branch of Student Government. Last fall the Town Men's Association launched a campaign to correct this undemocratic procedure, and the Student Party heartily endorsed their efforts, not because of any political advantage that might accrue, but because the SP has traditionally stood for equal rights of all students. In pursuance of this policy a bill to redistrict the town was introduced in the Student Legislature. It provided a separate district for the Town Men who had been so long disenfranchised.

The bitterness with which the UP attacked this bill is a measure of their realization of the degree to which they have abused their political power. If the UP had been fair to the Town Men in the past, there would have been nothing for them to fear in separate representation for the Town Men. The fact that the UP leaders have misconstrued the redistricting bill as an effort to make possible the election of SP legislators from town districts is a tacit admission that the Town Men have more to gain from an SP administration than has been possible under UP control.

It has been comical to hear the UP leaders insist in one breath that they are representing the Town Men adequately, and in the next breath argue that permitting the Town Men to vote in a separate district would result in the election of more SP legislators.

The response of the UP leaders to this redistricting bill was a series of "compromise" proposals. For the most part each such proposal was couched in terms of "if we make that change the SP will gain a seat or two, so let's offset that by this change so that the UP will gain the same number of seats." The SP has been unwilling to discuss the redistricting problem in terms of this party balance of power. The Student Party is anxious to have every segment of the student population represented in proportion to the number of students involved.

The most painful aspect of the former districting has been that the Town Men, with twenty-odd per cent of the student population, have had four per cent of the representation. This situation, a product of UP gerrymandering, is disgraceful. The SP sought to correct it, and the UP utterly opposed their efforts. Mr. Roberts is right when he alleges this vote was along party lines. I regret to say that not a single member of the UP delegation in the Legislature had the courage to stand up against the UP machine and vote to give the Town Men effective representation in the Legislature.

Ulmont Ives

Letters to the Editor

Madam Editor:

It is not often that I think so closely with another person's ideas as appears in a newspaper column, but I find that in the Feb. 10 Daily Tar Heel, is a column which really got close to me.

I liked Bill Peacock's column on the quotations from Coach Bob Fetzer in regard to student opinion and feelings on athletics. I agree with him that the students, and for that matter one generation, are gripped by a feeling of complacency.

I know that in the last few years, there has been less and less interest shown at Carolina in extra-curricular activities. I know best about The Daily Tar Heel. Take today—a half-dozen students probably wrote every bit of the copy that appeared in this paper. They work themselves hard and don't fool yourselves, they have to study just as hard as any student does. Well, maybe you will say how do they find the time. They don't. They just do it. Why? Because somebody has got to do it and also because they enjoy doing it, but that is no reason why they should have to do it all alone. Every minute they spend working at The Daily Tar Heel takes away from the time they have to study, and believe me, their grades usually suffer for it. I'm not defending their actions. They have their reasons, but what is your reason for not working in student activities?

Maybe our generation should be called the "lukewarm" generation. We are neither hot nor cold; we sort of drift along in the middle, hoping that we'll have a wonderful life and that we'll always have enough to live comfortably. Why don't we have more spirit? Why don't we want to knock ourselves out for what we believe? Why haven't we had more interested students participating in the national "Somebody-for-President Clubs?" Why don't we get out and work harder for a better newspaper, annual, student government, athletics, or any student activities, instead of sitting back and criticizing how bad that was and how somebody ought to do this to improve that? Why can't we be a generation that does something, one that makes a name for itself, that will be remembered in history for the strides forward we have taken? Why don't we have more Barry Farers? Why?

I don't know. Maybe somebody who reads this can tell me. One other thing. I wonder about things like this but I'm just like everybody else. I'm lazy too! And I probably will never climb Mount Everest or walk across the Sahara Desert or any other crazy thing like that, but I'll always wonder just what it would be like if I did something that wasn't practical or logical or spend half my life trying to invent something which will make this world better to live in.

Oliver T. Watkins

Visiting Chapel Hill after an absence of 35 years, I naturally expected to find many things different, and was not surprised to find few familiar scenes. The three old buildings and the well were barely enough to identify the place at all. Although it was with a feeling of nostalgia that I viewed the expansion and growth of my Alma Mater. I was glad. But it was with a feeling of sadness that I recalled the dreams and ambitions of those men like Doctor Battle, Francis Venable, Patterson, Kidder Graham, Marvin Stacy, and Horace Williams, whose very souls were on fire with love for the University. I was sad because they cannot be here to look upon the reality of their dreams come true.

However, this fine sentiment was knocked to smithereens when I walked into that elegant theatre on Franklin Street. Almost 40 years ago, as a freshman, I walked down the aisle in the old Pickwick picture house and underwent the jeers and sneers of the sophomores and dodged their barrage of spitballs, apple cores and even decayed vegetables, and I thought it was disgraceful. But the next year it didn't seem so bad after all, just a little momentary diversion at the expense of the freshmen. And even yet I can see that as a whole the sophomores were serious and studious at heart most of them went away greatly benefitted by their stay at Chapel Hill.

But the conduct of that portion of the University student body in the theatre last Saturday night indicates something deeper and broader than a little frivolity. The screams, screeches, yells and cat-calls from that crowd sounded more like a menagerie in which all the animals had broken from their cages and were having a free for all, than it did an audience of supposedly cultured University students.

I particularly went to the theatre to see that great picture the Flying Dutchman. But did I get anything out of that picture? I'll say not. From beginning to end, the show was interrupted at its most dramatic and absorbing moments by the yelling, laughing and lewd remarks that would have shamed the toughest blackguard that ever sailed the seven seas.

I came away from that picture show, Madam Editor, feeling glad that my old teachers and friends of the University mentioned above could not come back to witness such disgraceful conduct on the part of sons and grandsons of the university students they had known. I hear and read much about the shortcomings of modern colleges and universities and have accepted opinions of critics with a grain of salt; but if that thousand hoodlums making up the theatre audience last Saturday night is a sample of what our universities are turning loose in the world I am glad I shall not be around to look upon "what the harvest shall be."

Dudley W. Crawford

News Editor

Richmond County (N. C.)

Journal