

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is published daily except Saturday, Monday, examination and vacation periods, and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates mailed \$4 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered, \$6 and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor: WALT DEAR
Managing Editor: ROLFE NEILL
Business Manager: JIM SCHENCK
Sports Editor: BIFF ROBERTS
News Ed.: Bob Slough
Sub. Mgr.: Carolyn Reichard
Ass't. Sub. Mgr.: Bill Venable
Office Mgr.: Buzzy Shull
Assoc. Ed.: Nina Gray, Jane Carter
Sec. Ed.: Deenie Schoeppe
Circ. Mgr.: Donald Hogg
Asst. Spis. Ed.: Tom Peacock
Adv. Mgrs.: Charles Collins, Charles Haskett
Exch. Ed.: Alice Chapman

NEWS STAFF: John Jamison, Louis Kraar, Tom Parramore, Ben West, Jim Wilkinson, Sally Schindel, Jess Nettles, Hubert Breeze, Harry Dunlop, Ellen Downs, Tom Neal Jr.

Night Editor for this issue: Rolfe Neill

For Whom The Yells Scold

Each night from 12:05 to 1:00 a.m. NBC currently is re-broadcasting excerpts from Senator Joe McCarthy's daily investigations. For feelings of sheer horror, everyone should listen.

Following certain aspects of McCarthy's brand of "Americanism" (McCarthyism) are compared with similar aspects of Russian Communism. Personally, it is very difficult for me to understand why people who are opposed to Communism are not equally opposed to McCarthyism. But, to continue with the comparison:

1. McCarthy views not only conspiracy but also political heresy (the right to disagree and to hold alternative views) as a concrete danger to America. Accordingly, he seeks any means to stamp out heresy. In verbal assaults he has even gone so far as to brand such people as Adlai Stevenson and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt as "un-American and Communist sympathizers." (Even though many may very much disapprove of such persons, is there any way in which they can be construed as being disloyal or un-American?) Perhaps, if McCarthy's type of logic were extended back into history, Thomas Jefferson would turn out to be quite un-American.

Russia, just one jump ahead of McCarthyism, allows no political dissension. They even have periodic purges to remove non-conformists from the political scene. The people are little more than robots subordinated to party policy. The administration is a hierarchy of yes-men with Stalin at the top with final authority.

2. McCarthy, to secure America from Communism and un-Americanism, uses any methods to obtain incriminating evidence and testimony against those he deems as un-American.

The Communist regime, to secure Russia from anti-Communists, heretics, and non-conformists, also uses many methods to convict their political "criminals."

Both McCarthy's and Russia's type of investigation and "trial" remind one of the days of the Spanish Inquisition. Ruthless, impersonal, and efficient is the constant spying and investigation. Both the McCarthy and the Russian method assume a priori that a man is guilty and that the evidence and the sources for that evidence must stand unchallenged.

From FEAR of a few, the many are enslaved.

3. McCarthyism seems to claim absolutely to know what is "American," what is good and right for the people. According to the implications of McCarthyism, the American government and the American system—except for the unfortunate Communist and un-American infiltration—is perfect and beyond criticism.

The Russian Communists also lay claim to a monopoly on truth. They claim that theirs is the "ism" of isms. However, they too apologize for a few bourgeois influences which occasionally imperfect the system.

4. McCarthy is now correlating Communism with intelligence. Consequently, he is proposing an extensive investigation into the colleges to weed out the "disloyal, un-American, and Communist" teachers. Also favored is the elimination from the curriculum of certain subjects which the politicians feel are dangerous to the development of healthy, American minds.

The Russian Communists also have long been wary of intellectuals. Intellectuals, for the most part, are too reactionary to give up unconditionally their loyalty to the subordination and demands of the Party. (To reinforce this point, read "The God That Failed," a pocketbook telling the stories why six ex-Communists gave up Communism.) As for Russia's educational system, it is completely controlled and the curriculum dictated by the State.

5. Extreme McCarthyism favors a strict censor by the American government of so-called "pink" literature, drama, music, and art.

On this point, the Communist government in Russia today limits its considerably what the people may hear, what drama they shall enjoy, and what music and art is most away from the bourgeois influence, and therefore is "acceptable."

Truly we have good cause to oppose Communism if we cherish our individual freedoms. Yet why aren't we also opposed to McCarthyism, since it also attacks these freedoms? Is it because the



The NSA Story

The United States National Student Association (USNSA) has recently been charged with being a "subversive" and "insidious left-wing pressure group." These charges have been leveled by an extreme group known as Students For America through a monthly magazine and a speech delivered by its president before the National Interfraternity Conference in New York City last November.

USNSA takes no exception to the right of any group or individual to criticize its program, policies, and activities. USNSA, however, will not stand by and allow its reputation to be damaged by irresponsible and unfounded charges such as those that have been recently made.

USNSA is positively non-Communist and participates in absolutely no political activities whatsoever. USNSA cooperates with no subversive organizations. USNSA is not listed on any of the so-called subversive organizations listings, and it has not been cited by any of the security agencies for disloyal activities. Such charges are baseless and libelous.

USNSA is not engaged in activi-

ties to destroy fraternities as has been charged. Nowhere does USNSA demand conformity to any policies, and no policy calls for the destruction of the fraternity system. Many outstanding leaders in USNSA at present and in the past have been fraternity members. USNSA does stand for the eventual elimination of discrimination in all student organizations, a policy that has been adopted as a recommendation to member student governments.

USNSA claims to be the most representative student organization in the United States today by virtue of the active membership of three hundred student governments widely diverse in type of school and geographical location whose jurisdictions extend to over eight hundred thousand American college students.

Abroad, USNSA is successfully waging a campaign for the extension of democratic student life in the face of strenuous Communist propaganda efforts to win student support. Through the International Student Conference, USNSA works closely with thirty-five other democratic national student associations in promotion of mutual projects of assistance. At the present time, more student associations are cooperating in this effort than ever participated in Communist-inspired programs of the past.

USNSA is proud to have the active participation of an advisory group including such outstanding Americans as Harold E. Stassen, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Very Reverend Vincent J. Flynn, Dean Althea Kratz Hotel, and Reverend Celestine Steiner, S. J. Such Americans would not be actively associated with any organization of questionable loyalty.

As President, I call upon student governments in the United States and its territories to join in strengthening USNSA and in enriching its program and activities by active participation.

Richard J. Murphy
President, United States National Student Association

A Dead Letter

Harmony and the best interests of the University cost a fantastic amount.

They cost us an extra day in class, a new kind of going-to-school system, and another losing round in the battle of student opinion versus trustee and administration. When the Executive Committee is against you, you have a chance before the full board. But when the full administration, including Gray, Carmichael and House (Gray five times), calls for Saturday classes, your cause is washed away with the tide of surplus power.

It is a wonder, and at the same time, a tribute to the abilities of Ham Horton, that we mustered 28 votes in Monday's Trustee meeting, despite staunch opposition by these chief powers. Students are grateful for the support given them by Major L. P. McLendon and John W. Umstead, among others. Such friends in a heated discussion are heartily appreciated.

Before you or The Daily Tar Heel lambasts the Trustees, the administration, or any other part of the University, we think it's worthwhile to take a look at some of the causes of the Saturday class hassle.

The University community consists of students, faculty, administration, and trustees. Over a long period of time the University has maintained cordial relations with the board, but every once in a while there is a sudden outbursting of concern, or even anxiety among trustee members. One or two of the trustees, or even more, get over-zealous, and overexert themselves while performing their duties.

The Saturday class matter is a perfect illustration of this. Whether we had Saturday classes or not was purely an academic matter. It was a matter where the administration and the faculty could have dealt with much more effectively than the trustees.

A year ago we had a trustee by the name of John Clark who appeared as a one man investigating committee in the name of the trustees. The trustees censured him by saying that they were not responsible for his activities nor could he use the name of trustees in vain. This time members of the visiting committee, particularly Victor Bryant of Durham, have consistently regarded Saturday classes as the healing element for some of the University's problems. Since 1948 the full board of trustees has been interested in Saturday classes.

When the executive committee met last November, President Gray told them he was against Saturday classes. The trustees didn't mention any semester plan, but just ordered that Saturday classes were to be put into effect.

Two weeks ago, Grey told the same executive committee that he was for the semester plan, including Saturday classes. Here, Gray was showing his approval of the main parts of the Faculty Council's report. We believe that Gray thinks that the semester plan is more valuable than the quarter system anyway. The faculty recommended Saturday classes because they had to. An order is an order, and while Gray could have made an issue of the principle of the thing, by offering his resignation, he acted otherwise.

This is where the "best interests of the University" come in. That phrase sounds funny. It is hard to define it simply because it means all things to all kinds of people. Gray figured he could accomplish more in the long run by accepting the Saturday class-semester plan than by fighting the trustees tooth and nail on general principles.

As students, it is difficult to understand this position. It is even more difficult to understand why Gray, once he had made up his mind, was so vehement in supporting the Saturday class semester plan.

The fact that Gray and the faculty vociferously objected to the way the trustees handled the problem by butting into an academic matter, is of value, because there is some chance that in the future the trustees won't butt in (the faculty report blasted the trustees for impropriety and indiscretion). Yet we still can't help feeling that the trustees, by getting the go-ahead sign on an academic matter, won't in the future, take a hand in picking out textbooks, courses, teachers, etc.

Students must now realize that six days a week will be a standard affair, come September. The Daily Tar Heel will publish articles on how the semester system works out, and how it affects you.

Express Yourself

Editor:
As long as everybody seems to be defending NSA, I thought I'd put in my two cents. I know very little about the organization but what I do know about it, I like. I'm very glad to see that Ken Barton is writing a series of articles on the subjects, for I feel these will familiarize the campus with the activities of NSA.

There is one point I am extremely uncertain about, and that is, people on campus keep telling me NSA is supporting subversive organizations. In fact, there is a rumor going around that the Justice Department is investigating the whole NSA setup. I hope Ken will devote a future

article to answer this question of extreme liberalism in the NSA. In fact, I think it would be a good idea to list the organizations under attack and show these Doubting Tom's the true function of these groups.

I'm glad to see Carolina taking its place beside the more liberal universities in this country. Ken is doing a fine job in the writing of these articles, and I hope soon we'll hear no more rumbling about radicalism in the NSA.

Lou Wolfshoimer
(Editor's note: Dick Murphy, former Carolina student and now National Student Association president, answers this letter in another column.)

Express Yourself

Editor:

It might be well to clear up the small left by the utterances of Mr. Edward Bizzell in The Daily Tar Heel last week. Although I cannot believe Ed was really sincere, or that any of his colleagues took the letter seriously, it certainly behooves anyone who thinks to take a second look at just what is happening. And somebody needs to tell Bizzell it doesn't pay to be publicly insincere.

The Daily Tar Heel space was consumed essentially as follows: "Since when . . . you consider yourself qualified . . . consider instead your own narrow concepts . . . poor taste . . . clutter up student newspaper . . . babblings . . . the argument ad nauseum. Deeper down, Bizzell says this. "The pastor preaches a mere personal philosophy rather than the Christian religion as interpreted by the denomination of which he professes to be a part . . . mere human philosophy . . . no matter how good . . . should be confined to the classroom and lecture, leaving the pulpits of our churches reserved to the preaching of Christ's Gospel." This is known as theological claptrap.

As for your Mr. Bizzell: Your charge, proposed in a highly emotive and general fashion, and completely lacking in any specific observation or evidence, is largely

American public reasons that McCarthy is against Communism, they are against Communism, therefore they are pro-McCarthy? What good is high efficiency in the exposure of particular Communists if the cost of that efficiency is the loss of that freedom you intended to preserve in the first place? What good are your efforts to oust those who would overthrow your government and your set of values if in the process you yourself overthrow the fundamental values on which your government is based?

In the last analysis, does the mere fact that one political system is called "American" (McCarthy type) and another is called "Communist" make any difference, if in function they are the same?

An open letter to the childish, vitriolic, vindictive, sophomoric and "bravely" anonymous writer of the odious ode (in which is questioned the propriety of said editorial):

I do not know whether Charles Jones read what you wrote (either before or after publication) but I'm sure he didn't appreciate or like it.

Of course, you have a right to your own opinion, but when you set yourself up to assay the worth of others' opinion you should be a little more conscientious.

I take issue and exception to several of the things you said as well as the general tone of the poem (?) which I consider an

abomination of good literary taste and a subversion and prostitution of art (?) for political and theological purposes.

Charlie took his stand (well known) years ago and is content to stick to it. His life, far from "ruined," is a symbol of inspiration to us all, lending hope and courage to true Christian convictions—the living, doing, acting, thinking of what should be "not just an ideal" but a realized personal conviction, attainable for us all—at least in part.

It may just be that Charlie does not feel toward them as you do. After all, they may be acting in what (in their conscience) constitutes the general over-all good of the church. Certainly no one doubts that dissension has existed for some time.

Also equally evident is the clear fact that the congregation is almost solidly behind him (about 11 to one). Now the breach can hardly be closed with the type of thing you wrote. Antagonistic attacks on the Presbytery can only serve to widen the already existing gulf of opinion between the pastor with most of the congregation on one side and the Presbytery with a few dissenting members of the congregation on the other.

Nothing in Charlie Jones' make-up indicates that he holds anything but Christian charity for those who differ with him or oppose him. He's too big a man for that. He will come out of all this not smaller, but in the long run greater and finer—fully vindicated and justified.

Pebble Ernest Barrow
P.S. May I refer you to the Beautitudes as given in the 5th chapter of Matthew, verses 10 and 11.

And, oh, yes—sign your name larger and round (big and bold like John Hancock) for all to see—don't hide behind a cloak of anonymity.

Editor:
Senator Price Daniels' assertion (Tar Heel Feb. 20, 1953) that Truman's order creating a Navy oil reserve of the tidelands is "arbitrary" and "without legal au-

