

The University's Skipper: Man Who Was Chapel Hill

Chapel Hill, a wise alumnus once observed, is not a town or a university or any kind of place. It is a group of people.

It is faculty, administration and townspeople. It is students and student leaders and janitors and taxicab drivers and all other sorts of people.

One thing distinguishes these people from other people who live in communities of 11,000 population. They have a Chapel Hill slant on life. They attack problems with a Chapel Hill attitude; they ask questions with a decided trace of Chapel Hill in their voice.

One of the people who was most Chapel Hill was Skipper Coffin.

Some of his more naive students called him "Dr." Coffin; some called him "Mr." Coffin. Most folks called him "O. J." or, better, "Skipper." But all people thought of Chapel Hill when they mentioned Skipper Coffin.

He was as much a part of this place as McCorkle Place or Silent Sam or The Shack, whose unlevel floors he used to walk with the boys in the afternoon. He was as integral as the students he taught, taught in a different sort of way, because Skipper Coffin was a different sort of teacher.

Coffin believed simply in good writing, and his students reflected

that belief. He believed in being homey, and he walked and talked and drank beer with his students because he enjoyed it. When he was named dean of the School of Journalism, he said the title embarrassed him.

Like the chancellor pushing a baby-carriage down Franklin St., like Louis Graves parking his old green car in front of the Post Office, the sight of Skipper Coffin in Chapel Hill meant that, no matter how the rest of the world was going, this town was still the same.

And Chapel Hill belonged to Skipper Coffin just as much as he belonged to her. The two not only coexisted; they depended on each other.

So it was with a great sadness that we watched Skipper Coffin leave this town early last summer. For we knew that, in addition to Chapel Hill's losing one of the men who made the place Chapel Hill, Skipper Coffin was losing something very dear.

It is nice to know, however, that a lot of Skipper Coffin will stay with us. The Shack will remain, and the green oval of grass and trees will stay in front of the School of Journalism. But, best of all, there will be a lot of good newspapermen and women who are good largely because Skipper Coffin told them how.

S.C. Solons At It Again

The South Carolinians are at it again, only this time their cause is pitifully hopeless.

Led by former Gov. James F. Byrnes, a group of independents is trying to overthrow the Democrats. They recently called for a "new declaration of independence."

This is especially ironic, coming from the state where the U.S. Constitution isn't even recognized.

Meanwhile, South Carolina Democrats are calling for solidarity behind Adlai Stevenson. A Democratic victory, they say, is the only way they can be sure of getting Southern votes in the selection of federal district judges.

South Carolina independents are like most other South Carolina people, except in an election year. They farm, run businesses, gripe about the rain or the lack thereof, and sleep at nights. But let an election year come along, and they're disgruntled.

The Democratic Party hasn't done enough for them, they argue. They threaten, raise Cain at the convention, threaten some more, and maybe get what they want.

In this case, they didn't get what they wanted. So they're forming their own party to represent them.

This is good, and fine, and American. But this year it just won't work.

Third parties always have been laughing matters for most American voters. Professors of political science say their chief effectiveness lies in their putting pressure on the two major parties. Through a process of back-scratching, a third party can get what it wants from a major party, or it can cast its votes with the other party.

This is the way politicians go to national conventions and get nominated for the Presidency. The melting of a bunch of small segments into one has become an essential part of the democratic process.

But, we repeat, the South Carolina independent movement appears to have little real force behind it. Rather, it seems to be composed mainly of people who have too many gripes and too much honor to submit to the will of the Democratic Party.

We doubt that the independents will have either major party fighting to see which can incorporate the independent planks into its own platform. The independents just aren't that strong.

South Carolinians were kicked around quite a bit at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago last summer. It looks as if they would now be able to comprehend where wise politics leaves off and stubbornness starts.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editor: FRED POWLEDGE
Managing Editor: CHARLIE SLOAN
News Editor: RAY LINKER
Business Manager: BILL BOB PLEI
Sports Editor: LARRY CHEEK
Advertising Manager: Fred Katzin
Circulation Manager: Charlie Hol

EDITORIAL STAFF — Woody Sears, Frank Crowther, Barry Winston, David Mundy, George Pfingst, Ingrid Clay, Cortland Edwards, Paul McCanley, Bobbi Smith.

Staff Photographer: Norman Kantor

BUSINESS STAFF — Rosa Moore, Jonny Whitaker, Dick Leavitt, Peter Alper.

NEWS STAFF — Clarke Jones, Nancy Hill, Joan Moore, Pringle Pipkin, Anne Drake, Edith MacKinnon, Wally Kuralt, Mary Alys Voorhees, Graham Snyder, Billy Barnes, Neil Bass, Gary Nichols, Page Bernstein, Peg Humphrey Phyllis Maultsby.

SPORTS STAFF: Bill King, Jim Purks, Jimmy Harper, Dave Wible, Charley Howson.

Subscription Manager: Dale Staley
Staff Artist: Charlie Daniel
Night Editor: Woody Sears
Proof Reader: Cortland Edwards

CAROLEIDOSCOPE

Another Challenging Opportunity

Frank Crowther

Now that William C. Friday has officially taken over as the Consolidated University President, the South Bldg. focal point has become the office of the Chancellor.

Within the month we may also have a new Chancellor, and this new man may be the key to a new era of education at the University. In fact, this new Chancellor could mean all the difference in "an era of great accomplishments," as Mr. Friday put it.

To those of us who are actively interested in the outcome of this selection, the weeks are becoming more and more crucial and we have less time in which we may impress or influence those people who hold the power of selection.

I say impress and influence, because we are trying to do precisely that; we aspire to influence, impress, sway, enlighten, awaken, and induce them. In doing so, we feel justified, because we are vitally concerned with the future of the University of North Carolina.

Mr. Friday will need a man in the Chancellor's chair whom he can trust, whom he can confide in, who is honest, sincere and as dedicated as he himself unquestionably is. With this new Chancellor, he will control, for the most part the University. It is with this new man that he will embark on our new era of education in North Carolina.

And we have a man on this campus who, unreservedly, can fill the position with the same type of youth that our new President has, the energy necessitated by the position, the prestige needed to represent Carolina, a personality that literally sparkles and attracts, and finally, and of most importance, the educational competence and experience that the Chancellor must possess.

This man is William Hardman Poteat, A.B., 1941 (Oberlin); B.D., 1944 (Yale); Ph.D., 1951 (Duke).

There was a previous comment in the Daily Tar Heel which claimed that there was a movement to "railroad" Mr. Poteat into office by some "well-meaning faculty members and students."

That was an infantile attack on a serious and sincere effort.

We have not laid any tracks for a railroad; we have been working hard for the man whom we think can help the University most in the office of Chancellor. There are no selfish motivations attached.

The article went on to say that Mr. Poteat's removal from the classroom and installation into an administrative position would "sterilize the effectiveness of many of his talents..."

I don't believe that this is a question of administrative sterility



BILL POTEAT
...teacher or administrator?

ization, if there is such a malady, but one of hesitance for fear that the man would lose his creative spark and be sublimated by mental tasks.

If we look back to the duties

of the Chancellor for a moment, we will see that his talents, can be put to good use and there would be, in fact, more need to exercise them.

Poteat's logical and alert mind would be just what is needed to act in screening the faculty in his position as Chancellor where he would "recommend to the President all appointments for terms of more than one year, promotions within, and removals from the faculty and other positions, administrative or otherwise, in the institutions..."

And it is ridiculous to infer that we need a "progressive educator from some other area... with... fresh ideas" or an "outsider... to keep abreast of other leading educational institutions of this nation."

Do we suppose that Mr. Poteat is void of fresh ideas?

Contrarily, here is a man who has his most productive years ahead of him.

We have one of the best Uni-

versities in the country, and I hope it remains that way. We need not go outside our own community when we have such a wealth within. Let us draw from our own resources, not someone else's or some other region's.

It is only in the interest of keeping the University on a high plain and to continue with the same or even higher standards which are expected of our great University that we have given so much interest and contributed so much time and effort to this appointment.

William H. Poteat is a man whom we could respect, who would work diligently with our President, and who would flow smoothly into the vein of Carolina tradition of excellence, while adding the type of youth and vigor to the position that no other could.

It is without hesitation or reservation that we recommend Mr. Poteat for the office of Chancellor.

'Boy, Have They Got A Personality Cult Over Here!'



New Facts About Appomattox

The following explanation of the North's victory was slipped under The Daily Tar Heel of office door by an apparently unreconstructed Southerner.

After chasing the Union Army all over the map, even as far North as Gettysburg way up in Pennsylvania, the Confederates and General Lee were very, very tired.

The Southern Army, camped

out at Appomattox, was preparing to wipe out the Yankees the next morning, march victoriously into Washington and raise the Stars and Bars over the White House.

General Lee was resting at the Court House before mapping out the strategy for this final campaign. Into the Court House walked General Grant ready to surrender. Grant was such an in-

conspicuous looking man that Lee took him to be his orderly.

Naturally, Lee gave Grant his sword to polish. Grant, very surprised, took Lee's sword and actually thought that Lee had surrendered. He even thanked Lee for surrendering and General Lee, being a true Southern gentleman, couldn't go back on his word.

Pogo



By Walt Kelly



Li'l Abner



By Al Capp



The State Does Have Something

Wait a minute. We knew there was something nice about South Carolina.

The Associated Press says on the heads of South Carolina girls "rest five of the world's top beauty crowns—no other state can make that claim."

We always knew the Palmetto State was good for something.

SPECTATLER PAPERS:

Adlai's Campaign Time Running Out

Roger Wilk O'Horse

With Kefauver's nomination, hope faded for a wholesale swing to Stevenson among ordinarily Democratic groups in the powerful Northeastern states, and Democratic strategy turned to the farm states. If economic problems are pressing enough, they can overcome personality factors for many voters. Among farmers in some states the economic recession holds promise of obscuring strong qualms about Stevenson's personality, even though no one disagrees that the Democrats would run more strongly in the Middle West if their tickets were reversed.

On the other hand, it seems clear that more pro-Kennedy voters would swing to Stevenson if Kennedy were his running-mate than Kefauver is able to swing as the second man. In part this is simply because many pro-Kefauver voters are going Democratic in any case this year, for economic reasons.

But there is increasing doubt among Midwestern observers that even Kefauver plus the farm slump will be sufficient to turn more than normally Democratic Missouri and Minnesota to Stevenson. And, whatever happens in the Middle West, few detached observers presently see Stevenson amassing an electoral majority in the face of unwavering Eisenhower sentiment elsewhere.

General urban prosperity and the preference for Ike as a person seem destined to keep Stevenson from accumulating as much of the big city vote as he needs to win in the populous Northeastern states. Consequently, the best hope for salvaging some of these states lies among white collar and professional voters, many of whom live in suburbs and many of whom have warmed to Stevenson as they have to no other Democrat in recent times.

These people tend to think of themselves as "independents", but undeterred by their staunch devotion to Stevenson, they continue to vote Republican whenever they can. This, however, they can do only when the Republican candidate is a likeable "liberal", "internationalist", or "moderate"—i.e. Wilkie, Eisenhower, Warren.

Therefore, as one expert with a reputation for accuracy has explained, against such Republicans, Stevenson is under a double handicap: He loses Democratic-oriented voters who dislike him and can accept a moderate Republican, but is not able to pick up the votes of substantial numbers of Stevenson admirers who dislike his party.

Run him against a right-wing or personally unpopular Republican, this argument goes, and Stevenson's strength would be epic, for he would then hold most of the pro-Democrats who don't like him, and would in addition pick up an unprecedented percentage of voters in the group which constitutes a major bastion of GOP strength, New Canaan, Scarsdale, Evanston, and their counterparts around the country might then be found arm in arm with Brooklyn, Harlem, and Johnston County in the Democratic column.

Hence the critical importance to Stevenson of the Nixon candidacy and the President's health and age: If enough of the pro-Republican but pro-Adlai voters can be persuaded that a vote for Ike is a vote for Nixon, the Democratic big city defections might be offset enough in the suburbs to redeem at least some of the large Eastern states now clearly Ike's; one or two of these, plus California, which is always peculiar and where Nixon's unpopularity has had extra years to grow, plus the hoped-for farm breakthrough, plus the reunited South—and that's how the hopeful gleam gets in the eye of the ardent Stevensonite.

The trouble with the gleam is that so far there has been little progress in persuading the pro-Republican independent "moderate" who likes Adlai that Adlai's opponent in the race is Nixon. The suburbs are still 75% Ike's, and it is now Oct. 31.

THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE—PART 2

Independent Goes Republican

Dave Mundy

Why should an independent or a "Jeffersonian Democrat" vote Republican this year?

I am not a Democrat, and I am not a Republican. This, as far as my local registration books are concerned, make me an "independent." This puts me in that large group of people who votes according to issues and the capabilities of the candidates. It is from this context that I can, without hesitation, advise any and all to vote Republican nationally, vote Republican in North Carolina.

The northern wing of the Democratic Party, the "big labor" leaders, the party ADA "intellectuals," the big city machines, to all effects control the national party. They are pushing, harder than ever, the "shift to socialism." More government economic controls, larger expenditures, the "control of the masses" through larger subsidies—guaranteed cradle-to-grave security against everything except trench mouth.

A Democrat president simply means the loss of more individual freedoms. Many "states' rights" Democrats know this, yet continue to vote Democrat because their grandfathers did so back in the days when their party still retained its Jeffersonian attitude toward personal freedom. You try to figure out why.

Kyle Hayes, the Republican candidate for governor, Joel Johnson, candidate for the Senate, and Mr. Storey, candidate for education commissioner, are three of the best candidates ever offered by any party in North Carolina. I invite anyone to compare their statements over important issues—schools, segregation, taxes—with the now-traditional drive of their Democrat opponents.

So, Democrat, Republican, or Independent interested in preserving your freedoms—Vote Republican.