

Senior Class Sponsoring The Four Freshmen

Letters, Letters...

Max Frisch's 'Homo Faber': Journey Into Destruction

Frank Crowther

Max Frisch first came to my attention during the summer of 1958 when I was on leave of absence at the Brussels World's Fair. I read a favorable review of his book, *I'M NOT STILLER*, in an American paper which was being sold at the fair. The novel was described as being a European best-seller, "the first novel since World War II that has tried to exploit the rich, mixed inheritance handed down by Kafka, Koestler and Mann." At that time, in Europe, the students were talking of Camus, as always, and Romain Gary's *THE ROOTS OF HEAVEN*. The several who had read Frisch, however, were ecstatic with praise; almost all of them had their own interpretation of *I'M NOT STILLER*. Of course, I made a note to obtain the book as soon as I returned to the U. S., but somehow forgot or never got around to it. Now, having read his new novel, *HOMO FABER*, and having started, at last, *I'M NOT STILLER*, I can understand anyone's fascination and perplexity with his writing.

stand how reasonable people might fail to perceive and react against the rank injustices which characterize our present race relations. From this disturbing perception it is but a short step to the realization that the existing inequities impose a sickness on the social superiors and inferiors alike.

While the criterion of social morality may be abundantly clear, the means by which we can implement it concurrently with the other goals we cherish are woefully obscure. How, on the basis of deep prejudice, do we fashion a society which does not discriminate in terms of race? By what means, at what costs, and how fast do we approach the ideal of non-discrimination? We can't be sure. But certainly it is not enough to take some steps, small ones probably at the outset, which in turn should culminate in the right direction and make subsequent actions easier. In Chapel Hill, where the situation is not so acute and the tolerance greater, I would hope that elsewhere, the task of redressing racial wrongs may prove surprisingly and gratifyingly swift.

In whatever action we may take or advocate it should help to keep our eyes focussed on the ultimate ideal of equality. In this light the grievance of negroes who are made to stand while we whites sit at lunch counters becomes vividly apparent; so also does the indignity which negroes suffer by reason of their exclusion from our schools. And the injury, as I have said, is shared though in a different way by the segregated whites.

To picket peacefully against such evils is a valid means of registering social objection and surely it should not be outlawed. On the other hand, calm counsel may seek to discourage one or another means of protest because in a given instance it appears ineffective and possibly even perverse in its consequences. I hope this is all that our state authorities have meant by their recent warnings. It is, of course, perfectly legitimate to raise doubts concerning the overall efficacy of a particular tool in a specific setting. To issue a general injunction against entering the social arena or otherwise confronting one of the most pressing problems of our time, however, would be to compound the existing evil of racial inequality with a more serious loss of intellectual and civil freedom.

My own feeling is that college students should make the most of their "ivory tower", staying largely within its limits, savoring for four brief years the rare opportunity of unfettered, open-minded inquiry and quiet deliberation. But desert the tower they sometimes must to stand as responsible citizens on the overriding issues of their day. This is not merely a privilege. It is a duty.

James H. Blackman
Associate Professor
University of North Carolina

Editor:
In the March 17 DTH, Dick Mason and David Wilson write of Norman B. Smith. How this character has the audacity to think his actions are doing any good is beyond us. Here the point is neither that his actions are right or wrong nor that his actions are doing good or bad. The point is that he is making his actions correspond to his beliefs — something most "Carolina Gentlemen and Ladies" cannot claim.

The article referred to was just one of many which make "believe it or not" a friend to the editorial page. C's beliefs and what he stands for, we have heard, labels him an individual. How is there respect for someone who backs down from what he believes because of being called a name? Yet we are expected to do so by such articles. It is a faulty argument which fights an issue by slandering its supporters. Why can't we, in expecting others to respect us in what we believe, return the favor? We might write a little good from the arguments—or are we interested in speech itself?

Willard Turner

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY TARHEEL:
In his somewhat hysterical "Open Letter to Gov. Luther Hodges" of March 16, Mr. Frank Crowther seems strongly to imply that in engaging in sit-down demonstrations at lunch counters, Negroes are attempting to secure their legal rights. "I believe," he tells the Governor, "that, in this case, you . . . demonstrate your inability to commit yourself . . . to the way of this land as you know it to be . . ." The sit-down activities "were utilized by a people who have been denied the letter of the law, who have been denied their rights as American citizens . . ." Again, in reference to the Governor's statement that interested parties in the lunch counter controversy must adhere to law and order: "Whose law and order, governor? If you mean the established law and order of this country, I should not have to remind you that the U. S. Supreme Court is constitutionally designated and the final arbiter of the law. And this state is certainly not adhering to those laws."

I, in turn, should not have to remind Mr. Crowther that there is a Constitutional distinction between State action which deprives citizens of the equal protection of the laws, and private discriminatory action, and that whereas publicly sponsored segregation has been ruled an instance of the former, and hence contrary to the law of the land, the latter has not. The passages quoted above, while necessarily, in a literal sense, taken from context, do not, I think, misrepresent Mr. Crowther's argument, and certainly he nowhere indicates that he is aware of this distinction. A private establishment, even in being open to the public, is not, by the Constitution as heretofore interpreted, forbidden to discriminate racially. Mr. Crowther may think that it should be so forbidden, and it may be so forbidden in 1970, but it is not so forbidden now.

With other aspects of Mr. Crowther's argument, I am not here concerned. Were it shown of his wild-eyed denunciations of "authoritarian seduction" and "Southern aristocracy which reeks with anti-bellum prejudice," and the sanctimonious and impudent tears for North Carolina's "guilty" Governor, it might merit serious discussion. But it would seem prudent to substitute facts for emotions when citing matters of law, and to make clear where the law ends and opinion begins. Not everything of which Mr. Crowther disapproves is illegal.

Michael D. Clark

Editor's Corner

Be Sure To Cast Your Vote In Today's Spring Elections

Today has special meaning for us as you will soon determine as you wind your way through the text of the editorials below.

For the first time since our arrival on the campus in the fall of 1957, we are pleased to note qualified candidates seeking all offices. It is a welcome change to find every race presenting to the student body a clear choice, different political philosophies and grave ideological differences.

We have definite choices for all offices. Our votes will be cast along with the other 3,500 we expect to see express their opinions at the polls today. But, following a clearly established policy, we will make no endorsements except in the case of races where a single candidate is seeking the office.

The following offices fall into that category—Editor-in-Chief of the Yackey Yack, Secretary of the Student Body, all Senior Class offices, Head Cheerleader and a few legislative seats. In the case of these contests, we urge the student body to follow the normal procedure of checking the name of the

candidate as it appears on the ballot instead of toying around with write-in votes. All candidates for these offices are qualified and present good people to the student body. It is indeed unfortunate that no opposition has materialized; yet, since this is the case, we urge you to nevertheless give these people a vote of confidence. We are certain they will accept this as a mandate for a responsible job.

In the case of other offices, President of the Student Body, Vice President of the Student Body, Treasurer of the Student Body, Editor of The Daily Tar Heel, President of the Carolina Athletic Association, President of the Women's Athletic Association and Honor Council seats, there is a clear choice to be made.

In all of these races, we believe there are at least two qualified and sincere candidates running. We don't care how you vote. Just vote.

VOTE, VOTE, VOTE, VOTE, VOTE.

From The Editor To The Staff, Many, Many Thanks To Y'all

To All Members of The Daily Tar Heel Staff: During the past several weeks I have wondered which would be the most appropriate day for me to write this letter. I thought at first that next Sunday, being my last day as Editor, would be the one.

However after considerable thought, there was no logical choice other than Election Day.

For to me, Election Day signified both the beginning and the end of me as an Editor. It is both the good and bad, glad and sad rapped into one neat package.

On April 7, 1959, I won election to the paper's highest position. And today, March 22, 1960, a new Editor will be elected by the student body. A grand total of 319 days have elapsed since that Spring day a year ago.

One of the most difficult things for any Editor to do in his final week is to thank all

of the people who have been so good to him. It is a hard thing to do because of the nostalgia and emotions involved. Nevertheless, I will, this week, write about a hundred letters to students, faculty and administration members as well as many of campus friends who have been close to me during this challenge period.

I wanted you to be the first to receive my thanks of the 1959-60 paper. I wanted you to receive this praise publicly. And I wanted you to be first because you have been the most important, the closest, the hardest to forget.

I have never told you what it is like to sit in this job, easily the roughest and highest pressure position any student can hold. I haven't done this because nobody, not even those of you who work with me on the staff, can understand what it is like unless you have done it yourself. Therefore, I am not even sure that you will completely understand what it means to have a good staff, a really good staff as you have been, working for the paper. Only the Editor knows, and even he is at a loss for words.

I can tell you, however, that when I became Editor last year I inherited the smallest staff the paper has ever had. It was literally the skeleton of a skeleton crew. We had about four or five people who worked on a regular basis. There was only one staff member who knew how to lay out a page.

And in contrast to that, I can point to you. The present group working for the paper is the largest in the history of the paper. Many as twenty or twenty-five regulars on some sort of schedule. There are now nine of you who are competent to do layout.

There are many glaring weaknesses which I have had as an Editor. My intellectual scope was limited, my technical knowledge not the best and perhaps I have failed to meet many of the problems in a head-on manner. You have known all this. Yet, never once has your loyalty to either the paper or me slackened. You have worked in the same office with me and seen me make mistakes and do some pretty silly things. For a year, you have lived with me. Through this year, you have been far kinder, far more patient and far more understanding with me than I could ever be with you. And if you don't think this means something, you're dead wrong.

Regardless of how much I want to be relieved of the pressure of this job, I find it very difficult to say goodbye to you.

Whatever has come from the paper that is good, anything that has been constructive this year, is directly a result of your hard work. Any credit we have gotten is yours. The Editor

Dear Sir:

In an editorial last Thursday you asked faculty members to express an opinion on the recent picketing of local establishments refusing to serve food to Negroes at tables. In my opinion, members of a faculty do owe to students an expression of their personal opinion on serious moral issues. This issue seems to me to qualify as such an issue.

I feel that the refusal of food-serving establishments to serve Negroes at tables is one of many public indignities that Negroes endure in the United States. These indignities shake my sense of justice and I believe that Negroes have every right to protest against them by every legal means at their disposal. Other persons certainly have the right to join them in such protests if they feel that it is the best way to help them gain just treatment.

A university administrator shames the whole concept of a university when he advises students as a group not to follow the promptings of their own conscience on moral questions. Such statements by state officials raise questions that go well beyond the question of what position a group in the community should assume when it consumes food in public. It is one thing when Negroes suffer discrimination; that is an anachronism in our social order which by a continuance of patient protest may yet be wiped away. It is a different thing when those who feel moved to help, according to their own lights, in solving such problems in peaceful ways are restrained through fear. The University of North Carolina would not be a fit place for students or faculty if such fear should grow.

Very truly yours,
William N. Parker
Associate Professor

To the Editor
Daily Tar Heel
University of North Carolina

Your continuing concern with the problem of integration is deserving, it seems to me, both of applause and thoughtful comment. Though, unfortunately, you may meet with contrived silence and apparent indifference. Each of us has a compelling moral stake in the unfolding pattern of desegregation in our community and in the country as a whole. Moreover, whether as individuals we choose to play an active or a passive role, the outcome inevitably will be part of our doing. Today, perhaps more than ever before, it is neither easy nor desirable to stand aside.

This is not to pretend that all of the answers to this complex issue "are laid" nor is it to urge headlong action for its own sake. It is simply to recognize (as you have done) the gravity of the problem and to emphasize its immediacy. As we all know, important policies regarding racial mixing are being forged here and now. Surely such urgent matters demand both private study and public debate. The very least we can do as citizens is to express and critically examine our views and at propitious times and with sober care to enact the action which they imply.

Personally, I find it hard to see how people of good will can quarrel with racial fairness as an imperative (though not the only) social goal. In fact, they cannot and do not. If human dignity means anything, then equality—real and complete, understood and shared by all members of society—is the ideal area in which we must strive, albeit painfully.

Likewise, it is difficult to under-

What About This?

1. The nation is at war.
2. The nation is losing the war, badly.
3. The nation must exert a vastly greater effort.
4. There is still time . . . brother.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the University of North Carolina where it is published daily except Monday and examination periods and summer terms.

Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester, \$7.00 per year.

The Daily Tar Heel is printed by the News Inc., Carrboro, N. C.



Editor	DAVIS B. YOUNG
Associate Editor	FRANK CROWTHER
Assistant Editor	RON SHUMATY
Editorial Asst.	M'LOU REDDEN
Business Manager	TIM BURNETT
Advertising Manager	BARRY ZASLOV
Managing Editors	LARRY SMITH HARVE HARRIS
Sports Editor	ELLIOTT COOPER
News Editors	DEE DANIELS HENRY MAYER
Feature Editor	MARY ALICE ROWLETT
Photo Editors	CHARLIE BLUMENTHAL RON CUNNINGHAM
Night Editor	TOMMY WHITE

The New Editor

To All Students:
The new Editor of The Daily Tar Heel will take office on Monday, March 28, 8:30 days from today. His first paper will be the following day, March 29.

The present Editor will be responsible for all papers through March 27, next Sunday.

The Editor

The Fabulous FOUR FRESHMEN

Stars of Capitol Records
Appearing at WOOLLEN GYM MARCH 24



by SCHULZ

by KELLY