

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday, examination 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: \$4.00 per semester, \$7.00 per year.

The Daily Tar Heel is printed by the News, Inc., Carrboro, N.C.
EDITOR Jonathan Yardley
ASSOCIATE EDITOR Anthony Wolff
ASSISTANT EDITOR Ron Shumate
MANAGING EDITORS Larry Smith, Loyd Little
NEWS EDITORS Dee Daniels, Henry Mayer
BUSINESS MANAGER Tim Burnett
ADVERTISING MANAGER Barry Zaslav
SPORTS EDITOR Ken Friedman
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS Frank Crowther, Davis Young, Norman E. Smith, John Justice, Tommy White
NIGHT EDITOR

Letters to the Editor

Various & Sundry Subjects

To the Editor:
I would like to comment on Mr. Jack Wagoner's letter concerning President Grigg's statement in his inaugural about new academic regulations for Carolina's fraternities in which Mr. Grigg expressed the hope that "... we will obtain a relaxation of these rules ..."
I can believe one statement that Mr. Wagoner made: "I don't know." Obviously, he doesn't. Surely it is a privilege to be in a social fraternity, and the fraternity is obligated to contribute to the "promotion of an intellectual atmosphere on campus." However, I go along with Mr. Grigg that these rules should be relaxed or that similar high standards should be set for the non-fraternity community. To me it does not follow that in order to stimulate a more far-reaching intellectual community one group in that community should be required to adhere to a more stringent set of academic regulations.

nowadays create a considerable factor of power in their nation and in a few years will press the buttons themselves. As a matter of fact, the students are willing to give six or eight times as much as this university was willing to give to make their voice more effective and louder. They even decide to aid those unions which are not able to maintain themselves through their own finances.

At this point the most liberal and progressive university of the South decides to leave its national student representation because of \$1000, probably with the secret hope that a couple of other institutions might follow. It is thereby jeopardizing its national student voice. It would be a tragic joke, if under the present constellations in the student's world one of the most powerful nations could consequently no more exert its influence which thus was considerable.

The student government will organize another referendum. It will cost a couple of hundred dollars. The Carolina student will vote for it, since a North Carolina society-gazette simply does not tell him what is going on in the world today. And if he is reluctant, there will be enough "responsible and farsighted leaders" who will tell him that those \$1025 are a mere waste.

I say, give NSA more money so that it will become more powerful. If you think it cannot help you internally, because you consider your student government so advanced that NSA experience is without benefit, then never underestimate its importance abroad. The world has become too small.

Volker Berghahn

To require more of one group than others tends to alienate that segment from the larger community. It is my opinion that such a situation, therefore, subtracts much more than it adds to the "promotion of an intellectual atmosphere ..."
Bob Foxworth

(The following letter was received by a Chapel Hillian whose name has been withheld by request):

Cheers, greetings, and salutations.
Thank you for your good letter and the important ammunition that you inclosed in the form of the astoundingly courageous "open letter" from the TAR HEEL'S Crowther to Governor Hodges. I'm proud to still be able to count you among my listeners.
All good wishes.
Edward P. Morgan
American Broadcasting Company
Washington, D. C.

An Open Letter to Anthony Wolff:

I have just finished reading the first of your series of articles attempting to justify the loss of the Carolina team on the "College Bowl." Again, you have ingeniously succeeded in obfuscating the real issue by resorting to a stream of polemical cant.

You avoid the question of your own guilt by attacking Coach Tatum (the traditional whipping boy for the campus intellectual elite), the "fans" (us non-intellectuals) and the University News Bureau.

Your ritualistic condemnation of Tatum is to be expected, but really now, is winning as evil as you make it out to be? You offer as the sole reason for your participation: "We enjoy games." Come now, Mr. Wolff, assuming that you had won (granted, this is a radical assumption) you would have probably been castigating us "fans" for not showing proper appreciation for intellect by greeting you at the airport — as were your "rivals," "Professor" McGuire's boys.

You imagine yourself as exposing the University News Bureau. A public relations outfit? What else? Pete Ivey is doing precisely the job he is paid to do. He was propagandizing your participation in the "College Bowl" in an appropriately digestible form for mass consumption (the American public can only appreciate intellect in the form of regurgitated fact).

We "fans" at Carolina cannot be differentiated from the American public. This is why we "fans" are so disheartened by your defeat. We looked up to you, Mr. Wolff, as a member of the intellectual elite. Now that image has been destroyed. Where are we to turn?

I think we can reject your glorification of defeat as a poor attempt to rationalize yourself into martyrdom, e.g. "We went down to defeat in order that the superficiality of the "fans" and the News Bureau might be exposed." Your candor is admirable, but your attempt to absolve yourself by placing responsibility on the "fans" and the News Bureau does not succeed. You should have known that the "College Bowl" is merely a cleaned up extension of the now defunct quiz programs that fraudulently peddled "intellect" to the American public.

Like the defenders of Mr. Van Doren, you consider yourself victimized by circumstances. Yet you are guilty on two counts. First, you willingly submitted to a hoax — a misrepresentation of intellect. Second, and this is unforgivable, you lost at your own game.

Taylor MacMillan

Dear Sirs:

In the last few weeks we have seen an increasing number of integration pins being worn by many of the students here at Carolina. This has caused me to wonder just why so many southerners are advocating integration, while I am from the north and will not take a stand for this integration. Before I came to the south, I wondered why integration had not taken place down here as it had up north. But at that time, I did not know the whole story. Integration is a good thing — in the north. But the situation is entirely different down here. In the first place, the ratio of Negroes to whites is greatly increased in the south. Also, the standard of living for the Negro in the north is a good bit higher than it is in the south. I think that everyone realizes that integration will take place in time, but that is the key word, time. Without a doubt, a very serious problem will arise if integration is forced upon the people of the south. The school that I attended began to integrate Negro students into our classes, as opposed to a separate class containing only Negroes, when I was in the sixth grade. Not much trouble arose, but I had only 5 Negro students in my class. How many would be in the classes here if integration were to take place at the present time? As for these sit down strikes and other demonstrations, I feel that more sensible individuals, both Negro and white, have and will continue to avoid them. This is an almost senseless ordeal that only makes for more trouble and tension. In the future, integration will have its way and the majority will favor it. This will be necessary if we plan to improve, as well as maintain, our democracy. The only thing that must be realized is that such matters do take time, and cannot be forced on people.

Larry G. Steele

The Editor:

There was so little challenge which came out of the Carolina Symposium that to continue content on its real failures may only be a further bore. The more intimate dialogues the various speakers held in seminars and private conversations were probably more beneficial than the majority of those dull harangues on the same theme with the same labyrinthine befuddlement about what to do.

The high spots admittedly were there. But there will be real disagreement about the less sparkling performances. Surely someone has to differ in part with the Tar Heel columnists, Lewis and Mayer, who rightly bludgeoned much of the Symposium program.

It may be only a minor cavil to point out that while John Wild had a good metaphor going, he brought confusion but no brilliance to expounding it in terms of concepts of man. In addition he made no mention of any of the contemporary visions of human existence in modern arts which are not properly classified as "Existential." On Existentialism itself Wild is hardly an auditor, let alone a catechumen.

Of his successors on the panel only Desan chose

Humphrey Plays A Losing Hand

We have always considered Hubert Humphrey a man of great integrity. His fights within the confines of the United States Senate for the liberal cause have been conducted with considerable dignity and aplomb.

His last minute rejection of the Mock Democratic Convention's speaking engagement was not carried through with such finesse. Fortunately, Oklahoma's Representative Edmundson has been able to fill his shoes, but these shoes are hard to fill in such an event.

It was quite a coup for the Convention to have been able to secure the services of a bona-fide candidate for the Presidency as keynote speaker. This was to have been for many the highnote of the entire sessions, for it is through personal exposure that one can make his best judgement of a person.

We grant readily that the trying West Virginia primary is of considerable importance to the Minnesota Senator, as a result of the fact that the national press has decided to blow these mish-mash events all out of proportion until they assume the stature of the actual November vote. Humphrey is correct in realizing the necessity of his being in West Virginia to get out and shake a few of those

folksy mountain hands.

He is quite incorrect, however, in underestimating the importance of a major college mock convention. Students, by nature of their youth, naturally reflect the opinions and prejudices of their elders; at the same time, they have reached college age and their parents will listen to what they have to say.

The convention would have been of considerable use to the candidate for two primary reasons: he could have tested the wind in this part of the country, and he could have tried to make a good impression on the youth of North Carolina. The wind will not blow too well these days, because people do not like to be turned down at the last minute and left in a hole.

It would have been all right if he had turned us down in January or February. We might have been able to find Symington, Johnson, Meyner or some of the other potentials willing to come - Kennedy had already rejected an invitation (in plenty of time for us to find another man).

This was an inconsiderate and probably unnecessary action. It took some of the glamour from our little convention, and it took a lot of lte shine off Mr. Humphrey.

Uncle Syngman's Cabin

Things are settling back to normal in South Korea again. Grand Old Man Syngman Rhee, 85-year old four term potentate of the people, has re-established his final and ultimate supremacy. The rebellion has been quashed.

A few days ago 100,000 South Korean students saw fit to protest the re-election of Herr Rhee in the only way that students ever see fit to protest anything; they banded together, swarmed through Seoul, and made a great deal of noise.

The Rhee government, acting as all good governments do, saw fit to react to this demonstration in the most violent means possible. Approximately 150 people are now dead because they dared to rise up and protest what they considered injustice. The New York Times reported a pair of revealing incidents:

"Many Koreans knew the story of the unfortunate jeep driver for Chosun Ilbo, a prominent independent newspaper. He was taking a photographer to an assignment. When the cameraman identified himself at a roadblock in central Seoul a policeman fired at him point-blank. The bullet passed through the photographer's coat without harming him and killed the driver.

"Koreans in the street were talking also of a 13-year old boy who was shot and killed in front of the National Assembly building in bright sunlight this morning. No one knows why, since the curfew had been over for four hours and the area was guarded by heavy tanks and armed soldiers stationed on the sidewalk every few yards.

"One hospital alone reported that twenty-three were dead on its premises. The total unofficial count of fatalities was more than eighty, with more than that wounded or hurt. Authorities are apprehensive of the effects if the citizenry demands a mass funeral service."

The battle goes on. This is the same battle fought by the Jews against Hitler, by the Hungarians against Soviet oppression, and even by the Chinese people against Chang-Kai-Chek. It is the battle of the underdog against the kingly, and it is invariably a losing battle. These people are fighting for more than their right to cast a fair ballot; they are fighting for their freedom.

This unwillingness of the Rhee government to allow its people freedom was eloquently pointed up in a post-rioting statement from the President. After a few words of soulful, heartfelt sorrow, he concludes by saying that the Korean people must "display their patriotism and follow the instructions of the responsible authorities ... we can go forward together as a united people faithful to the principles of law, of order and of justice."

Never is freedom mentioned. The only freedom implied is that of obedience or disobedience. The latter is suicide, and all South Koreans know it.

Syngman Rhee has fashioned for himself a dictatorship. Under the post-Korean War blessings of the Eisenhower Administration he was allowed to create a nation bound, and shackled to his iron hand. Now his rulership is being contested.

It appears that, like all dictators, Syngman Rhee has been turning about uneasily on his seat. He apparently found it necessary to help his cause with an extra vote or two at the ballot box; the people, apparently, object.

Of course no one has proved that he allowed the boxes to be stuffed, but that is immaterial to the central issue: the people are dissatisfied. They are obviously beginning to stretch their muscles and to find that chains do not make for easy muscular movement.

As the old saying has it, the natives are getting restless. Syngman Rhee is in the cabbird seat.



by WALT KELLY

by ZHUCHS

to show that Wild was conceptually wild. Natanson spoke forcefully, if in some respects wrongly, on a significant phenomenological — or human — problem, death. As for Poteat, we heard about as much theological bombast as public decency can stand; there is a word in the dictionary which characterizes such "ministers of the evil passions of others."

The mid-phase of the Symposium needs no discussion from me. But the Tar Heel columnists in their "Symposium Wrap-up" distorted Rexroth's performance with the very stupefaction which he himself has attacked elsewhere in quite useful and coherent addresses on contemporary education.

Two things were ignored in toto by these writers (and probably by other detractors). If they heard him at all, they ignored the man himself for the terms of his popularized publicity. Further, if they had listened to Rexroth, they would have heard him deny that he was a cloak-and-dagger jazzbo, and affirm, not something about himself, but about the exhausted state of contemporary literature. Those who need reminding about the social rebel Rexroth was discussing ("reverence for the pornography of the past" they call it) should consult the brief note in Approach, Fall, 1958. Seems Camus was talking about the same rebels.

There are a small number of persons on this campus who know the bare necessities about Rexroth. Surely there are none among the Tar Heel censor. It would be shocking to admit that Rexroth's reading of his own poetry was the most competent and engaged performance from any poet who has read here this year.

Briefly again, there is not a word about Rexroth in the summary of the Symposium which is true. Further, the columnists made themselves good exemplars of our present instinct for making facts out of rumors and "doctrinal" presuppositions, and for maintaining the lowest possible level of sensory and intellectual discrimination. Rexroth declared that the sick, sick, sick days are over, while our local journalists are dedicated to the smug conditions out of which the Beats generated. Why send us off on a jag again?

Richard Rickert
(Poetry Editor, The Carolina Quarterly)

Dear Editor:
I wholeheartedly agree with you that the educated person should be "aware of his heritage." However, my contention is that this awareness is not enough. One can study philosophy, read great classics, evaluate profound historical events endlessly. This may improve one's mind, further one's intellectual curiosity and make one more fully aware of his heritage. But what good will this knowledge do for him or his fellow man if it cannot be applied to the existing environment?

My main grievance lies in your apparent misconception of the professional education. A professional education strives to make the individual aware of his heritage, but it also gives him an opportunity to apply this awareness to life. Who can be more emotionally prepared to meet the problems of both life and death than the student who studies the theories of philosophy, the classics of literature, and the events of history one day and the next day is given an opportunity to apply this knowledge in dealing with the needs and feelings of suffering people?

I personally feel that "both contemporary education and contemporary America" need to find a compromise between the production of "mechanized creatures" and the production of idealized thinkers. Granted, this is not an easily solved problem nor one that can be solved overnight.

However, whether we like it or not, our world is becoming more specialized. What the advocates of an academic education must fight against is the production of mechanical robots, mechanical in either thoughts or action. They must strive to produce individuals who can perform specialized skills with an understanding of the implication which these skills will have on the heritage which they are helping to form in the world today.

Jane Huber
Sophomore Student Nurse