

The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-eighth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Richard Overstreet, Chairman.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff, and all reprints or quotations must specify this.

NOVEMBER 12, 1960

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 51

The Next Secretary Of State

Sometime around Thanksgiving President-elect John F. Kennedy will break the suspense which has been hanging around the nation and appoint his secretary of state. Our next President seems to have quite a flair for the dramatic, since the country can go from one mystery right into another thanks to his preference for waiting a while to make his choice.

There are three names which crop up regularly when discussion turns to the subject of our next foreign relations general: Representative Chester Bowles, Senator William Fulbright and Adlai Stevenson. All of these men are extremely capable and Kennedy would do well to choose any of them.

Of the three, however, we much prefer either Fulbright or Stevenson. Bowles, while a brilliant man, does not seem to us to have the international reputation that the other two have nor does he seem possessed of the same qualities of leadership which they so fully possess.

Fulbright, whose name is a byword on college campuses because of the famed Fulbright Scholarships, is a man of tremendous ability and drive. His work as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has shown him to be one who is deeply concerned with the state of American prestige, respect and power.

Stevenson, however, is the best of the crop. Not because he is a

great military mind or one known for his ability to make fast, accurate decisions; but rather because of the brilliance of his mind and the warmth of his heart have made him perhaps the most beloved of all Americans beyond our shores.

The Stevenson image is one of friendliness and concern, and it is this image which Senator Kennedy seems intent upon pressing not merely on our friends but our allies as well. In Latin American Stevenson is regarded as a man of peace; in Europe he is regarded by some, particularly in touchy France, as a minor idol. Doors which would open to few would open to him.

The next secretary of state will face a tremendous job, one steeped in difficulty and hardship. He will have to sew back together a series of alliances, pacts and friendships that has slowly disintegrated under the fire of "brinkmanship" diplomacy first espoused by the late John Foster Dulles.

He will have to cement together the American people in a concerted effort to raise not only our military power but our national morale as well. He must instill in us, along with the President, the strong belief in ourselves and our nation.

We believe that the man for this job is unquestionably Adlai Stevenson. His strength of mind and character would soon be transferred to both the American people and the entire free world, and we all would march toward peace under his direction.

A Republican And His Party

Under normal circumstances nothing can make this staunch Democrat less happy than a victory by a member of the Republican Party. But, as is always the case, there is an exception to the rule. His name is Charles R. Jonas, and he is the congressman from North Carolina's 10th District.

Jonas's victory over Democratic challenger David Clark, up for his second shot against the erstwhile incumbent, was of surprising proportions. His lead was approximately twenty-eight thousand votes, which is considerably more than respectable.

Otherwise, the Republican Party made a very poor showing in North Carolina. Vice-President Nixon lost the state by some seventy thousand votes, while Stevenson in 1956 was able to defeat Eisenhower by a mere fifteen thousand. Robert Gavin was soundly trounced by Terry Sanford for the governorship.

In the North Carolina House of Representatives the Republican Party increased its membership considerably—there are now fourteen Republicans in that body. Another seat is in considerable doubt and will not be decided until a ballot box missing in Alexander County can be found to determine the outcome of a very close race.

So, out of all the Republicans on the North Carolina ballots, only Charlie Jonas was able to accomplish anything, and many North Carolinians, including some Democrats, seemed happy about this continuance of a good voting pattern down in Mecklenburg County and the rest of the 10th District.

If the rest of North Carolina's Republican Party could conduct itself as has Congressman Jonas there would be considerable difference in the state's voting actions. He has been and is a good representative, one whose record shows both allegiance to his party and the ability to take rational, thoughtful stands on all issues. He has been a credit to his party and his district.

If Robert Gavin had conducted a campaign similar in tone and gentility to Jonas's; if he had been a little less intemperate; if he had based more of his statements on fact and less on hearsay; if these and many other things had been true, he might be governor.

These suppositions, however, are but "ifs." The Republicans still have a long way to go, and this election has made that way all the longer. In between now and the next election, they might do well to consider the nature of the course they have followed, and look to Charles Jonas for an example of a winning, excellent Republican.

Editor Attacked

To the Editor:

In *The Daily Tar Heel* of November 8, 1960, you made the following statement in your editorial lauding Mr. Kennedy's proposal for a "Peace Corps": "In other words, this program would enable those college graduates who do not wish to waste two years of their lives in a peacetime army yet who do wish to serve their country to spend a few years in constructive service of a peaceable nature."

Since when is serving one's country as a member of its military forces a "waste" of one's time? Perhaps you do not believe that our peacetime military machine is a deterrent to those who would forcibly or otherwise impose dictatorial rule on the world. Granted that many men have said their time in uniform, be it two years or more, was "wasted"; however, the time one spends in the military is to a large degree what he makes it. It can be a period which he looks upon with pride or one which he regrets, depending on whether he applied himself.

Many complain that they could be making more money as civilians, but have they ever thought that those who served in past times of war and peace made it possible for our country to remain a free land in which their descendants—maybe you and I—could work at the jobs they choose and live as free men. Their service may well be one of the reasons that we, Mr. Editor, can now attend the University instead of being an inmate at a slave labor camp.

Wilber R. Boykin

BOB SILLIMAN

Wastemakers 'Glut Market With Unwanted Goods'

SOCIOLOGIST Vance Packard has the rather disconcerting habit of telling Americans, in a trio of books, how they are duped by the captains of American industry. In his first book, *The Hidden Persuaders*, he told of advertising firms appealing to frustrated desires—through ads of various sorts—to sell products. *The Status Seekers* revealed the motions that class-conscious adults go through to prove that they are really members of the upper elite—even if the paycheck is only \$80 per week.

In his latest effort, *The Waste Makers*, Author Packard sees Americans as a nation of manipulated gluttons: a people that consumes unwanted commodities for the sheer pleasure of buying. In short, we are all hedonists.

AUTHOR PACKARD does have a point. Americans consume more goods than any nation in the world. Gone is the old Yankee concept of thrift. Gone is the institution formerly known as "saving for a rainy day." Replacing these time-proven virtues is the credit card, buying on installment, and purchasing for the sheer pleasure of spending money.

The black villain in this melodrama of the decline of American character is the manufacturer. These twentieth-century Simon Legrees must continue the boom prosperity of the 1950's by selling more and more products. But there is a problem: the market is saturated.

Mr. American Buyer already has a late model car, a new refrigerator, and a smoothly functioning television set. Whatever is the manufacturer to do?

THE OBVIOUS solution is to sell products even if the consumer has no need for them. Make the buyer want the product. And there are many devious means of accomplishing this. Clothing sales are bound to increase if the manufacturers change the styles every two years. The same applies to automobiles—cars are no longer valued for their comfort, or engine performance, but rather for their style changes.

The most insidious device for selling unwanted goods is to produce goods that depreciate rapidly, thus necessitating the buyer to replace the worn-out commodity often. Packard cites several instances where products might be improved—but manufacturers ignored the improvements because the products would last longer. The sociological term for this is "planned obsolescence."

Another instance in which Americans are waste makers is the phenomenon known as the "throw-away spirit." Products today are tailored for the lazy consumer—but it is costing him

money. Consider all of the "instant" products—instant whipped cream, instant chocolate syrup, spray-on hair products. All of these goods cater to the individual who does not care to bother with the "messy" preparations. All the buyer has to do is "throw away" the commodity after use. Packard estimates that the cost of preparing these items—reflected in increased price—is costing the average American \$500 per year.

ONE of the worst charges leveled against manufacturers is that they have convinced Americans that they are "unpatriotic" if they do not spend money. The logic behind this little gem of wisdom is that by saving money, Americans are not stimulating the economy. By harboring hard-earned dollars, they are stifling

American industry. In short, Keep America Strong by Going Into Debt.

But Author Packard does not make his accusations without facts—he marshals much evidence behind his charges. The following are several discoveries that Packard made in the process of his investigations: A completely furnished home, bought on the installment plan for \$19,500 in reality cost \$37,000 because of the interest payments. Credit cards are now being issued to teenagers to increase the buying spirit. A leading economist contended that the prosperity of 1959 rested solely on the success of the 1959 automobiles. A leading flashlight manufacturer purposely decreased the length of the life of flashlight bulbs to increase sales. Automobile manufacturers me-

thodically plan to make an automobile style obsolete and "unfashionable" in two years.

THE MORE serious implications of Packard's theory are many. First, by glutting the American market with unwanted goods, we are becoming a nation of debtors—the identical conditions that caused the 1929 depression. By our extensive manufacturing operations, we are rapidly going through our supply of natural resources. By 1975, notes Packard, we shall be from 25% to 100% dependent on other sources—foreign countries—for our resources. At the same time, Packard cautions against overconfidence in "miracle solutions" to the resource problems.

Let's face it, gang, Vance Packard is right. We are all gluttons.

Allen B. Thomas



Another On Attack

To the Editor:

In your editorial of November 8, 1960, entitled "A Forward-Looking Proposal," you made the following statement:

"... this program would enable those college graduates who do not wish to waste two years of their lives in a peacetime army yet who do wish to serve their country to spend a few years in constructive service of a peaceable nature."

Mr. Editor, this statement implies to me two things: First, that serving in the defense of one's country is a waste of time, and second, that college graduates are "too good" to serve in the armed forces. Let us consider each of the implications.

First of all, since when is service in defense of one's country a waste of time? I suppose that in your judgment, the millions of Americans who have fought from the trenches of the Marne to the beaches of Saipan to the hills of Korea were wasting their time. I suppose that Arlington is the resting place of men who "wasted their time" by giving their lives that we today may live in freedom.

Perhaps you would like to ask Mr. Eisenhower if he thinks he has wasted a lifetime defending this country which he has led for eight years; or perhaps you would ask Mr. Kennedy if he thinks he wasted the years he spent defending the country which he will lead during the next four years. "But," you may argue, "I was referring to a peacetime army." You apparently think that such an army has no purpose aside from destroying two years of a young man's life. Now what do you think would happen if we had no peacetime army? I suppose you think that life in the world would go on as usual with K just casually remarking to Mao, "I hear that the United States has no army these days."

Our peacetime army is vital and is necessary as a deterrent for the defense of our nation. We are today involved in a struggle for our very existence, and our military strength is of paramount importance in this struggle.

In regard to the second implication, namely that college graduates are "too good" to serve in the armed forces, I will simply say this: We do not have a caste system here. A college graduate is no better than anyone else in this respect. A college degree simply means that one has either the money or the ambition to educate himself. The college graduate has benefited just as much if not more than the non-graduate, from our free society.

Allen B. Thomas

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Late Note From A Republican & Officials Supported

To the Editor:

In the past fifteen years the U.S.S.R. has again and again demonstrated to the world its methods of conquering a foreign country from within: at times a gentler process of mind-molding propaganda to render its victim plastic before the bloodless coup, at times an instigation of violent factionalism to "justify" Soviet intervention in behalf of the "oppressed" faction. This "inside-job" expansion is now an old story. Moreover, it is obvious that the U.S.S.R. does not intend to vanquish the U.S.A. by nuclear or bacteriological aggression from without. To make this fabulous American paradise uninhabitable by any human beings would be stark madness. Only some unfortunate accident would trigger such a catastrophe. Mere intelligent common sense should warn us of an "inside job" in our case also.

A university specialist in current affairs recently told me that the Communist Party, U.S.A. has died out—a widespread opinion which the Party works hard to foster. The leading editorial in a recent *Daily Tar Heel* deprecates the legal ban which prevents Americans from voting for Communist candidates. Americans evidently need some plain facts.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., still flourishes in the open, in many clever forms of disguise, and under ground. Nor is the Party legally excluded from election ballots. It simply finds that it can grow faster by other kinds of activity. A great new strategy is the "Popular Front" ("collaboration with the bourgeoisie"). Hundreds of thousands (perhaps millions) of white-collar Party members and sympathizers are

worming their way into influential positions in government (local, county, state, and federal), communication (press, radio, TV), industry and business, education, law and medicine (especially psychiatry), the Church (especially the Protestant). Each "Popular Front" is committed to using his peculiar talents and connections for the Cause, working within the American culture to (1) undermine, soften, and disrupt it—the preliminary work of demolition, (2) move toward Communism as the substitute, using the safer term "New Community." (One of their frequent terminal comments: "It would be unwise to say any more now.") These "Popular Fronters" are sprinkled freely through our society, defending freedom to introduce slavery, pleading for "peace" (?) and "disarmament" (?), trying to "atheisticize" the Protestant Church, sneering at the U.S. Armed Forces, the F.B.I. and American culture in general.

Whatever your judgment as to the relative merits of the two great American political parties, you must grant the commonplace truth that the Democrats are closer to Communism than are the Republicans. So the "Popular Front" Communists infect the Democratic Party in far larger numbers, naturally preferring to take the less circuitous of two alternate routes where the direct road is still under construction and too rough for comfort. Moreover, Southern Communists infiltrate into the Democratic Party for its better chance of winning state, county, and local elections. Hence Democrats in general and especially Southern Democrats have a greater need than Republicans to guard against dupery.

Look the Trojan horse in the mouth.

Stephen A. Emery

An Open Letter to Norwood Pratt Dear Mr. Pratt,

I was delighted to note after reading your book review in the DTH, 11/8/60, that our *Bias Majors* are on the ball. By the way, what is your minor, "missing-the-point"?

Who are you to dictate how a man should make a living? The poetry brings money, and the Beats must eat—food costs money. However, you will note that the market for their literature is not the "greedy public," but rather those appreciative individuals who see a message in Beat works.

As for this "social disease"; this is a purely relative term, relative to the name caller. However, intellectual vacuity, Mr. Pratt, is not a relative term—as it signifies a lack of a definite and measurable characteristic of the living organism. Other applicable terms are complacency and fear-of-what-is-not-understood. Perhaps, this is why Beat poetry is so obscure to you.

But, this is not the point, (after all, you don't have to buy or even read their literature) why should you care whether the Beats tolerate you or not? (You don't tolerate them.) Do you perhaps have a slight fear that they could have a valid point or two? Are you ever dissatisfied with the rigid, intolerant, unseeing environment you inhabit? Do you ever feel a twinge of social guilt about Southern lynchings, religious persecution, or today's active contempt for the intellectual? Have you ever seriously wondered who you are or why

you are here? Have you ever known the full glory of enlightened tolerance, rational thinking and objectivity, freedom from FEAR OF THE TRUTH?

Why does it bother you when the Beats withdraw into their coffee-houses and "bug" no one? Why do you "sweat it," Mr. Pratt, when they reject you?

Jean Moriarity

To the Editor:

Since Mr. Lodge appeared on this campus as a contestant for public office, neither Chancellor Aycock nor President Friday could have justified sharing his bandwagon. Neither were they under any obligation to stand in awe of Mr. Lodge's previous honors. Had Mr. Lodge visited this campus as the official representative of the United States Government, I am confident that he would have been honored by the University administration.

However, sharing the Nixon bandwagon with Mr. Lodge would have signalled "University of North Carolina" endorsement.

Both Chancellor Aycock and President Friday would have been jeopardizing the reputation of the University of North Carolina. Also, I do not believe the state is paying its officials to participate in campaigns for political candidates. I for one never anticipated the presence of either man on the stage, regardless of his own personal political affiliation. To me, either's appearance on the stage would have been as coercive as is the school teacher's peddling encyclopedias to the parents of his pupils during his off-duty hours.

Name Withheld by Request

The Daily Tar Heel

JONATHAN YARDLEY Editor
WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER Associate Editors
MARGARET ANN REYNOLDS Managing Editor
EDWARD NEAL RINES—Assistant To The Editor
HENRY MAYER, LLOYD LITTLE—News Editors
SUSAN LEWIS—Feature Editor
FRANK SLUSSER—Sports Editor
KEN FRIEDMAN—Asst. Sports Editor
JOHN JUSTICE, DAVIS YOUNG—Contributing Editors
TIM BURNETT Business Manager
RICHARD WEINER—Advertising Manager
JOHN JUSTICE—Circulation Manager
CHARLES WHEEDER—Subscription Manager

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4 per semester, \$1 per year.

The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina. Published by the Colonial Press, Chapel Hill, N. C.