

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 30, 1960

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 61

The New President Gets To Work

For the past three weeks the town of Washington, usually accustomed to almost any disturbance and willing to accept it with blase condescension, has been alternately stunned and exhilarated by the Kennedy storm which swept in on November ninth.

It has been, thus far, a rather exciting storm, yet one characterized by uncertainty and doubt. While Senator Kennedy has been ardently pursuing the difficult task of filling the many jobs in and around the White House that the spoils system will leave emptied, the nation has been asking itself a great number of questions about the man and his methods. The most predominant question, however, has been a very simple one: Will Kennedy be a good, reliable and strong President?

There are doubts that can and should be raised about the next President; they have been raised in the past and will continue to be raised for many a day. We and many others have long wondered whether his desire to be President supercedes his desire to be a good President; we have often wondered whether his brilliance also included tolerance and conscience. To a certain extent these ques-

tions were answered during the campaign, when it became apparent to many Americans that there is a good deal more to the Senator than had originally been suspected. Enough people were impressed with what appeared to be his sincerity and ability to vote him into the office he desired.

We are faced now with the realization of the hopes of the months that led to Kennedy's election; we are left only to wonder to what extent these hopes will be realized and to what extent we will be disappointed.

The new President has gone to work, however, and he has done so in a convincing and vital manner. There have been no moments wasted in the complicated process of changing administrations, and there have been many encouraging signs for the future.

President John F. Kennedy, though he did not receive a popular "mandate," goes into office with the support of most Americans. We have faith in his ability to do the job as well or better than he promised he would.

This is a time for national unity and strength. Out of this could grow a greater and better America.

Goals For Americans

When President Eisenhower announced his proposal to set up a commission on national goals, it appeared to be an exciting and attractive idea. Such a group, it seemed reasonable to hope, might sound a clarion call for a greater and better America and point the way toward achieving that brighter future.

Such hopes were strengthened last February when the very distinguished composition of the commission was announced, for the obvious high competence of the individuals named implied that their recommendations would carry great weight. But the commission's report published Monday disappoints these hopes. It is hardly likely to excite many imaginations or to unloose any great wave of creative enthusiasm among our people.

Of course we all want a United States in which the dignity of the individual is enhanced, prejudice of all kinds reduced, the democratic process perfected, knowledge and innovation advanced on every front, education and medical care improved, unemployment kept low, our independence preserved, and so on. But one would not think it re-

quired a formal Presidential commission with 100 experts advising it to state such obvious conclusions.

Unfortunately, the commission, in most sections, went but little beyond such generalities. Its emphasis upon compromise at a lowest common denominator of agreement is evident. The report does not even include a specific recommendation for repeal of the Connally Amendment, limiting the World Court's jurisdiction, though a concluding note makes clear that eight of the ten members, including the chairman and vice chairman, favor such repeal.

Even so, however, the commission's report on what obviously needs to be done in our nation over the period ahead will require for realization, as Crawford H. Greenwald points out in a note, "unprecedented increases in Government expenditures over the next decade." This makes the rate of growth of our economy a central issue, since only by achieving great growth can the required tax load be made supportable.

Yet the section on economic growth goes little beyond some general remarks that appropriate policies, not very clearly defined, might give us an annual growth rate of 3.4 per cent. And unfortunately, as Frank Pace Jr. notes, the commission apparently agreed it "could not enter into the more difficult and detailed problems of priorities and paying for goals achievement."

Perhaps the chief lesson to be learned from this experience is the irreplaceable role of creative, elected political leadership in our democracy. No unofficial committee of distinguished leaders having differing views can do the job of articulating and implementing national goals. That responsibility falls most heavily upon the President of the United States. In a few weeks we shall begin to observe how a new President plans to rise to the challenge which the voters' decision and our pressing national problems pose. — From the New York Times.

A Villain Steals DTH

Dear Editor:

Somewhere, at Carolina, an individual lurks in the shadows, intent on little else than destroying the American tradition of free speech.

This man, if we can call him a man, glories in destroying the issues of the DTH before we students can clutch them in our hot little hands to gaze at its informative pages to glean from them the wisdom that daily falls forth from the presses.

Sadness! Sorrow! Lackaday and dammit. Who's fouling up the works? It has been so long since I've seen an issue of that wonderful paper that I don't know who is president. My mind is a vacant chamber waiting to be filled with the ebb and flow of today's news—such as it is, after you get through with it.

We must find this blackguard, this infinitely horrible fiend who dares to steal the issues of the Voice of the Campus before I can leap jubilantly from my bed, trip over the pot that sits near it, and run outside my room to scoop up the latest offering and hustle to the john to make use of it. Read it, I mean.

Wherein does this foul villain gain such pleasures in destroying the DTH before I can pore over its fact-filled pages to find Milton's ad?

He must be stopped. Or perhaps it would be better if you just delivered the paper in the first place instead of leaving it on the presses every day, or whatever you do with it. Give man, like, give. I'm getting illiterate.

A Once-Upon-a-Time-Reader

"Just Think—Some Day He Might Become All-American Quarterback"



EXECRABLY EDUCATED, READER STATES

Gentlemen, Remove Those Velvet Gloves!

Editor Jonathan Yardley and Associate Editor Wayne King, THE DAILY TAR HEEL, Colonial Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, cc: Hon. A. M. New York City ('14 alumnus of The Phillips Exeter Academy and '18 out of Amherst College).

Gentlemen:

This Thanksgiving a distant relative came to visit bearing copies of the famous *The Daily Tar Heel* for November 19 and 20 with your arrestingly thoughtful editorials (before and after) on the football game with "Dook," won by "Carolina," the score 7-6.

Those were bold statements, gentlemen: iron-views-in-velvet-glove-words sort of thing. Well, this letter invites you to remove your gloves: I am responding.

Clearly, you don't like what you see, sportswise, on your own delightful campus year after year, do you? Observing grown men and women behaving worse than ill-mannered children—over a mere game: "only a game." These spectacles do not increase your regard for your elders, even your teachers, even your nation: that provides these in the hundreds, thousands, year after year? If the truth be told, the reverse of increased respect for your elders occurs.

That is, you are increasingly dismayed by the ridiculous puerility of it all? "Men who will never see again the sunny side of forty prance around like star-struck freshmen" you note, sardonically.

While students display "completely malicious intentions" towards their own friends-in-play, "A faint note of shame," one insists he feels, recalling the victory: "... the same hands that pummeled the back of Coach Hickey (in praise)..." had been clenched in righteous indignation": in anger at the same man weeks before.

In "righteous indignation" at an employed professor of sport for team losses: as if the coach were the intended architect of both defeat and victory: as if he were the team captain, on the field of play...

Seldom does one come upon such candor in modern American college students concerning the errors of their elders—especially concerning the conduct of sports!—on campus and off.

This is all to the good, as far as it goes: about halfway to first base: just the kickoff of what is now due from such editors.

For this reader sees more than your questioning young minds seeking reason in collegiate ridiculousness. He sees profound confusion in student minds. He sees students desperately, sometimes

even despicably, misled: even execrably taught. Not only abysmally neglecting the first, simple, kindergarten principles of good sportsmanship, but students—in American universities everywhere—betrayed, betrayed, betrayed: by their own Almae Matrae.

He sees this pedagogical treason-to-truth repeated from coast to coast, year after year: indeed, decade after decade. So repeated through the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's President Pritchett called all this "immoral to the last degree"; this appeared THIRTY-ONE YEARS AGO... And conditions today are immeasurably worse than in 1929: believe you me...

The upshot—today? Our entire nation of men and women—graduates of schools and colleges teaching what they have, now, increasingly, since about 1920—openly cynical. Knowing that college and university authorities up to chancellors, presidents and trustees permit far worse than the most lamentable bad-sportsmanship. Even in teaching football players to lie, cheat, circumvent rules.

For what is our nation thus betrayed, betrayed, betrayed? For bubbles... For caps and bells... Bought with whole souls' taskings... "Two magical digits on a scoreboard," you noted with a maturity of judgment rare as hens' teeth in mid-twentieth-century American "higher education." Thus "shame" if not quite... "ultimate degradation that must corrupt the... loyalty and support we owe the... men on the field..." is the price paid for those "two magical digits." And this sort of thing repeated thousands of times, before millions of "fans," annually.

To begin with, there is more than one stance to take in dealing with error. One is to blame one's teachers: as you may the Physical Education staff and Athletic Director in your own university; they should, long ago, have profoundly revised their policies and teachings.

Or, to be more charitable—or more scientific: the bell tolls for all of us for any man's evil, and the results thereof continue to the end of Time... It were better to blame the teachers of those who presently determine athletic policies at your university? Just as, if you should find, in the Congo, witch-doctors treating patients without anesthetics, it would hardly be rational to hold them responsible, would it?

And, of a surety, today's American physical educators, athletic directors and intercollegiate sports coaches are very like those hypothetical Congo physicians of

today: simply and abysmally ignorant of what they ought to be teaching and doing?

Now, gentlemen, your editorials cast aspersions on no persons: they but noted the ridiculous, not to say vicious, condition of affairs still dominating the campus and the minds of yourselves and your fellow-students. Indeed, the question arises whether you would have been published had you fixed the blame on any personalities, or even on any official offices. For that matter, I have not, above, named any Carolina officials as responsible for the manifest social as well as educational viciousness of what is still permitted, nay encouraged, on your campus for the sake of caps-and-bells and bubbles: "for two magical digits on a scoreboard." For your chancellor, president and trustees are busy men; moreover, up to now nobody has so much as indicated to them what ought to be done. And in modern U.S.A. higher education, ignorance is still considered a good excuse for up to manifest despicability.

But what ought to be done? A GOOD QUESTION: I shall answer it herein as briefly as possible; some of it I provided in a little book published in 1929, then rather highly praised in no less than a full column on the editorial page of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, among others: titled THE AMATEUR SPIRIT IN SCHOLASTIC GAMES AND SPORTS.

Moreover, now you have this insight in hand and mind, (or will, shortly, if you dare... to persist) you seem honor-bound to act, somehow. As follows, then:

To begin with the elementary, kindergarten principles of good sportsmanship, what? Consider that, at very least, one does not kick an opponent when he is down: this has been Anglo-American sports policy since when? Very well. But this is a negative statement: let's change it to positive? Thus:

THE MORE NEARLY EQUAL ARE OPPONENTS IN SPORTS, THE FAIRER THE GAME? Obviously. One does not pit kindergartners against college players, does one? One does—if one is any kind of a good sportsman—seek one's equals? Indubitably: that is, if one is a good sportsman? Indubitably!

Therefore the better the sportsman, the more eagerly does he seek his equals? And the better the teacher of good sportsmanship the more does he insist on his pupils playing with their virtual equals? That is obvious, too.

Then the best teacher of good sportsmanship uses the best techniques to assure that his pupils do meet their equals? Necessarily! Then—in such a milieu—

we come upon the following surprising but incontrovertible basic sportsman's code:

IN GAMES BETWEEN FRIENDS, A TIE SCORE IS THE IDEAL SCORE.

And do I hear you retort that, "This is precisely the score nobody wants in modern American interschool and intercollegiate sports!"

Do I? Even you must, up to now, have so felt: why was it "two magical points" you hailed, not "one magical point"? Because even you have not yet so much as heard of this Ideal Formula for good sportsman? But it is old, old: I recall hearing it first spoken in the great Assembly Hall of the Massachusetts State House in Boston, sometime in 1929, if memory serves. After which reporters put it on the AP wires, headed "Queer Ideas."

But if a score is not ideal, WHAT IS?

For that matter, this idea of "equality" is the very essence of Democracy—isn't it? While if you go higher up, you will discover it expresses one essence of Christianity, eh, what?

Then those who practice the opposite (Example is ever the best of teachers) are enemies of both Democracy and Christianity? It figures. I know this thesis raises a host of questions. At the same time rest assured: the answers are well in hand: have been for thirty years. The trouble is that, up to now, nobody has wanted to face up to either questions or answers. (The nation has become poltroonish?)

I didn't say that at all: only terribly misguided and execrably educated. Repeat: EXECRABLY EDUCATED (in most-important phases of education, too.)

And who most assiduously practice the opposite of "initial equality between opponents in sports"? No less than the sports coaches, surely; and the "physical educators": those who most vociferously preach that they are "character educators": forgive the tautology: the phrase is theirs...

So that last Saturday you were witness to far worse than the childishness you saw on the campus: by men who will "never again see the sunny side of forty."

More: when opposing teams are approximately equal in initial abilities, it is far easier to teach them the virtues of courage, cooperativeness, courtesy, leadership, strength, perseverance, even reason and certainly justice, than when they are not so adjusted. Indeed, one might well fashion the formula:

THE MORE NEARLY EQUAL ARE OPPONENTS THE BETTER, MORE PERMANENTLY, AND MORE QUICKLY CAN THEY BE TAUGHT

Damn Yankee Liberals

To The Editor:

I don't see how you damn Yankee liberals can come down here to the Sunny South and expect to run all of our business like you owned everything and didn't have any feelings or cares about how we want to do things.

I am a segregationist and I am proud of it and furthermore I voted for Nixon and have two copies of "Conscience of a Conservative" and think it is the greatest book ever written.

I don't think you should be in this University or in Chapel Hill or in North Carolina or in the United States or anywhere that you might bother other people with your obnoxious views.

I am for slavery and think that apartheid is great and have a lot of faith in John Kaspar who is one of the great men of the century; and just because I think these things that is no reason for you to get snotty and refer to me in such a lousy way.

I think the South will rise again because fate is on our side and progress must be made, even if people like you do stand in its way. I have a lot of faith in the ability of Jimmie Davis to straighten out some of the mess that radicals like Eisenhower and Taft got us into.

I hope you go home and never come back. I hope you fall over your own stupid words and hurt yourself badly. I hope you swallow your tongue.

A Fighter For Truth

MANY SOCIAL VIRTUES, AS WELL AS MORE SIMPLY MANLY.

Thus, those physical educators—who neglect to "equalize" opponents under their supervision, are very like surgeons who neglect to avail themselves of the results of X-rays. In the Congo, once more, this would be at least excusable: for either native witch doctors or even for grossly untrained or poverty-stricken Western civilization surgeons.

But in America—of mid-twentieth-century days? What shall be said of such surgeons: EITHER OF BODIES OR OF MINDS?

FOR TEACHERS ARE MIND-SURGEONS, EVEN BRAIN-SURGEONS...

Are you beginning to get the message, gentlemen? That, by the exercise of perhaps a bit more than a modicum of courage: virtue: manhood! you can initiate a complete revolution in the sports-policies of your famous university: FOR THE GOOD OF ALL—ALL!

Simply begin to state some of the concepts herein set forth—AS YOUR OWN: WHAT DO I CARE: THEY ARE THE INVENTIONS OF MANY: THEY ARE THE DISTILLED WISDOM OF THE RACE: ALAS, UNTIL NOW CURIOUSLY NEGLECTED EVEN ATTEMPTED TO BE GARROTTED, BY whatever "physical educators": even since about 1930...

Nor is this more than a bare beginning of what ought to be done—in both the University of North Carolina and The Phillips Exeter Academy: simply to render the teaching of sports kindergarten well done. (No wonder the nation now behaves like boys in short pants? Or worse: like natives in darkest Congo, or worse?)

What else is there? What more that will make the ideal of a tie score look like child's-play?

Patience, gentlemen! One thing at a time! Get a start on this easy one, then ask for more! For I know the "techniques" of "the educators" as well as the next person: one is to ask for more and more, until the source of wisdom is exhausted. Then the reply is: "We will consider these, discuss them with others, appoint committees..."

For of this, too, I am confident: you will be hard put to it, locally, to find a single professor of sociology or education, let alone of philosophy or religion—and not a one in such as physical education or athletics, enough to so much as challenge any of the above over his signature. So, onward!

Frederick Rand Rogers

The Daily Tar Heel

JONATHAN YARDLEY Editor

WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER Associate Editors

MARGARET ANN RHYMES Managing Editor

EDWARD NEAL RINER 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 JESTER Circulation Manager

CHARLES WHEBBER Subscription Manager

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Monday, circulation 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, \$7 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.