

## The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-ninth 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.

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.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1961 TEL. 942-2356 VOL. LXIX, No. 5

## Rise Of Conservatism?

Where are the conservatives at Carolina?

Much has been heard of late concerning the "Rise of conservatism on the college campus." Supposedly, the traditionally liberal atmosphere pervading the academic air at colleges and universities is being countered by a rising tide of conservative reaction. Barry Goldwater is labeled the new hero of the sixties collegian, and liberals supposedly are having a tough time of it.

A cursory glance at the Carolina campus would indicate that somewhere, a conservative public relations man is working overtime to create an unfounded image.

About the easiest thing to be at Carolina is a liberal, so much so that liberalism has become an overworked and often meaningless label. "I am a liberal" is a cliché as easy to parrot as "Mary had a little lamb."

The conservative at Carolina has become a very silent individual. His views, if he has any, are quietly expressed in the dormitory or fraternity, and the highly touted national conservative rise appears to be mostly myth at UNC.

The crux of the situation seems to be that the liberals are wont to be articulate, while the conservatives are observing a self-imposed silence.

Whether Carolina is predominantly liberal or not is a moot question.

But it is evident that the conservatives have lost the power of speech. The New Left is outspoken, the New Right has yet to be organized.

In many respects, this is an unhealthy situation. Most political questions have more than one side—yet Carolina is represented nationally as being strongly liberal. The votes cast by the UNC delegation to NSA in Wisconsin this summer, for instance, were predominantly liberal on issue after issue.

We agree wholeheartedly with this vote, we are surprised to find that there has been no conservative reaction to it here. Apparently the conservative faction is either unthinking, unconcerned or scared. Perhaps it is a combination of the three.

The bulk of conservative reaction has been confined to ineffectual grumbling and half-hearted groaning.

Despite all this, we are inclined to believe that there is a strong element of conservatism at UNC, although most of its weight is slung in mass.

The columns of *The Daily Tar Heel* are open to any opinion whatever its particular political orientation. If conservatism is actually on the rise, then why does the campus not hear from it? Why does student government follow an unchallenged liberal course? Why does the conservative satisfy himself with behind-the-scenes mutterings?

Conservatism on the rise? We say no.

## The Electoral College

The results of a recently concluded nationwide Gallup Poll indicate a growing popular dissatisfaction with the present system of determining the electoral vote in the Electoral College.

The poll showed that 6 out of 10 persons interviewed favored replacing the present method with one in which each state's division of the popular vote would determine the electoral vote split.

The poll also bore out that the extremely close vote in the 1960 election influenced popular opinion towards a proportional system of representation, since the number of persons favoring a proportional system rose by 11 per cent over a similar total in April of 1960.

It is gratifying to see that the majority of the people—if we can trust Gallup's findings—favor reform in the electoral college.

Following the 1961 presidential election, President Kennedy received 56 per cent of the electoral vote, yet he gained just over 50 per cent of the popular vote.

The drama of the final counting shook many people into a realization that the present "winner-take-all" method of vote division can and has resulted in the election of a president who had less than half the popular vote. There have, in fact, been eleven such men—Harry Truman, most recently. However, the opposing popular vote has always been split; and the total popular vote for one man has twice exceeded that of the winning candidate.

In the past, the prospect of having a "losing" candidate assume the office of President has twice inspired attempts to reform the Electoral College system along proportional lines.

A bill proposing such a reform was introduced in Congress in 1960, passed in the Senate, but failed to pass in the House. The bill was re-introduced in 1956 but failed to gain the two-thirds vote necessary on a constitutional amendment.

The issue, fortunately, is not dead, and it is probably only a question of time before a new bill to provide for proportional division is introduced.

We hope that it passes.

## The Chains That Bind



### WHY HAVEN'T THEY ASKED CHURCHILL?

## Who Let The Reds Take Berlin?

WASHINGTON (UPI)—Democrats and the State Department are disputing with Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Republicans the answer to this question:

"Who made the decision permitting the Russians to take Berlin single-handed at the end of World War II?"

It seems odd that neither side has called the best informed and only

decision to relate the circumstances qualified surviving participant in that and to assess the blame. That witness is Sir Winston Churchill. His testimony is in the "Triumph and Tragedy" volume of his history of the Second World War, pages 456-468.

Reading those pages, it becomes understandable why Ike didn't summon Churchill to testify in his behalf and why the State Department and the Democrats also overlooked

Churchill. Churchill's account of the colossal Berlin goof does not make Ike look good, nor the Democrats either.

THE IMPLICATION of Churchill's account is that General Eisenhower was ignorant of the political meaning of the wind-up campaign in Western Europe. Churchill rates the U. S. Joint Chiefs as equally ignorant of what the political objectives of that wind-up campaign should have been.

The jolt to the Democrats is that Churchill says President Roosevelt in March-April, 1945 was incapable of comprehending or dealing with the political implications of the swift Russian advance westward.

Churchill gives Stalin high marks for understanding these political implications and for taking advantage of exhaustion in Washington and political ignorance in the Allied military high command.

The State Department is retreating under pressure of Republican protests from a public statement implying adverse criticism of Eisenhower for failing to go all-out for Berlin in the closing days of the war.

IKE HOLDS THAT the Berlin decision was political; that is, made by the politicians in Washington and London. This Churchill seems direct-

ly to challenge. As for his own point of view, Churchill quotes in "Triumph and Tragedy," page 467, from a memo he sent to General Eisenhower April 2, 1945:

"I am all the more impressed with the importance of entering Berlin which well may be open to us. I deem it highly important that we should shake hands with the Russians as far east as possible."

Churchill also warned the general of what he regarded as the Russian objectives with respect to Berlin.

TO FDR ON APRIL 1, 1945—11 days before FDR's death—Churchill addressed a long message including the following:

"Berlin remains of high strategic importance. The Russian armies will no doubt overrun all Austria and enter Vienna. If they also take Berlin will not their impression that they have been the overwhelming contributor to our common victory be unduly imprinted in their minds, and may this not lead them into a mood which will raise grave and formidable difficulties in the future."

Churchill's book has a footnote to that message: "Actually, although I did not realize it, the President's health was now so feeble that it was General Marshall who had to deal with these grave questions."

And that, children, is how we began to lose the peace.

## Foreign News

## German Election Poses Problem

BONN, West Germany (UPI)—Until the middle of next month Germany will be ruled by a lame-duck government capable only of house-cleaning. After that, answers must be sought to some long-delayed problems.

The more pressing the Berlin crisis becomes, the more pressing these problems will become.

As of now, the betting is that the federal republic's next chancellor will be Ludwig Erhard, whose economic genius is credited with Germany's present prosperity, but who is no politician.

AFTER THAT THE name most prominently mentioned is that of Defense Minister Franz Josef Strauss.

Strauss is the man who has built the West German wehrmacht into the most powerful army in Western Europe and who is regarded as one of the most astute politicians in the Christian Democratic party.

Strauss is one of the few present cabinet ministers who ever dared talk back to the old man, and is regarded as a good possibility for foreign minister in the new lineup.

NOW TO SOME of the problems:

West Germany's immediate problems arise from the new Soviet pressure on Berlin and Khrushchev's announced intention to sign a separate peace treaty with Communist East Germany. This includes questions of increased defense spending, stepped up conscription and a longer term of service.

The long-range problem springs from the fact that West Germany is aligned firmly with the West, both militarily through NATO and economically through its membership in the West European Common Market.

In the same way, East Germany is tied just as firmly to the Soviet zone.

BUT THERE remain areas of negotiations.

West Germans as a whole appear resigned to many years of division between East and West, even though no West German politician yet has dared to say so.

So the West could live with a separate Soviet treaty with East Germany even while not recognizing it.

The chief problem is the West's free access to Berlin.

Between the East and West zones are strong economic ties which require open communications. The same principle could be a decisive bargaining point when applied to Berlin.

THE ADENAUER government took tentative, but never decisive steps toward an accommodation with Poland over the lost-Oder-Nesse territories.

It seems probable the mood of the new government will be more positive.

Peaceful settlement of the problem would go a long way toward cutting the ground from under the Soviet picture of a revenge-seeking Germany.

### DTH Forum

On September 19, William Evans became an immortal martyr in the cause against the House Un-American Activities Committee. The *Daily Tar Heel's* readers will always remember that a fine fellow named Evans lost his job because of the HUAC. Due to a twisting of reasoning everyone is misled.

Mr. Evans did not lose his job because of the HUAC, but because of the narrow-mindedness of the administration of Mt. Olive College. Evans was not convicted, but accused of Un-American Activities. A man is innocent until proven guilty, and William A. Evans was not proven guilty. Perhaps it might behoove all concerned to ponder this fact and not the validity of the HUAC.

—Albert L. Sneed, Jr.



WINSTON CHURCHILL

### Reflections

The saying "stiff in opinion and always wrong," characterizes the rural Southerners who are calculating how many "colored folks" will be killed if their schools integrate.

It's not necessary for them to be concerned. Negroes are fast moving to urban centers where they can obtain decent educations, and those who remain are too far gone to be helped by integration.

A good many of the two-thirds of the freshman class that flunk out every year come from rural white high schools, so one might conclude that Negroes would not gain very much by integration of schools. They'd do better to up-grade the facilities they have, rather than waiting for integration to do it for them.

## COMpletely Satisfactory To No One In Brazil Quadres' Successor Faces Snags

By United Press International

When Brazil's President Janio Quadros took the office from which he resigned in a fit of temper last month, he did so on a pledge of internal austerity and an independent foreign policy.

The government replacing him after days of chaos which nearly erupted into civil war, is pledged to a similar program.

But it faces the same difficulties as those which plagued Quadros, and suffers the additional misfortune that it is completely satisfactory to no one.

WHEN QUADROS TOOK office, he did so by virtue of the largest vote in Brazilian history. But the honeymoon was short. In less than a year in office, he vetoed Congress 19 times and quit after Congress overrode his 20th.

Mounting restiveness against tough

austerity measures contributed to Quadros' troubles, but important factors were his flirtations with Castro's Cuba and Red China and a growing suspicion that he would seek ways to free himself of congressional restrictions.

If by his sudden resignation, he sought to obtain this latter point a cry for his return, he miscalculated.

FROM THIS, THEN, erupted the crisis exposing the deep divisions within Brazil which merely were patched over in the hastily-conjured solution.

Brazil's constitution clearly provided for the succession of Vice President Joao Goulart, a man totally unsatisfactory to leaders of Brazil's armed forces who suspected his Communist sympathies. But the armed services also had

one of the best records in Latin America for staunch support of the Constitution.

From this came the unsatisfactory compromise wherein the constitution theoretically was preserved by a switch to a European-type parliamentary government which stripped the president of his powers and reared it in the hands of a premier elected by Congress.

### About Letters

The *Daily Tar Heel* invites readers to use it for expressions of opinion on current topics regardless of viewpoint. Letters must be signed, contain a verifiable address, and be free of libelous material. Brevity and legibility increase the chance of publication. Lengthy letters may be edited or omitted. Absolutely no note will be returned.

GOULART, POSSIBLY with fingers crossed, accepted the change but insisted the new premier be a man of his choice. His choice was small, balding, thin-lipped Tancredo Neves, a 51-year-old banker who also is regarded as one of Brazil's most able politicians.

Brazil, the largest of the Latin American nations, is a keystone in President Kennedy's "Alliance for Progress" campaign.

Should Brazil tumble into the arms of Castroism or Communism, or should it resume its reckless dash toward bankruptcy, then the whole program would have to be surveyed.

### The Daily Tar Heel

WAYNE KING

Editor

MARGARET ANN RYAN

Associate Editor

JIM CLOFFESS

Assistant to the Editor

ENS, HEWES

Managing Editors

LOUIS LITTLE

Executive News Editor

SEVE VAUGHN

News Editor

NANCY BARR, LINDA CHAPMAN

Feature Editors

HARRY W. LLOYD

Sports Editor

TIM BURNETT

Business Manager

MIRN MATHEWS

Advertising Manager

The *Daily Tar Heel* is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C. pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8 per year.

Published by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Chapel Hill, N. C.