

# The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-ninth year of editorial freedom, unbampered 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.

October 31, 1961 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 36

## Atmospheric Testing

Displaying complete disregard for world opinion, Premier Khrushchev has gone ahead with the explosion of a nuclear super-bomb.

This obvious contempt for the feelings of the world community has led some observers already to believe that Khrushchev has decided to forego all attempts at conjuring an image of a peaceful nation which arms only for protection, and pursue a policy of direct and obvious coercion.

The explosion, then, is reduced by this logic, to a bluff which will force the U. S. to give up part or all of her claims in Berlin. By holding the threat of nuclear war over the heads of the nations of the world, Khrushchev thinks he can contain U. S. opposition.

In response to this coercive approach, some in the U. S., notably New York's Governor Rockefeller, have come up with the solution that the U. S. should counter by resuming atmospheric testing of her own.

We can think of no course more ridiculous than the resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests by the U. S. Such a move would be nothing more than an approval of the Russian move, and an admission that nuclear threats are the only deterrent to war.

ing more than an approval of the Russian move, and an admission that nuclear threats are the only deterrent to war.

Governor Rockefeller's proposal is nothing more than a continuation of the U. S. policy of reaction, of countermove rather than positive action.

For the U. S. to step into the atmospheric test arena, when she now has bombs perfected which, on the testimony of experts, can deliver a death blow anywhere in the world, would be nothing more than a rash response for the sake of showing our power.

For the U. S. to join the Russians in filling the air with fall-out, even though it would not push us over the danger point, would be compounding the Russian error. We cannot allow ourselves to be frightened into rattling weapons as a defense mechanism.

We need to protect ourselves, but the resumption of atmospheric testing goes far beyond the call for defense and falls into the category of frightened response, and a dangerous response at that.

## Old Joe's Bones

The following paragraphs are from a Chapel Hill Weekly editorial commenting on the efforts of Colonel Henry Royall to brand participants in the recent conference on the first amendment as Communists or sympathizers.

We have nothing but contempt . . . for Colonel Royall and anyone else who attempts to brand a man as a Communist by implication, by innuendo, through the

guilt by association technique, and because of sheer and unrelieved prejudice.

Without hearing the first word uttered at that conference last Friday, Colonel Royall charged that God was pushed out of His Holy Temple by anti-Christ activities and he urged the Christian Patriots of Chapel Hill to join him at the tocsin. If any Patriots should happen to answer the Colonel's call, we hope they will come with a clapper other than the dusty bones of Joe McCarthy.

## What Happened

For those who are still interested in what happened to the "major foreign policy speech" slated for delivery by President Kennedy here, Oct. 12, the answer has now been

made public.

The truth is that the President had the text of what was definitely a major policy speech on the plane with him, but got into a hassle with the coterie of braintrusts accompanying him, and decided not to give it.

That is the reason for the re-hashed campaign speech that was delivered.

### Help Needed

On the front page of this issue, an announcement appears asking for volunteers to help with the folding and handling of 6,000 copies of a DTH special issue on the bond election. These papers will be mailed to the parents of in-state students to encourage them to vote for the bond issue.

In order to accomplish the task in time to get the papers home in time, over 100 people will be needed. We urge every student who is interested in the passage of the bond issue to help. Those who can assist in this project will meet at 7:30 tonight in the Rendezvous Room, GM.

### The Daily Tar Heel

WAYNE KING

Editor

MARGARET ANN RHYMES

Associate Editor

LYONS LITTLE

Executive News Editor

BILL HOBBS

Managing Editor

GARY BLANCHARD

Assistant Editor

JIM CLOFFELER

Assistant to the Editor

STEVE VAUGHN

News Editor

NANCY BARR, LINDA CRAVOTTA

Feature Editors

HARRY W. LLOYD

Sports Editor

DAVID WYSONG

Subscription Manager

JIM ESKRIDGE

Circulation Manager

ED DUBREE

Asst. Sports Editor

JIM WALLACE

Photography Editor

TIM BURNETT

Business Manager

MIKE MATHERS—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 in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8 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 Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

## DTH FORUM

# Found In A Big Fat Mailbag

## 'Children's Group Nominating Mouse'

To the Editor:

Recently I had the great pleasure of attending a political convention presented by one of the University's leading parties. To my amazement and disappointment, the meeting was not a convention, but a mob of animals run by a political machine.

These students, who claim to be educated, acted like a group of children at a cartoon show while Mickey Mouse is being nominated for offices. Students boomed and hissed so loud that at times some speakers were not heard. When the so-called convention did settle down, many did not know who they were voting for and those who did discovered that their delegation was pledged to a certain candidate.

I seriously ask you, the students at UNC, to open your eyes and examine your student political parties. If you do not take an active and serious interest in your parties now, what type of active interest will you take in national politics later. It is my sincere belief that our political parties should conduct themselves in a more serious manner, instead of the frivolous show, I observed a few days ago. Above all, do not be afraid to criticize or change your government or political parties—this is the only way they can be improved.

—Wyatt Hart

## Dictatorial Censors

To the Editor:

The TAR HEEL is probably the single most important means of communication on campus, and as such possesses tremendous influence. At present, however, it only represents the editorial viewpoint. The students help support the paper financially and should be guaranteed a few more "commenting" rights than they have at the moment. If a student writes a letter of personal opinion, it is subject to almost dictatorial editing under the statements contained in the "About Letters" section.

On Tuesday, an editorial appeared that said the Yack Beauty Contest must have been more important than the Operation Abolition film because the Contest had late permission. The editorial did not say that Women's Residence Council

only grants permission for the event that the permission is requested for, and that the sponsors of the film did not request that permission. Granted, this is only an isolated example; however, the paper often criticizes editorially various segments of our Government, such as HUAC, and even other campus affairs. Then they ask the faculty editorially for more freedom of the press, a freedom that they refuse to extend to fellow students.

Why can't we be guaranteed a little short space somewhere — perhaps a weekly four column inch — to put forth divergent views or factual additions concerning the week's editorials which would not be under the present rigid censorship?

Bolling Puller

## "It Seems THEY'VE Decided To Start Influencing US"



## Readers Debate The Debate

To the Editor:

On May 12-14, 1960 the House Committee on Un-American Activities held its hearings at the city hall in San Francisco, California. On October 23, 1961, several hundred UNC students tried to attend a controversial film dealing with the so called "Riots" resulting from the improper practices of the Committee. This film, "Operation Abolition" was to be shown in Carroll Hall at 8:30 Monday night. By 8 p.m. the auditorium was full; people were sitting in the aisle, on the window ledges, and many more were gathering outside the door.

By 8:30 some 300 students were assembled on the steps and in the adjoining area of Carroll Hall. Some carried placards advocating their views:

One read, "In God we used to trust, now we have HUAC." another referred to the historical basis: "32 Crucifixions, 1,500-Torture chamber, 1,700-Witch burnings, 1800-Guillotine, 1900-Gas Chambers—HUAC means progress." another placard requested that we "Support Our HUAC, Volunteer for their black list."

And so it went—but the uniformed police guards at the door stood firm

and let no more enter, except a few card-carrying faculty members, a placard carrier who said he was working for the American Legion, and some coeds who were better looking to the police than the rest of the crowd.

Somebody felt that this was unjust and he yelled, "Break down the Iron Curtain!" someone else cried, "Let's have a Communist inspired riot." But this was not acceptable, because the crowd realized that if somebody took pictures, they would be shown to the students at San Francisco next year, and this would be too democratic. So the 300 students quietly dispersed, content to read about "Operation Abolition" in the newspaper the next day.

Fess Green  
401 W. Franklin

To the Editor:

Well, whoever was responsible for showing "Operation Abolition" came through in the old tradition of not knowing what in Hell he was doing. It is one thing to show the film in an auditorium that has the seating capacity of about one-fourth of the people that wanted to see it, but they also had to schedule the thing on a night when the Yack Beauty

Contest was held.

I think it is really pitiful, after all the publicity that has been given the film, to turn away the majority of the people that wanted to see it. This, in my opinion, is just another one of the typical blunders that is so common around this University.

Chandler Van Orman

To the Editor:

In reading your paper's front page article of October 25th, concerning the Lewis-Harrington debate on HUAC, one who did not attend the debate just might be led to believe that Lewis had nothing constructive to offer. That your reporter slightly favors Harrington and the liberal point of view is clearly made evident in the article. If this is the way in which a news item is supposed to be written then you have my apology and I stand corrected. Perhaps this was not meant to be a news item.

If this is the case, might I suggest that your writers confine their personal prejudices to the editorial section of the paper? As a rule, front page stories are news stories and to "editorialize" a news item not only shows bad taste but it also shows an inability to analyze a fact situation.

David V. Smith

## Free Enterprise Not 'God'

To the Editor:

I would like to make a few comments on Mr. James M. R. Smith's article on the U. S. as a Welfare State and the possibility of our becoming a Socialistic State. From what I can gather from Mr. Smith's "thinking," he is opposed to past governmental legislation in the areas of welfare and business, as well as proposed further legislation along these lines. It is the rejection of past legislation in these areas that I would question.

Mr. Smith seems to make a "God" of the free enterprise system and also of the "Survival of the fittest" cliché. I feel, however, that our country is not set up solely on the premise that free enterprise should reign supreme. There seems to be some opinion, instead, that our government must be concerned with the welfare and interests of all of its citizens. This concern is not merely for the strong, the most intelligent, the "fittest," or the lucky, but also for the weak, the less intelligent and the unlucky. In a country where social and economic ills (on top of personal physical disabilities) do not allow all the people to have even a minimum standard of living at all times, the government has an obligation to provide help. If this makes us a Welfare State, then we are a Welfare State—and must be so.

In regard to governmental controls on business, it seems that Mr. Smith knows little about the period in our history when big business was allowed to run unchecked. We were then, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, treated to the spectacle of a country under the powerful fist of growing business interests. Fortunately, some people realized that the government (as a representative of the people) must have some control over businesses, which affect the lives of all.

Competition is great—up to a point. But should we allow competition to run wild, we would be denying the interdependence of all people in this industrial age. The higher levels of the population use the lower levels of the population — as workers and consumers —, so it would seem that the "little man" should have some say in how his life is used. Furthermore, when persons are forced out of the competitive arena (for various reasons), they have a right to a part of the profits, based on their contributions in the past and their possible contributions in the future.

For Mr. Smith's leisure reading, I might suggest a good American history book, and, especially, the sections on for whom our government is set up, the rise of big business, and the Great Depression of the 1930's.

—Doris Bowden

## Belated Comment On Theatre

To the Editor:

Belatedly, Mrs. Evangeline R. Darity's letter to the Editor reprinted in the Daily Tar Heel of October 17 came to my attention. Reasons for the situation described concern not only the policies of the management of the Carolina Theater and Mrs. Darity's feelings, but also the more serious matter of public and individual attitudes. Such occurrences should do more than furnish a moment's reading and casual reflection; they should make us pause to examine our own feelings and opinions and weigh our own attitudes against the hurt and bafflement of children, and the humiliation and frustrations of devoted parents who are also good citizens.

Although I know the Darity family and count them friends, I found myself thinking regretfully and objectively of other such experiences happening to other Negro children. For the opening sentence in Mrs. Darity's letter—"I am the mother of two small children"—attests to her chief concern and her automatic second-place position in the matter.

Her eight year old son is old enough to wonder what being an American actually means and why there is a division in standards bas-

ed on a difference he is learning about for the first time. He was born in a foreign country, but witnessed daily the good services of his parents as representatives of one of our government's operations designed for world benefit. Over and over he was told what coming home would be like, that he would finally know what it meant to be an American.

It must be a shock for such a child and in turn, a source of pain to his parents, to wonder if Americans are classified as goodies and baddies, and if for some reason he hasn't yet grasped, he is consigned automatically to the unacceptable incorrigibles.

If it wouldn't add to the boy's wonder about the way adults run things, I should like to apologize to him in person for the rude suddenness of non-acceptance in a place operated for the pleasure of the paying American public and to thank him and the rest of his family for being good citizens of our country while they live through the troubled days that should make life a more totally human concern for the children of our next generation.

Mrs. Frances Barrie  
Dept. of Public Health Education

## Reader Comments On Conformity

To the Editor:

Crisis! Political upheaval! 50 megaton bomb explosion! These are the words that greet us every morning in the newspaper. Being a student at the University of North Carolina seeking knowledge of the generations before me, what should I expect to hear my fellow students discussing and debating? What type of person should I see sitting next to me in my classes, walking past me on campus, or cavorting through that great social institution "Y-Court"? Being an optimist and an idealist, I expect to see young individuals. More stress should be put on the word individuals than any other. I don't see young individuals, but young, uninformed, small talking and thinking men and women that are the "future of our country."

Does this sound like a dramatic slice at our social conformity? Partially it is. We dress alike, walk alike, talk alike, and basically we are playing our social role of college students very well. There is one likeness many of us have that should be exterminated—conformity of thought. Too much social conformity is a good foundation for mental conformity. This must stop. I'm not the "Old Philosopher" as I am as guilty of this as any one. Let's "think big," but mostly let's think. Remember the trite expression—"you are the future of our nation." Trite, yes, but also true.

—Dennis Kurseciw

### 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 none will be returned.

## What! Starch In My PJ's Again!

To the Editor:

Have you ever rolled over in bed and cut yourself? Do you have trouble buttoning a shirt that has one a quarter of a button left on it? Do you really enjoy walking to an eight o'clock in starched socks? If the University Laundry is trying to build character in the student body they are doing a remarkable job. Personally, though, I find it very difficult to sleep in board-stiff pajamas. I go wild over real live whole buttons on my shirts. Need I comment on starched socks?

I would just like to make one small, humble suggestion. If our infamous Laundry insists on washing our clothes in a button-smashing cement mixer, I wish they would use soap instead of straight starch!

—Ted O'Brian