

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.

November 2, 1961 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 38

Censorship

A recent letter to the editor lodged a complaint against what it called "dictatorial censorship" on the editorial page.

We would like to make clear, if possible, what measures of "censorship" are brought to bear on letters. The DTH attempts to print every letter received for publication.

We will print any letter that is signed, regardless of viewpoint, if it is libel-free and in good taste. We do ask that letters be as brief as their subject will permit. To put this in concrete terms, we will print any letter under 400 words. If a writer desires to have a longer letter printed, we will be glad to do so if the writer will call us beforehand and explain why he needs extra space.

We do ask that writers exercise a fair degree of reason in realizing that there is a limit to available space. If we receive more letters than can appear on a single newspaper page, then some letters must be held until a later date.

If, for some reason, a letter does

not appear within a reasonable time, then the writer has only to call the DTH office to discover the reason—in every case, there is a reason—either the letter was unsigned, a personal attack unreasonably long, etc. If the DTH is in error in not printing a letter, then we will quickly remedy this if the writer will contact us.

To our knowledge, the DTH has this year refused to print only four letters which were signed. Three of these were vicious attacks on various persons and had no place in print. The fourth was blatantly profane and obscene.

We impose only a few restrictions, and these are imposed only for the sake of space and compliance with libel laws and good taste.

As anyone who has read the editorial page regularly can testify, even these restrictions are only loosely adhered to.

If this constitutes dictatorial censorship, then we stand guilty as charged.

State Affairs

Seldom does a committee at Carolina do a job so well that it causes a stir throughout the state. Seldom, also, do individuals devote themselves night and day to doing a job well.

When both of these rare occurrences turn up in reference to the same committee, it is cause for comment.

Tom White and Larry McDevitt have done, and are doing, an excellent job in promoting the bond issue through the State Affairs Committee. Both have expended a stagger-

ing amount of time and energy in organizing and carrying through the projects of the committee.

The Torch for Education Marathon run across the state, which is going on now, is receiving a warm reception in every town through which the runners pass.

Both McDevitt and White deserve commendation for their work.

This project and the others carried on by the committee are certain to have a great effect on putting over the bond issue.

GOP In South

The Republicans are playing both ends against the middle in their efforts to establish the GOP in the South.

This campaign, which came to Chapel Hill yesterday with the "Paul Revere" panel of Republican congressmen, is going especially strong in Texas. Last year, John Tower became the first Republican U. S. Senator from Texas in many decades. Tuesday, former President Eisenhower stumped Texas for John

Goode, Jr. — Republican candidate for the House of Representatives.

General Eisenhower, the "Paul Revere" boys, and most of the other Republicans working on the South play with the conservative Southern position as skillfully as if they had been taking lessons from "Tricky Dick" Nixon.

Look, for instance, at the Reveremen:

On the one hand, they attack the Kennedy administration as having "reneged" on its civil rights campaign platform. They also claim that Republicans stand for "States Rights" (local synonym for "Segregated Schools.")

But on the other hand, the GOP 'Saviors' refused (in Asheville) to say whether a Republican congress would take a strong stand on civil rights and shied away from clarifying what they meant by "States Rights" in relation to segregation.

In short, Republicans are attempting to gain strength in the South by posing as the Segregationist Friend and Home Companion. But they're not so friendly when one tries to pin them down to specifics—probably because of the growing influence of the Negro vote both here and in the North.

They're burning the candle at both ends, playing both ends against the middle—it's the same old saw.

We hope they are counting their chickens before they have hatched. Remember what happened to Richard Nixon?

—Bill Hobbs

Quality Or Quantity Education For UNC?

Educational Program Gets Back-Handed Compliment

A Raleigh pastor has paid North Carolina's quality education program what seems from here to be an unqualified, back-handed compliment.

Dr. Albert G. Edwards, pastor of Raleigh's First Presbyterian Church, says the program is geared to "the better-than-average student without regard to others. Under-average children are being ignored and forgotten in a system adaptable to only a few."

What he seems to mean by this is that North Carolina schools have, or are, turning their backs on all

but students who are geniuses. If this is true, then he is most correct—and we join with him—in pressing for a re-evaluation of the program.

But is it true? Or has Dr. Edwards lent his office and high personal reputation to an opinion without being able to rationally substantiate that opinion?

His statement, quoted above, is one of airy generalities. Further, the statement has not been accompanied by validating information in any of the several dispatches and editorials we have read concerning it.

Yet the charge undoubtedly has, and will, influence the quality education sentiments of many North Carolina voters, who know only that a respected Man of God has criticized the program, so the program must be bad.

Yes, everyone is entitled to his opinion, including Dr. Edwards. That is not the point.

The point is responsibility. Does Dr. Edwards' charge result from a close and careful scrutiny and appraisal of the program? If it does, where are his findings?

Or is the charge frivolous, representative of but a slight and fleeting examination of the program?

From here, Dr. Edwards seems to be an unqualified critic who has paid North Carolina educators and sponsoring politicians a very high, if back-handed, compliment. For he implies that they are aware of the value of high goals in education as elsewhere, aware that people are not easily or accurately categorized blankly as clods or geniuses, and aware that individuals—young or old—usually respond to higher goals with better performance.

—Garry Blanchard

State Bond Issue

Moving Into 'New World'?

I am an American citizen. I am against a competitive base for our society.

I do not think nations should compete with one another. Every nation making policy considers only what is in the interest of a Universal Brotherhood of Man before considering its own interests and needs.

One of the major premises of International Politics is that each nation regardless of its power is equal. Sierra Leone is entitled to as much weight in the making of international decisions as the Soviet Union.

The foundation for world government is the United Nations General Assembly where nations of the world are represented equally and are responsible to world moral public opinion. Thus the world's course under majority rule would conceivably be decided by the naked, the illiterate, the uneducated, and the starved. We hope one day to equate their status with ours.

We must not reward individual initiative. We train exceptional people with a mediocre education, conform them to mediocre standards, leveling them to a mediocre, homogeneous mass. We always point out to them that mediocre people made this country great.

We ask of them in class to listen to lectures and repeat the lectures in quiz books. Any creative or spontaneous contribution is discouraged because the world needs cold hard, impartial bureaucrats with no faith, no convictions, and no ambitions.

And thus we move into The Brave New World—the "last best hope" of man.

—Norman Smith
Tim Tetlow

University Student Says She'll Vote 'No' Nov. 7

(From the Charlotte Observer "Letters" column):

Since I became eligible to vote, just three weeks ago, my interest in our government and its spending programs has taken on a new view—that of a person with the right to officially approve or reject the measures put before the American public.

As a student at the University of North Carolina, a state tax-supported institution, I have observed during the past year that a great deal of money is put into the construction of new buildings.

On Nov. 7 we, the voters of North Carolina, must decide if the need for more such spending is worth a bond issue of \$61.5 million. Here at the University, a good portion of our \$13.2 million will go for additional dormitory construction to house the rising enrollment.

While it is supposedly a good indication that more and more young people are seeking a college education, I think that this emphasis on the numbers of students and not necessarily on their ability to profit from such guidance is a mistake which is keeping the academic standards much too low.

Even a public institution such as the University must draw a line somewhere. So rather than drop the line lower and add more to the numbers, we would do well to find out just how many of the students presently enrolled here are actually worth the space they are occupying.

I shall exercise my newly-gained privilege on Nov. 7 by voting against the \$13.2 million section for the Uni-

versity of North Carolina.

The present housing situation is critical indeed, and its improvement would be worthy of the appropriation. But this excellent place of learning does not need more dormitory space just to increase the numbers of uninterested, unthinking school children who can afford to flock here for a few years of fun.

—Brenda Smith

Balcony Building Suggested

To the Editor,

The headline in this morning's Daily Tar Heel (October 26th) that theater picketing was scheduled to resume on January 3rd unless full integration is achieved brought the undersigned readers to a careful consideration of our situation. Because highly conflicting opinions exist concerning the question of theater integration, it is not likely that a resolution may be reached which would be fully agreeable to everyone involved. Such a solution, however, indeed exists.

This solution involves the construction (from funds half supplied by the theater owners and half by a fund-raising campaign on the part of others involved) of balconies in the two existing Chapel Hill Theaters. The merits of such action are immediately evident. The bottom floor of the theaters would be maintained on a segregated basis. This would satisfy those who do not favor integrated theaters. The balcony would be opened on a fully integrated basis. This would satisfy the Negroes in that they would be admitted to the theaters. It would also be pleasing to the liberal and Christian or liberal-Christian elements who would be able to attend motion pictures in a fully-integrated balcony. The theatre owners themselves would benefit from the increased number of admissions which would in time cancel the debt imposed by one half of the cost of construction.

It is hoped that the above suggestion will receive the serious attention of the diverse elements mentioned. It seems an answer acceptable to all.

—Joe E. Greene
Joseph R. John

No Planning

Former President Eisenhower, whose administration spent millions training and equipping Cuban refugee troops for something, says "There was absolutely no planning for any invasion in my administration."

White House sources say, "The general is in error."

We submit that the outcome of the invasion clearly bears out the contention that there was absolutely no planning.

—The Atlanta Constitution

"Well, Here Today, Gone Tomorrow"



Ideologies Endangering Man's Existence

The October 25, 1961 edition of the Daily Tar Heel contained a criticism on my article which appeared on October 17. As the criticism missed my point, I shall re-state my first intention as plainly as possible.

The criticism was based on an assumption that my article was maintaining that America should relinquish her freedom and subordinate herself to communism in order to avoid world annihilation. This, however, was not my whole point. If I were in Soviet Russia and if they were to allow me to speak, I would say that they also should give up trying to extend their doctrine so as to save the world from annihilation. I did not intend to confine my discussion to either side. My discus-

sion was on the human folly which is endangering the existence of their own beings.

WHAT I WANTED to say was that human beings as a whole, without distinction as to their ideologies, should become wise enough to realize that their firmly held convictions to their ideologies are endangering their own existence. The communists can identify their ideology with the basic elements of human civilization just as well as one can do freedom with the civilization. When our forerunners struggled for the realization of their ideologies, there was not the possibility of a holocaust of the entire world. They were allowed to behave so be-

cause they had less knowledge of science. The modern world, however, has to be more cautious before proceeding in such a manner, since the potential dangers are so infinitely greater. It is in this sense that we have to modify our traditional ideologies.

We must realize that the period which demands heroic deeds for one's ideology is passing. If this period is not passing, we have to endeavor to urge the transition as soon as possible. As the field of science went into the New Era and changed its older ways, one should not seek on the glory of the old era in the phase of ideologies. We have to realize that as long as we maintain (By "we," I mean human beings

as a whole) our own convictions blindly, the ultimate result will be certain destruction of the whole world.

If any ideology is aiming at the betterment of human life, it has to secure the existence of human life first before people start to expound their ideologies. What is the use of freedom or communism if we destroy the whole world? In case a nation confronts a necessary choice between either subjugation or annihilation of the world I strongly hope the nation has the courage and the wisdom to choose subjugation to save the possibilities of a betterment of the world in the future.

—Harno Konishi

The Daily Tar Heel

WAYNE KING

Editor

MARGARET ANN REYNOLDS

Associate Editor

LLOYD LITTLE

Executive News Editor

BILL HOBBS

Managing Editor

CAROL BLANCHARD

Assistant Editor

JIM CROFT

Assistant to the Editor

STEVES VAUGHN... News Editor

NANCY BARR, LINDA CRAWFORD... Feature Editors

HARRY W. LLOYD... Sports Editor

DAVID WYSONG... Subscription Manager

JIM ECKEL... Circulation Manager

BO DUNN... Asst. Sports Editor

JIM WALLACE... Photography Editor

TIM BURNETT

Business Manager

MOON MARRIERS... 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 with 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.