

# 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 8, 1961 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 43

## How Long?

The question of southern integration has many facets, all of which have been the subject of continuing controversy and comment. The moral and legalistic aspects have naturally assumed a position of high importance, since these are subjects which command an air of immediacy.

Both sides of the argument have resorted to psychology, religion, sociology, philosophy, and to a lesser extent, the arts, in advancing their point of view. Clergymen, politicians, scientists, lawyers and others have been working overtime in providing grist for the various mills that produce comment on the issue of integration.

Strangely, in our super-materialistic society, the question of economy has not commanded its share of attention, taking a berth far back in the order of importance. But it is in the area of economics that the South stands to benefit most from making better use of the potential inherent in the Negro population—a potential that has been realized, in the main, only by the most menial of tasks. In every southern city, even the most casual of observers can find Negro college graduates sweeping floors, waiting tables and otherwise wasting the talents that education can provide. This situation is not confined entirely to the South, of course, but it is in that area that it is most widespread. And it is in the South that the Negro population comprises such a large proportion of human resources.

Here in N. C., for instance, the Negro population comprises roughly one-fourth of the total. In Georgia, it makes up nearly one-third, according to the figures listed in the latest World Almanac.

Should the South suddenly be able to break down all racial barriers—in education, in job opportunity and training, in attitude—the resulting economic thrust supplied by the Negro population would be unequaled anywhere in the world.

As the situation now exists, the Negro population is hard put to carry its own weight in most southern states. The number of Negro welfare cases alone is staggering. These cases are the result, in good proportion, of the white attitude in not providing adequate training and opportunity.

Obviously, the Negro cannot shake off over a century-and-a-half of servitude and unequal opportunity in a twinkling. Some progress has been made, grudgingly, in providing the Negro with physical opportunity, with schools and other facilities. But in attitude, much of the South is but a short step beyond the Civil War.

Legally, we are in an era that functions under the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision. In attitude, however, much of the South still lovingly embraces the Dred Scott decision of 1857 which sees the Negro as a piece of property. Here exists a major paradox. Even if, for the sake of argument, we bar all legal and moral considerations, the laws of simple economy dictate that a resource should be cultivated and utilized. This is as true for human resources as for any other.

Yet the Negro, the South's virtually untapped human resource, is denied the path towards bettering both himself and the South.

How long, O, Gentle Southland?

## College & Communists

The administrators of the New York city colleges helped—rather than hurt—the interests of the Communist party with their recent

decision to prohibit Communists from speaking at student forums. Witness the experience of Benjamin J. Davis, the party's national secretary, whose invitation to address a Queens College group led to the ban.

Columbia University students, irked at the sabridgment of academic freedom, promptly arranged a meeting for Mr. Davis on their campus. He told them he had been deluged with requests to appear on television and radio and to speak at other institutions. "And the publicity I have received couldn't be bought by all the gold in Moscow," Mr. Davis crowed.

Now City College undergraduates are talking of boycotting classes to protest the ban; a mass indignation rally has been held and the Communists are getting a sympathetic attention they never otherwise would have had. If the heads of our municipal colleges will not see that their policy of suppression strikes at the free exchange of ideas basic to higher education, they must be aware that our minuscule Communist party thrives on "martyrdom." The ban is wrong, as we have stated previously; and it is also self-defeating.

# 'We Hold These Truths Self-Evident?'

The concluding resolution of our Declaration of Independence asserts: "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be free and independent states . . . with full power to do all acts and things which independent states may of rights do."

These "free and independent states" were created and founded upon Judaic-Christian precepts now under world-wide attack. The truth that made us free is everywhere assaulted by an onrushing force of fraud, falsehood, and lies flying the Red banner of international Communism. It openly boasts of its intention to bury God-given freedom under an avalanche of activated atheism. Thus far, we have been content to let this force march on unresisted.

OUR WESTERN civilization, and particularly our American republic, was founded upon these precepts. It has been sustained solely by them, and by what they have meant to the peoples who were guided by them. The civilization that was founded upon them stands alone as the only obstacle between the Communist swine and their goal of world domination.

But now our civilization is in grave danger of being destroyed, from without and from within. In the name of "progress," a clique of socialist welfare-staters assure

us that the only way to overcome the temptation of Communism is to succumb to it—and to see that other nations have no other choice than to tag along. They frequently and flagrantly give aid and comfort to the enemy, under the malicious falsehood that it is humane.

THE GOLDEN RULE is not a mandate to commit national suicide. It is not a mandate to sacrifice even individual rights that were so generously bestowed by the Creator. If the Golden Rule is to be really observed, then we should apply it both to our friends still free who look to us as the guardians of freedom, and to those that we have permitted to be swept into Godless slavery behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

Christ told us that the truth would make us free. We are fast losing the freedom that the truth gave us. That truth is Christianity and the responsibility it places upon the individual. That truth is that this responsibility REMAINS with the individual, and that it not be gradually or suddenly usurped by a Communist-socialist-welfare statism. That truth is that all men and generations ought to have the chance to know and practice this truth. It is not un-Christian to oppose those forces that seek to destroy this truth.

THE MASTERMINDS that work

night and day to destroy our civilization are, of course, concentrated in the Kremlin. But their dupes and agents roam at will all over the world, preaching propaganda and lies designed to bring us to our knees. They are equally at home at conference tables as well as in military establishments. Through our stupidity, they are provided forums and media through which to disseminate their poison, all with one ultimate goal: to destroy our civilization and the rights that hold it together.

We validated this piratical conspiracy when we recognized the Communist dictatorship as the government of Russia in 1933. We rescued it from the consequences of its own treachery by embracing it as our ally in World War II. We permitted it to occupy Berlin, and to sweep 100 million Eastern European people into its godless orbit of dictatorial slavery. They remain helplessly chained there to this day.

WE PERMITTED the anti-Communist army of Chiang Kai-shek to be driven from the Chinese mainland, leaving more than 500 million Chinese to the tender mercies of Mao Tse-Tung and Chou En-lai.

This, then, is the conspiracy with which our politicians assure us we can "co-exist." This is the conspiracy to whose mercies we left the Hungarian freedom-fighters, and for whom we cruelly double-crossed

the Cuban invaders. This is the conspiracy that enslaves hundreds of millions, and which will permit at least 20 million Chinese to starve to death in communes this winter. "Co-existence" with these murderers ought to be considered immoral.

ADLAI STEVENSON has told us that, under the U. N. charter, we are no longer free to intervene unilaterally to prevent the spread of Communism. True enough, but apparently we are still free to intervene to HELP Communism. We have repeatedly done that, and are preparing to do so again.

We are charged with the duty to save civilization for ourselves and our posterity; and to free those helpless humans whose slavery we permitted. In this civilization lies the good that man has produced in his stay on earth. If it is permitted to be abolished, any further residence on earth will be little better

than that of any animal unfortunate enough to be left. Christianity and freedom will then disappear for a thousand years.

SHOULD WE take steps to save ourselves, our welfare-staters would undoubtedly tag us as being bigoted, prejudiced, reactionary, conservative, old-fashioned, fanatical, witch hunters, fascists, and the legion of other misnomers that the "liberal" mind can produce. So be it. But we will also retain our freedom.

"For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and yet lose his own soul." Without a speedy reversal of our present policy of containment, appeasement, and "co-existence," we will lose both the world and our souls. There is a fate worse than death.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident." We hope so. But we have been given reason to wonder.

—Martin L. Wilson

## ATTITUDES By Clotfelter

### 'Laugh Aloud When Things Get Ridiculous'

Fully-clothed in the red, white and blue of the Nation . . . marching steadily toward the time when that Day of Reckoning shall have obliterated all the Reds and fellow travelers and their families and friends and people who read their newspapers and who think very loudly and who favor any one of numerous causes which have been dubbed Pink . . . marching steadfastly backward is the American Legion, host for Monday night's two-ring circus in Memorial Hall.

A packed Carroll Hall audience had seen the first clown show October 23 when "Operation Abolition" had been shown. The audience Monday saw "Operation" plus an added attraction (apparently in the place of the Twenty cartoon): "Communism on the Map," a flick which portrays Red subversion around the world.

Of course the Legion did not allow a debate, which would include an agent of the Conspiracy—an agent such as Socialist Mike Harrington, who debated Fulton Lewis III at the "Operation Abolition" showing last month. Aside from a National Student Association-sponsored sheet handed out, there was no protest, no opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee's Red-infested film, or to "Communism on the Map."

But we suppose a Legion audience wouldn't want to be told nasty, unpleasant facts. It wouldn't want to find out the truth about "Operation Abolition" (a subject which previously has been covered in some detail in the DTH.)

A Legion audience wouldn't want to hear the opposition viewpoint on "Communism on the Map," a film put out by Harding College of Searcy, Ark.

Persons of Legionnaire mentality might not like to have former HUAC Staff Director Richard Arens challenged when he says (in the

film), "The Supreme Court has all but wrecked the structure of internal security."

Innuendo and half-truths are the meat of this film, as in: "In West Germany today, Communists are present in every aspect of national thought." Or: "Serious students think that the Communists will take India whenever they choose."

"Communism on the Map" marched further into the land of make-believe with allegations that Iceland is Communist-dominated, that Venezuela is a "Communist satellite," that America's NATO allies are not to be trusted, and on and on.

As the Legion audience watched breathlessly, "Communism on the Map" presented conclusive proof that the U. S. is surrounded by Red satellites; that only Formosa, Switzerland, and maybe Canada and West Germany are still free of Communist domination, the rest of the world being under the control of the hammer and sickle.

A Legion audience wouldn't want to hear any opposing arguments and Monday night it didn't. American Legion Post No. 6 of Chapel Hill fulfilled a traditional purpose of that glorious organization: the advancement of an over-fed and under-educated "Americanism." (Mr. Henry Royall was responsible for bringing "Operation" and "Communism on the Map" to town. Mr. Royall is chairman of the Legion's Americanism Committee.)

Many persons in the audience sat quietly and absorbed Monday night's True and Deep Message. But others, less willing to become Legion "dupes" either watched in quiet disbelief or took the advice of a California student, as reported in "Operation Abolition": "Laugh out loud when things get ridiculous."

—Jim Clotfelter

## "Notice The Big Change?"



## Edit Page Open To Anyone...

To the Editor:

The editorial page, and indeed the whole Daily Tar Heel itself, has taken a one-sided view to news events and the world situation. This is the so-called Liberal attitude and it is one which the readers of this newspaper have had to endure in increasing quantities. The Daily Tar Heel is the broadest and most effective means of communication on campus. But the Tar Heel is losing readers which it will continue to do if the staff and writers of this newspaper persist in writing articles that show partisanship and inflexibility.

As Clyde Wilson's article—"J.F. K. Drifting From the Left" pointed out quite rightly, world events change daily and policies have to be adapted as such. Khrushchev's policy depends on the element of surprise and continuous change. One would hope that Washington and the Government is not preoccupied with a policy that has any "label" whether it be Liberal or Conservative. The President himself is realizing a new trend in events at this moment.

BUT STILL we hear such words as "world opinion." The Editor referred rather loosely to this in an editorial this week. I would seriously question that there is any such thing, and if there is, it should have nothing to do with our foreign policy.

Our dealings with each foreign nation is different. While we should not support the Socialist Govt. in British Guiana, we should be doing all we can to give aid to countries that we know are committed in our effort to prevent the infiltration of Communism throughout the world. What Nasser, Sukharno, Tshombe, and Nehru think of our foreign policy has got nothing to do with the issue, UNLESS they show an active desire to fight Communism. What they have shown on a number of occasions is that they are perfectly able to look after themselves.

Thus we must be ever-ready to accept new ideas without bias or prior judgment. These facts, even if we dislike them, often turn out to be the reality of the situation. We cannot afford to be misinformed on the essential issues of today. A GREAT DEAL OF RESPONSIBILITY LIES WITH THE PRESS, AS

THE STAFF OF THIS PAPER IS READILY AWARE.

—Jim Tetlow

Editor's Note: World opinion, for better or worse, does exist and has a definite bearing on our foreign policy.

As for foreign aid, should we refuse aid to the emerging nations of Africa, for instance, merely because there is no immediate and pressing danger of Communism there?

That our aid programs have been poorly administered is an unfortunate fact. But it does not follow that we should eliminate the programs. The neutral nations are becoming a vital force in the shaping of world affairs. Do we disregard them?

The ideological struggle is not confined to one front. It involves, directly or indirectly, every nation in the world. We cannot afford to lose sight of India, of the Congo, of Indonesia, of the United Arab Republic, or of any other nation merely because our first concern is Russia.

The editorial page, incidentally, is open to anyone: Liberal, Conservative, Nazi, Communist,

## More Letters....

### Reader Disagrees With Editorial

A disturbing lack of insight was manifested in the editorial "A Dumb Move" which appeared in last Friday's Tarheel. Editor King's stand against U.S. aid to Yugoslavia and, in fact, all nations which call themselves "neutral" was hopefully a ruse to attack controversy.

The logic of the argument, which concludes that "we're plain stupid," consists of several rather dubious premises. It is stated or implied that (1) "neutral" is equal to "pro-Russian," (2) Yugoslavia will be able to get a war device from Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace program, and (3) Russia is waiting to give Yugoslavia anything that we won't.

However, more important than the article's logic, or illogic, is the basic issue of foreign aid to countries not allied with the West. The United States has not denied aid to

right-wing dictatorships such as Spain, where U. S. missile bases are located. Yet this is wise not only for military reasons, but more important, it materializes America's support for so-called neutral countries that oppose Soviet imperialism and mass bomb testing.

Does it not make sense to apply this reasoning to Yugoslavia, where Russian military has been consistently condemned, and a progressive economy has successfully benefited the populace without the tyranny and oppression felt in Russia and Spain?

The United States will never be able to return to the conservative's utopia of isolation it experienced in the days before global conflicts and ideologies. But more consequential this country cannot survive amid these global passions without acknowledging all of mankind, and letting democracy be felt in every corner of the world.

—Harry DeLong

## The Daily Tar Heel

WAYNE KING  
Editor

MARGARET ANN REYNOLDS  
Associate Editor

LOYD LEXLER  
Executive News Editor

BOB HOMP  
Managing Editor

GABRYEL BRANCHARD  
Assistant Editor

JIM CLOSETT  
Assistant to the Editor

SEVA VAUGHN  
News Editor

MARY BARR, LINDA CRAWFORD  
Features Editors

HARRY W. LLOYD  
Sports Editor

DANIEL WELSON  
Subscription Manager

JIM ESKRIDGE  
Circulation Manager

ED DUPREE  
Asst. Sports Editor

JIM WALLACE  
Photography Editor

TIM BURNETT  
Business Manager

MICK MATTHEW  
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.