

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.

January 12, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 76

Fussbudgets

The Young Americans for Freedom, a group of youthful Conservatives somewhere to the right of Barry Goldwater and barely left of Robert Welch, has produced an impressive mass of literature condemning various men, institutions and ideas, including the UN, foreign aid, welfare, the Supreme Court, all Liberals, some Conservatives, most Democrats, most of the State Department, all opponents of HUAC, and various and sundry others.

It should be said of YAF's favor that it has not, as far as we know, lambasted God, penicillin, or Mother's Day. An oversight, we feel sure.

The latest drizzle of vitriol to seep over the edges of the organization's seemingly bottomless well is directed at Time magazine's selection of President Kennedy as Man of the Year.

YAF Secretary Ralph Anderson writes in a letter in Time's latest issue:

Your selection of John Kennedy as Man of the Year is an insult to both the intelligence and integrity of your readers. Although articulate, he is a man of inaction; although forceful in appearance, he is inadequate in performance.

We are not sure just whom Anderson feels should have been chosen. "Time," either because of space limitations, or because Anderson did not include them, failed to print a list of his favorites.

At any rate, we have no indica-

tion of whom he feels is qualified—if anyone. The YAF slogan seems to be "Whatever it is, wherever it is, whoever it is, at whatever time, OPPOSE IT!"

As for Anderson's disdain for the President on the grounds that he is "articulate" but "a man of inaction," we have somehow failed to note that the YAF has been particularly short on words and long on actions. Neither have we been able to see many instances in which YAF's carefully polished "appearance" as a group of freedom defenders has been bolstered by "adequate performance."

On the contrary, most of what we have been able to see of YAF is that it is making one hell of a lot of noise, directing most of its efforts toward losing arrows at everything in sight that pricks its conservative conscience—as prescribed by Barry Goldwater, William Buckley, Jr., and a few others.

This is not to say that we quarrel with YAF's embracement of conservative dogma; we do not. What we do object to is its insistence on blasting, jabbing and ripping everything within range. The object seems to be to hamstring our foreign policy, besmirch the nation's leadership and otherwise follow a plan of destruction rather than construction.

Young Americans for Freedom? A better name would be Young American Fussbudgets.

Student Stand

There won't be any Dixie Basketball Classic here this year — and had you noticed that any complaining about its absence comes from people not connected with State College and not from the students themselves? In fact, had you noticed that when basketball was de-emphasized last spring at State and Carolina that the squawks came from alumni, merchants, people about town and not the students themselves?

There must be some real significance in the calmness with which the students have accepted the de-emphasis program. Part of the significance must come from the fact that the highly emphasized basketball programs at both State and Carolina had long ago reached the point where they were aimed at the outsiders and not at the campus.

They had reached the point where they were spectacles for off-campus spectators instead of simply games being played for the benefit of students.

In a recent editorial on the subject, the State College newspaper, The Technician, put it this way: "The primary mission of State College is quality education, not recreation for the students, local businessmen, and alumni. The athletic programs, like other student activities, are of course an important part of the college experience; college recognition merely on the basis of the type athletes attracted there is shallow, indeed."

That's a good summary of what a college must be, and what athletic programs must be and must not be in a good college.

The Dixie Classic will be missed this year, make no doubt of that. It was mighty nice to see the friends from all over the State who saved part of their vacation time so that they could come here for the three days of the Classic. It was fun visiting with them, going to the games with them, talking over old times with them.

But there is no doubt that the Dixie Classic had nothing to do with State College's standing as an institution of higher education. There is no doubt, too, but that the Dixie Classic had come to represent the king can-d-o-no-wrong attitude which contributed to the things which made basketball de-emphasis necessary.

We still have basketball, good basketball, in this area. We won't have as much of it this season as we had last year. But, because basketball has been de-emphasized, we'll be more likely to have it for a longer time to come than we would have had basketball not been cut down to proper size last spring.

Raleigh Times

"I Don't Know If It's Solid Enough To Hold Both Of Us"



The Great Chaotic Awakening

America is a nation where public spirit at times has been known to doze off into the quiet comforts of complacency. It is in these little periods of national back to the womb philosophy that the American citizen's concern for events taking place in the outside world seem to be at its most dormant state.

The decade from 1950-1960 has been labeled by many critics as a decade of public complacency in America. It is now felt by these critics that America has awakened from this complacency, but the awakening has been a most disturbing and chaotic one.

America's awakening has been much like that of a small boy who has been dreaming that he and his playmates are fighting an imaginary war with imaginary bullets with an imaginary enemy, and that he is considered a great hero and leader by his playmates. Then he suddenly awakes and finds that there is absolutely nothing imagi-

nary about the war, bullets or enemy. They are all very real, and he and his playmates (who no longer consider him a hero, but nevertheless look to him for leadership) are in great danger of being destroyed.

YES, AMERICA has awakened to find herself and the free world under a tremendous assault by communism. How did America get into such a precarious position? There have been many answers applied to this question since America's public awoke. There are those who place the blame on the previous administration. There are those who place the blame on liberals going back usually as far as F.D.R. There are those who place the blame on a great internal communist conspiracy which has supposedly infiltrated every branch of our government, schools, churches, etc. There are those who place the blame on our newspapers, radio, and TV. There are those who place the blame on

segregation, and those who place the blame on integration. There are, in fact, as many opinions as there are citizens who have at last awakened in America.

AMERICA IS now awake. She is examining herself internally and even inspecting the outside world with a look more critical and intense than just that of a tourist. She is still a great nation, but she is also a worried, confused, and sometimes even frightened nation.

But this in itself is a hopeful sign. For being worried is better than being listless. Being confused is better than being indolent. Being frightened is better than being complacent. The American public is, in short, stimulated. They might not be in agreement as to what road of action they are to take, but at least they have their eyes open now and are searching for one.

—ALAN GOLDSMITH

Primer For Defense Loan Applicants

AN UNUSUALLY righteous Congress has shoved down President Kennedy's throat an amendment to the bill providing for the extension of the National Defense Education Act. The amendment provides that in order to qualify for a loan under the act, a student must first take a solemn oath (in writing, no less) that he is not a Communist, and presumably that he will refrain from applying the education he receives as a result of the loan to activities conducive to the violent overthrow of the government of the United States.

Taken at face value, this seems entirely reasonable. Who among the American taxpayers, wants his money spent to finance the furtherance of such evil, Godless practices?

It is thus assumed that everyone, red, pink and blue, will honor this solemn vow. After all, what decent, self-respecting Communist would initiate disorder, turbulence and internal strife in the good old U.S.A. after having promised on his honor forever to behave?

Now that Congress has dissipated forever the Communist menace in our colleges with one act, only one minor point remains to be clarified—what the devil is subversion?

WELL, recent precedent seems to say it is positively against the interests of freedom and democracy to steal secret documents for the Soviet Union. One could also put his heartfelt loyalty in a bad light if he shot the President of the United States or set off a bomb in the Senate cloakroom while in the pay of the international Communist conspiracy.

Such practices should be discouraged by all available means, and the new amendment praised for any deterrent effect it may produce. People (and there are such people) who would do things like that definitely would be deterred.

If you were to take a loyalty oath, chances are you would very likely realize that participation by you in such goings-on is entirely out of the question. Having therefore given up your plans for assassinating President Kennedy (or Senator Goldwater, as the case may be) you might well assume that you have become a "100 per center" in strict accordance with your NDEA vow.

If it were that simple, being a loyal American citizen would be remarkably easy for most of us, and an editorial on the subject entirely unnecessary.

But, in the strict sense, being a true patriot is much more complicated. In fact, it is entirely possible that you are, in reality, a dupe of the Reds.

In addition to abstaining from clearly defined acts of aggression and sabotage of the fundamental tenets of our American way of life (which, to compound the issue, vary from list to list) you will find it necessary to employ strict introspection to determine whether they are not being subversive in less conspicuous ways.

HEREFORE, here is a list which, though by no means complete, may nevertheless aid such students in following to the letter their vow never to interfere with the principles on which this great nation is based.

1) above all, do not join or permit your name to be connected with any Communist front organization, or with any group which may take the "Communist line" on any given issue. Lists of forbidden organizations can be obtained from the Attorney General, the F.B.I., or the John Birch Society, so ignorance of the nature of a group is no excuse.

2) And nearly as important; do not join or permit your name to be connected with any group which has as a member a man or woman who

is also a member of or a sympathizer with any of the groups on the aforementioned lists. This may sound difficult, and it is. You will avoid trouble, on this point, however, if you join only anti-Communist groups which are not listed as subversive—groups like the JBS, the American Legion, the American Nazi Party, or the Ku Klux Klan.

3) To thus decline from actively preaching the Communist line is not enough. You may unwittingly become a dupe of the Reds by merely being attentive to the subversive elements which infest the United States. Avoiding these people is not as easy as one might suppose. To do so requires a constant and active effort. Careful adherence to the following will definitely aid you in this respect.

Read Norman Vincent Peale and Fulton Lewis, Jr., but never Walter Lippmann or Walter Winchell. Studiously avoid Red propaganda films such as "Spartacus" and "Inherit the Wind." "Operation Abolition" and "The Alamo" are recommended, however.

Avoid association with Catholics, Negroes and Jews, all notoriously subversive. Shun the National Council of Churches, oppose the NAACP, beware of Shirley Temple and Eleanor Roosevelt. Support "right to work" laws and any other anti-labor measures, but never say a good word for UNESCO, Moral Rearmament, or SANE.

Trujillo (late dictator of the Dominican Republic), Nasser, Chiang Kai-Shek, and Salazar (dictator of Portugal) are above reproach; but Nehru, Khrushchev, Kennedy and the like are to be constantly watched and criticized.

4) Learn these fundamental truths: Anyone formerly a member of a questionable organization is still a

Kennedy Is More Popular Than Ever

WASHINGTON — President Kennedy enters upon his second twelve months in a strengthened political position.

This second session of the 87th Congress will be encountering a more confident, and a more decisive President.

Gone is Mr. Kennedy's haunting pre-occupation with the closeness of the election; gone is that special element of uncertainty which came from the fact that a near-majority wanted Mr. Nixon in the White House.

Congress will not be a rubber stamp this year anymore than it was last. Congress remains the same, more conservative than the Democratic platform and on some issues more conservative than the Chief Executive. But the President is not the same.

There is this difference: After winning the election so closely that he barely made it, Mr. Kennedy has in less than a year remarkably consolidated his standing with the American people.

As a candidate for President Mr. Kennedy was able to win no more than a paper-thin majority. As President Mr. Kennedy has succeeded in winning a higher approval-rating than any of his recent predecessors—a high of 83 per cent, and in the latest Gallup poll, 77 per cent. (Mr. Eisenhower's peak was 79 per cent.)

Last January Mr. Kennedy took office as a Chief Executive who almost lost. This January he is a President who has gained new political credentials and new public standing.

THIS DOES THREE things. It gives the President greater confidence. It encourages him to take a bolder course, as he has in his proposed trade policy to take advantage of the European Common Market. It gives added leverage to his leadership.

Opinions will vary as to what has produced the nearly steady rise in Mr. Kennedy's graph of public approval. But the fact is not in dispute. Senate leaders of both parties, recently returning after several months at home, almost uniformly agree on the President's general popularity.

Sen. Barry Goldwater noticed it, but he does not believe it will help the White House much with Congress on controversial legislation. Sen. Mike Mansfield noticed it, and believes it will help the White House. It was confirmed in the elections last fall. Where Mr. Kennedy personally campaigned, as in New Jersey and Texas, the Democrats won.

WHEN YOU LOOK back over his first year in office, it is evident that in the early months of the new Ad-

ministration the President was neither very popular — nor very unpopular — until he made the great mistake over Cuba. Oddly enough, the first substantial rise in Mr. Kennedy's public approval status came in the immediate wake of the Cuban fiasco. Since that time it has risen further and held. These seem to be the reasons:

1—Obviously the horrendous failure of the Cuban operation — all the blame on the United States for having a hand in it but never putting a sufficiently strong hand in it to make it successful — did not give the President any credit or any credentials. But the fact that Mr. Kennedy publicly took the full responsibility for all the final decisions, quickly calling off the overeager apologists who were looking for scapegoats, did more than anything else to win him an upsurge of goodwill and approval.

I know of no one in the Administration and few outside who do not think that Mr. Kennedy learned immeasurably from the Cuban experience and that his action in taking complete blame was not only wise but accurate. He was to blame and in saying so he won more public support than the failure lost him.

2—The second factor in the President's present popularity is his wise and firm handling of the Berlin crisis. He has succeeded in strengthening his ties with Macmillan, De Gaulle, and Adenauer. He has helped to keep the allies united on the substance of policy, including the unwavering determination to defend our rights in West Berlin. He has kept the door open for serious negotiation whenever the Soviets want to negotiate seriously.

Most people, I think, feel that the danger of war over Berlin is less than it was six months ago largely because Mr. Kennedy has got his message through to the Kremlin.

—CHARLOTTE OBSERVER

Letter To Dr. George

I have read with great interest your opinion that U.N.C. students are being "indoctrinated" by integrationist professors.

Your remarks stirred the memory of an "indoctrinating" experience which I once had, though not in the college classroom. It happened on the streetcar, before I had even started to college. I say on the streetcar; actually it happened because I looked out the window, into the back yard of a Negro house.

I got a pretty close view: the tracks cut right across the Negro yard, black of course, and glistening with mud. The white side of an enamel sloop bucket broke a blackness otherwise unremitting, and then one's eyes came to rest upon the house itself. The original white paint had long since faded, and the bare boards showed, muddy, to match the yard.

By contrast, my uncle's hog pen, as I had remembered it from my last visit to the country, was a thing of beauty. The pigs were well cared for, the fence was in good repair, and the greenery surrounding the pen was lovely.

Naturally I accepted then, and still accept, as nothing out of the ordinary, the fact that Negroes live in homes worse than hog pens. After all, as you will ably demonstrate, Negroes are "inferior," and I suppose that the real estate brokers have taken this to mean that Negroes are hogs, or worse than hogs.

I wanted you to have the picture that "indoctrinated" me; and I wanted you to know that in my opinion your study, when it is finished, will provide a very appropriate frame.

—MAXINE PHILLIPS

Pink Press

The DAR is at it again. This time, the Texas branch, for very novel reasons, has objected to a group of American authors (including Benet, Faulkner, Sandberg, etc.) because they are "questionable," i.e., sort of pink.

Maybe the girls just don't like authors. Maybe they can't read. But more likely, their novel reasons are just fiction.

—G. STORCH

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING.....Editor
MARGARET ANN RHYMES.....Associate Editor
LLOYD LITTLE.....Executive News Editor
BILL HOBBS.....Managing Editor
JIM CLOFFELTER, BILL WUAMETT.....News Editors
JIM WALLACE.....

Photography Editor
CHUCK MOONEY.....Feature Editor
HARRY LLOYD.....Sports Editor
ED DUFREKE.....Asst. Sports Editor
GARRY BLANCHARD.....

BUSINESS STAFF

MIKE BURNETT.....Business Manager
TIM KE MATHERS.....Advertising Manager
JIM EVANS.....Subscription Manager
JIM ESKRIDGE.....Circulation 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.