

# 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 17, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 80

## Junius Scales

Junius Scales has been variously referred to as a "brilliant, but naive man," "a misguided martyr" and "a vile, contemptible subversive."

Which of these comes closest to the truth is a question that has been debated across the length and breadth of the United States. But one thing is certain: the Junius Scales who entered Lewisburg penitentiary late last year to begin a six-year sentence could not be the same man who was sentenced in Greensboro in 1955 for being a member of the Communist Party.

In 1955, Scales still believed that Communism was the answer to what he considered failures in capitalism and democratic government in America. Two years later sickened and disillusioned by the Soviet treatment of Hungary and the hypocrisy of Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin, Scales repudiated Communism and broke completely with the Communist Party. In 1958, Scales was again convicted on the same charge. (He had been granted a new trial on a legal technicality.)

In June of last year, the Supreme Court upheld the 1958 conviction by a 5-4 decision. The decision also upheld the Smith Act of 1950 which holds membership in the Communist Party to be participation in a group which advocates violent overthrow of the government.

Scales, was never shown in any of his trials to have personally committed any act of violence, or to have advocated overthrow of the government by force or violence. He, in short, was convicted on his beliefs, not his actions. For his be-

liefs, he is serving six years in prison. Worse, they are beliefs that he no longer holds, that he repudiated when it became clear to him that his years in the service of the Communist Party were wasted on an utterly false ideal.

Thus a man is being punished as vindication for a once-held belief although he has not committed any overt act of violence himself nor advocated such an act in the pursuit of that belief.

To continue to connect the Junius Scales of 1955 with the Junius Scales of today is an injustice in itself. His original conviction under the Smith Act, which makes belief a criminal offense, is an even greater one.

Judging from the government's handling of other Communists, some of whom still fervently believe in Communist totalitarianism, Scales might have won clemency had he conceded to enmesh others in the threads of the Smith Act. His refusal to do so, on the grounds that none of the persons he knew in his days as a Communist are now dangerous, virtually guarantees that he will not be released before his six years of penance is paid.

It is perhaps belaboring a point to say that the questions surrounding Scales conviction and sentencing have nothing to do with the validity or invalidity of Communist doctrine. Its fraudulence and vileness is readily apparent to Americans; even, since 1957, to Scales. And it is the duty of any American to oppose it with courage and strength.

But to translate this opposition into vengeance upon the head of a man who has disavowed all affection for Communism is to trample on democracy.

## Note To Dr. George

Note to Dr. W. C. George, professor emeritus and racist extraordinaire: PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 20—The

American Anthropological Association has strongly disputed statements that Negroes are biologically and mentally inferior to the white race.

The association's council has adopted a resolution reaffirming its belief in the inherent equality of the Negro and white races.

The resolution stated: "The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, and reaffirms the fact that there is no scientifically established evidence to justify the exclusion of any race from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States."

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 192 to 0.

In other words, Dr. George: As a scientist, well, you'd probably be a good truck-driver.

## "You Bungler! We Were Counting On You"



## ATTITUDES by Clotfelter

# 'Reflections,' Forum For Dissenters And Defenders, Has Superior Art, Layout

The current issue of "Reflections" from Chapel Hill magazine is valuable for its excellent content and genuinely superior art work and layout. But it is more valuable because of its existence, regardless of the quality of its material.

"Reflections" is a student-edited "magazine of art and thought which welcomes a variety of opinions." It claims to be "a rallying point for Southern liberals" and "a forum for dissenters and defenders." The editors have said they will print any well-written article or story—no matter what opinion is expressed or what topic is covered.

This editorial attitude that ANY intelligently-presented idea is worth being said and being printed is the magazine's greatest contribution to the Southern (and National) literary

and journalistic scene.

Too often a divergent thought has been suppressed because it is "pink" or "radical." "Reflections" hopefully has freed itself from this childish inhibition.

The articles and stories in the current issue carry out the above policy, with the unfortunate exception that no "rightist," "conservative," or even "middle-of-the-road" article appears. (Apparently none was contributed, but the editors are nonetheless responsible for encouraging the expression of ALL ideas and attitudes, not just those of a "leftist" slant.)

Lawrence Ferlinghetti, the famous San Francisco poet and author of "Her," leads off this issue with "One Thousand Fearful Words for Fidel Castro," a sad, mocking little poem which is very effective and timely. My favorite line refers to the "experts" who "know the difference between Soviet Communism . . . and socialism with a small c."

The next piece, "A Modest Proposal for the Final Settlement of the American Question—A Turgid Treatise on How to Fix America But Good (Through Trenchant Truncating Tactics)," is a Swift dose of nonsense by James K. Layton. By the simplicity of his solution to the world's problems, he puts to shame all of the advocates of One Handy Solution to the Cold War and Other Diverse Problems.

Editor Bob Brown's 13-page editorial is an intelligent, very personal attack upon the nature of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The editorial opens with several pages of pondering as to how "Reflections" should fulfill its purpose to present controversial views and simultaneously escape unjust criticism because the views are printed. Brown refuses to follow many other "liberals" who go on the defensive by saying something like, "Yes, I love America and capitalism and democracy and motherhood, even though I am a liberal."

The photography of the late William Rezek takes up several pages. This unique person was apparently fascinated by sewerage at all levels, and his interesting photographs reflect this fascination.

Socialist editor and economist Paul M. Sweezy wrote the next article, "The Struggle for Latin America," a brief historical review of United States "economic colonization" of its southern neighbors. He is not an apologist for Fidel Castro, but a vigorous defender.

Sweezy discusses the economic as-

pects of Fidelismo, but not its often unfortunate political results. The economist's opinion of Castro is not mine, but it is one with which students of the Cuban situation should be acquainted and should understand.

Washington reporter Marvin Kaplan's "The Last White Family on the Block" is a lucid description of a white integrationist's feelings as he and his family become the "last white family . . ."

The first Negroes who move into the neighborhood are nice, think their white neighbors (according to Kaplan), "yet each small disturbance (which concerns the Negroes) is magnified in the wide eyes of fear . . . Two gangs, one white and one Negro, get into a fight, and rumor runs through the neighborhood like fire. That's what we fear. Negro turbulence. Where is it? Next door? It is seldom next door. But it's down the street, next to old Mrs. Grandy, who lives there all alone, poor soul . . . OUR Negroes are different. But who knows who will follow them?"

The dilemma of Kaplan (who is president of Neighbors, Inc., a group seeking to retain the integrated nature of their neighborhood) cannot be solved by reference to dogma and his article is therefore free from any hint of what people "should" do.

Elizabeth Tornquist's "The Poverty of Liberalism" is a call to arms

## Hoover Who?

# Columns' Objectivity Vs. Readers' Accuracy

At the conclusion of the Sunday (Jan. 14) DTH editorial column, Jim Clotfelter made a remarkably interesting observation: "No objective journalist can be sure who is 'anti-Communist,' who is 'Communist-leaning,' or who is 'Communist.'"

For the sake of logic and consistency, if for no other, Clotfelter should read his own column in order to prevent such obvious inconsistencies which result from an apparently insincere desire to advise others.

There is one unifying factor which repeatedly occurs in Clotfelter's expositions and that is the expression of resentment for journalistic or political opposition to Communism. He never suggests overtly that pro-Communists should be granted respect and admiration but he does imply that they should be given the consent of silence.

He wrote a few days ago that J. Edgar Hoover, undoubtedly America's best qualified critic on Communism, only added to confusion to the Katanga-UN problem by opposing the province's falling into the control of the pro-Communists. The conflict here was resolved very simply by Clotfelter's own either-or alternative. Either Katanga must receive the stability and protection from a Communist but united Congo or remain independent and anti-Communist and go to the devil. Deciding which observation is more valid is certainly a difficult task in this instance. Ignoring his far-rang-

ing experience in dealing with communist controversy, his unchallenged access to more pertinent facts concerning the matter and his authority on the subject, we are expected to disregard Hoover's position because he is definitely known to be anti-Communist, and therefore could not make an objective observation—valid perhaps, but never objective. Also, if we consider Clotfelter's position, it is absolutely essential that we ignore his experience, access to the facts, and authority but compensation is made for these relatively minor aspects by the outstanding objectivity with which he presents the case.

Speaking of objectivity, is it not true that you, Mr. Clotfelter, wrote the "news" report of the Harrington-Lewis debate on the film, "Operation Abolition" which appeared in the Oct. 25 issue of the DTH? If there were a Journalism Hall of Shame, this story would surely be a top contender in the Most Unobjective category. Not only is one party lauded in the news column and is given almost all attention, but the other party, the one against whom you have publically expressed antagonism, was ignored until he said something that would appear ridiculous out of context and with perhaps with slight paraphrasing. Does this measure up to your ideal standards of objectivity?

It is true that objectivity is an essential criterion in contemporary journalism. It is also true that there is a present trend toward interpretative writing. The journalist, today, is expected to do more than collect and report the simple facts: he is now responsible to the public to probe further and report the significance and the implications of these facts, the result of which is a meaningful analysis as opposed to the traditional enumeration of details. With this bit of progress in the journalistic profession must come also added responsibility for objectivity and fair play.

An examination of the purposes and responsibilities of the contemporary journalistic profession contradicts the charge that "no objective journalist can be sure who is anti-Communist, Communist-leaning, or pro-Communist." Furthermore it seems that the opposite natures of capitalism and communism would provide still another method of distinguishing between the two.

—CHARLES HEATHERLY

Mr. Heatherly:

I never mentioned J. Edgar Hoover in my column on Katanga. The individual's name was Herbert Hoover. He was once President of the United States.

—JIM CLOTFELTER

## 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.

The current issue of "Reflections" is the third since the magazine was begun last June. It has grown considerably since that time and the nature and quality of this issue testify to the importance of its continued success.

—JIM CLOTFELTER

# JFK College Bill Headed For Damaging Revisions?

President Kennedy's college education bill probably will be the first major legislation to be debated this year. It is expected to pass but there is some danger of damaging revisions being made by Sen. Cooper (R-Ky) and others.

The five-year program set up in the measure would include \$1.5 billion in loans for classroom construction, \$924 million for college student scholarships, and \$250 million in matching grants to help build public junior colleges.

The bill authorizes 25,000 scholarships to be awarded the first year; 37,500 the next; and 50,000 each for the next three years. These could not exceed \$1,000 annually. The states would administer the program and a recipient could attend any college of his choice.

Universities would receive \$350 as a "cost of education allowance" for each scholarship holder in attendance.

Democratic leaders appear to think the Senate, which passed the President's public school grant bill last year by 49-34, will also pass this bill. The House killed the elementary and high school bill last year, but it is expected to pass the higher education bill since it does not involve the divisive issue of aid for church schools.

Last September the Senate Labor Committee approved the \$2.67-billion college education bill by 12-2—with only Barry Goldwater and John Tower (D-Tex) in opposition.

Congressional floor disputes are expected to concern both the classroom loans and the scholarship provisions.

Sen. Cooper has said he likely would offer an amendment to change student scholarships to student loans. In 1958 Cooper led the successful revision effort to change "scholarships" to "loans" in the National Defense Education Act.

U. S. college and university enrollment is growing faster than schools can accommodate the students. It has become a near-cliche that universities need more classroom and dormitory space—but they do. It has been said often that many qualified students cannot attend college for financial reasons—and it is true.

UNC is presently constructing a new language building. It needs more library space. Many departments are crowded into small alleys in the older class buildings. In addition UNC receives many requests annually for scholarships and loans—requests which cannot be filled for lack of funds.

The Kennedy Administration bill, which is tentatively set for debate beginning next Monday, will help to alleviate these problems, both for universities and students.

—JIM CLOTFELTER

## The Daily Tar Heel

### EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING, Editor

MARGARET ANN RHYMES, Associate Editor

LLOYD LITTLE, Executive News Editor

BILL HOBBS, Managing Editor

JIM CLOTFELTER, BILL WUAMETT, News Editors

JIM WALLACE, Photography Editor

CHUCK MOONEY, Feature Editor

HARRY LLOYD, Sports Editor

ED DUPRE, Asst. Sports Editor

GARRY BLANCHARD, Contributing Editor

### BUSINESS STAFF

TIM BURNETT, Business Manager

MIKE 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 to the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$9 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.