

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.

February 11, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 89

Sen. Thurmond

In taking strong stands against revealing names of the censors of military speeches, both President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara must have remembered the witch-hunts of the McCarthy period.

Secretary McNamara, who has had the full support of the President since the inquiry kicked off by charges of "muzzling" by Sen. Strom Thurmond of South Carolina has said that he would not subject members of his department to "harrassment."

The Secretary doubtless had reference to the volume of mail which has been received by Willis Lawrence, one of the dozen or so Pentagon censors who blue-pencil military speeches. Lawrence said this week that he had been called "a traitor, Pro-Red and all sorts of things," since he was called up before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee two weeks ago to answer questions concerning "muzzling."

Since McNamara was unable to fend off the inquiry on his own, the President was pushed into using his right to executive privilege. In this instance, the President acted clearly within his right. The Constitution is necessarily vague on the matter, and the courts have been generally unwilling to force the issue.

That both the President and Secretary McNamara acted wisely is generally conceded, except by Sen. Thurmond and others of the pot-banging set. The New York Times of Feb. 9 reported that it was evident that Sen. Thurmond was the only Senator on the subcommittee who objected to the decision.

Fortunately, President Kennedy made it clear that his decision to use the Executive privilege—the first time he has used it in his term of office—in no way established a clear precedent. The President stated in his letter to the Secretary the principle involved could not be "automatically applied to every request for information" and that every case "must be judged on its own merits."

It is well that the President made this distinction. The governmental power balance could well be hamstrung by indiscriminate use of the Executive privilege. The right of the Congress to know and judge executive actions is basic to that balance.

Yet the duty of the President to insure the smooth functioning of executive departments should not be upset, as it might have been in this case, primarily as a result of the South Carolina Senator's screeching.

It is unfortunate that Sen. Thurmond was unable to push the investigation far enough to force the use of the privilege. It is equally unfortunate that the Senator continues to rant about "muzzling." He is fighting a lonely and, hopefully, a losing battle.

How much more dust he will be able to kick up to cloud policy decisions remains to be seen. Late this week he declared that he would continue his plans to present a major speech on the Senate floor which he says will show that State Department policy reflects a "false conception of the world Communist conspiracy." He has called the President's use of Executive privilege—which he termed the "executive fifth amendment"—one of the "most dangerous acts that has ever been committed by a president of the United States."

The Senator's declaration, which he made despite Sen. John Stennis' outspoken defense of the President's use of the privilege, leads us to wonder at his motives. Either this, or we must question his wisdom, particularly in light of all that has gone before.

The bitterness of his attack and his rejection of all considerations except his own personal battle have resulted in some violent tactics. He has used his podium as a Senator unwisely and sometimes even viciously.

We hope he will extract his foot from his mouth long enough to close it. His shouting promises to do little real good and might serve to do genuine harm.

High Ceiling

A fortnight ago President Kennedy recommended an increase of ten billion dollars in the legal ceiling on the national debt. The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has now made a first move in this direction. But instead of an increase of ten billion, the committee has approved an increase of only two.

This action is really meaningless, for it is certain—from a glance at the proposed expenditures recommended by the President and a second glance at the anticipated revenues now in sight—that the national debt will increase by much more than two billion dollars before the end of the year. Why, then, this small increase? Apparently to uphold the prestige of Congress, which alone has power under the Constitution "to borrow money on the credit of the United States."

What really determines the size of the national debt is not the legal ceiling which Congress puts on it—witness the fact that this ceiling has had to be lifted fourteen times since 1938—but the amount of money spent by Congress in relation to the amount brought in by taxes. The trouble with these fictitious "ceilings" is that they sometimes handicap the Treasury in its effort to borrow money on the most advantageous terms. The present ceiling (\$298 billion) has had precisely this effect four times in the last thirty days.

—The New York Times

"However, We've Been Known To Make Deals"



King Should Broaden Himself

To the editor:

As an enthusiastic participant in the recent Toronto Exchange, I feel compelled to respond to Thursday's editorial. Not only do I object to such superficial, uninformed, and irresponsible editor criticism of such a worthwhile program, but I am amazed that the editor of our venerable newspaper, certainly an astute and responsible person, should take such a strong position on something about which he obviously knows so little.

I suppose that my evaluation of the exchange would be termed subjective by some, having been brainwashed by the warmth and friendliness of the Canadian people and having enjoyed to the fullest the stimulating intellectual and social program of activities with which I was presented in Toronto. However, I must attempt to give substance to certain aspects of Mr. King's understandably limited outline of the exchange activities.

The intellectual program of events was not done justice in the article written by a member of the exchange. The Friday afternoon seminar, keynoted by Professor Careless, concerned itself with the background and causes of the rising tide of

Canadian nationalism. This movement, so vital to our foreign and economic policies, receives scant attention in this country. The reflection of the varying attitudes of the Canadian people toward the United States, as seen in the seminar, proved to be a startling revelation for many of the Carolina students.

The Saturday morning discussion was led by a Toronto professor who had studied and taught at Yale University and the University of Oklahoma before returning to Toronto. His impressions of the American college student gained through experience in these two poles of the American college scene provided a pertinent and humorous contrast to the Canadian students' attitudes and scholastic habits and stimulated a lively discussion which revealed many interesting differences and similarities (sic) in the educational systems of the two nations.

However excellent the program of organized mental activities, the real value of the Toronto Exchange lay in the informal contacts which Mr. King, despite his worldliness, fails to recognize. Although the Daily Tar Heel office or even that colorful campus watering-hole, Y-Court, may fail to yield people or

relationships which provide meaningful educational experiences, this was certainly not the case with the Toronto Exchange. The real transmission of ideas, information, and opinions among intelligent people always achieves its greatest depth at the social level, which lacks the limiting aspects of an organized seminar or discussion. You cannot learn to know people in such austere circumstances and it is not until you feel that you know others that any real intellectual interchange begins.

Even such unlikely surroundings as a Canadian beer-party provided conversations and experiences which will be of lasting significance in terms of the intellectual maturity of all concerned. Besides, the value of a calculated intake of alcoholic beverages as a means of stimulating deeper, aesthetic intellectual exchanges has long been recognized by many cultural groups, among them a small but noted sect of Turkish poets.

If Mr. King cannot appreciate the real value of "socializing" and see beyond the superficial impressions left by returning Tar Heels' tales of inspired Bacchic rites, then his has been a colorless and meaningless life indeed. I might suggest that

he expand his range of interests and activities and overcome the provincial outlook and limited experience that his editorial reveals. Perhaps even a trip to Canada would be in order.

—Myron Simmons

Editor's Note: Nothing would please me more than to become a member of the Canadian Club. Please enter my name at the top of the list of volunteers.

However, in the event I fail to qualify as a participant in this admittedly worthy program, may I submit this alternate plan: After choosing 26 worthies and receiving an adequate appropriation from Student Legislature, we will all form a daisy chain and dance three times around the campus singing "Oh Canada." After which, suitable surroundings will be chosen—perhaps the Forest Theater—and all participants will re-enact the orgiastic scenes from "La Dolce Vita."

Thus primed for intellectual stimulation, we will discuss the comparative incidence of gastric hyperacidity among the Australian koala bear and the Canadian moose. We will then take a side-trip to Carboro.

NSA

Is It Democratic?

In a changing world it is extremely important that the modern American student acquaint himself with the organization that represents him nationally and internationally. Much has been said about the National Student Association, both complimentary and otherwise, but such comments are meaningless to most of us unless the structure of the organization is explained. It is our hope that through a series of articles explaining the NSA, student interest in this important area of student government can be generated, and fact can be separated from fiction.

To begin with the U.S. NSA is a democratic organization. Each year member universities from all over the country send delegates to the National Congress. (Within regions member universities send delegates to the Regional Assemblies.) To a certain extent the perfect arrangement would be direct election of the representatives at each school. Although this is done at many universities, Carolina and others find that election schedules make such a system impractical. Carolina's Student Legislature officially appoints our representatives, and last year the SG president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, attorney-general, DTH editor (his alternate) and the UNC NSA Coordinator attended. These student leaders represented Carolina at the NSA Congress held last summer at the University of Wisconsin.

Both criticism and commendation has been heaped upon the NSA because its actions do not typify the

"average American student" (if such a creature exists). To be sure the policies adopted would not be supported 100% on campus. But it should be noted that these measures did meet opposition in the Congress. In the DTH earlier this year an article appeared in which it was stated that the barrier between NSA and "the student" was the fact that the NSA delegates were interested leaders while "the students" were generally apathetic. It is truly our hope that NSA can become more of a student voice, not because it avoids debatable issues, but because more students deliberate its policies and resolve to somehow have a hand in shaping them, if only through a ballot in an SG election.

I have read articles by certain conservatives (not to infer that only conservatives criticize NSA) who advocate UNC's withdrawal from the NSA because of the NSA's pro-liberal policies. While we on the NSA committee here at Carolina welcome suggestions, it seems to us that the reason NSA espouses liberal goals is because a majority of the delegates were liberal. Rather than withdraw from a confederation which does not demand that its member schools agree with all its policies, would it not be better to strengthen this group as a representative assembly and work within its framework as a minority? The conservatives are welcome to control the NSA if the majority of the delegates sent there wish to vote accordingly.

In subsequent articles we shall attempt to explain NSA's major areas of activity, its Congress, its committees and subcommittees, and its policies. Additional information can be picked up from Bill Straughn, NSA Coordinator, in the SG offices in GM. All students should have a legitimate concern with the issues which affect them in their role as students, no matter where these issues arise. Here at Carolina we can express our ideas and aspirations through our student government; we can also join our fellow students across the country through the U.S. NSA and express our opinions on a national and international level.

—FORD ROWAN

Reflections

From the New Republic: "On January 2, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued a further defense of its film 'Operation Abolition,' admitting only one mistake, since corrected, about Harry Bridges.

"The American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California has now issued a version of the film called 'Operation Correction,' applying sub-titles to show how time sequences were continually juggled, inserting revisions in the soundtrack to reveal deliberate distortion."

The reason for sub-titles being used in the ACLU version of the film, we are certain, is that "Operation Abolition" speaks a foreign language. An un-American language.

'Who Are The Extremists?'

The rise of Conservatism on college campuses and throughout the country in general has been most disheartening to the Liberals, who have had a virtual monopoly on intellectual vociferance and political power over the last thirty years.

The groundswell of activity on the Right has taken many Liberals by surprise, and has led to incompetent responses on their part. Instead of relying on calm, intellectual rebuttal to stem the growing number of Conservatives, the Liberals have resorted to, at best, name-calling, and at worst, slander and innuendo in their desperate attempt to discredit their opposition. The Liberals, of all people, have become very irrational when confronted with viewpoints other than their own. Most exemplary of this irrationality is their attempt to label any activity to the right of center as "Extremism."

Who, in fact, are the Extremists? In New York City, Pete Seeger, the folk singer thrown in jail for contempt of Congress, led a rowdy bunch of "beards and leotards" through the streets chanting "You Can Dig Your Grave in Your Own Back Yard" and "I Ain't Gonna Study War No More," along with placards denouncing nuclear tests, arms, and fallout shelters.

In spite of court orders (quoting from the "National Review," Feb. 13, 1962), students, acting under the strategic guidance of CORE (Congress of Racial Equality) maintained a 24-hour sitdown in the corridors outside the office of the Chancellor of the University of Chicago. Their

professed complaint was the 'gradualness' of the University—which has a notorious record of liberality on all racial and civil rights matters—in opening all housing it owns to total integration.

Harold Taylor, former President of Sarah Lawrence College, told 1,500 anti-arms demonstrators outside the UN to demand immediate unilateral disarmament on the part of the U.S.

"Nine hundred professors (also from "National Review") of universities on the Eastern Seaboard denounced in large newspaper advertisements and press releases the idea of building any sort of fallout shelters." These people, who think "fallout shelters" breed defeatism and fear in the general populace, are also the same people who wish to "ban the Bomb" because they fear nuclear war. Now, it would appear that those who fear the consequences of nuclear war, and therefore want to ban the bomb, would be the same people who would take steps to protect themselves by building fallout shelters. But such is not the case.

Another example of Extremism on the Left, and there are many, is the position of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. This extreme Leftist organization maintains its campaign in favor of the Castro regime in spite of the fact that Castro is avowedly Communist.

Harvard and Yale, citadels of Liberal thought, have arbitrarily denied their students the right to participate in the National Defense Education Act. This was done be-

cause Harvard and Yale wished to "protect" their students from the injustices of having to sign a Loyalty oath in order to receive loans. But it is apparent that the real infringement on freedom was that imposed by Harvard and Yale's administrations, who denied their students the freedom to sign the oath or not, as the students wished. Harvard and Yale (and several other colleges) have violated the very rights that they seek to protect.

When taken as a group, these examples of Liberal extremism: a) advocate policies that would strip this country of its means for protecting itself from possible enemies, b) to give aid and comfort to enemies of the United States, c) arbitrarily reject public laws, d) put forth crude slogans, e) appeal to fear and ignorance, and f) offend the integrity of the American people.

But perhaps many Liberals abhor the above examples of Extremism. They should be commended for their insight and common sense. We do not mean to condemn all Liberals for the antics of some of their associates. But, likewise, the Liberals should show a little tolerance toward the Conservatives, who also object to groups like the John Birch Society who, through hatred and distrust, subvert the legitimate beliefs of Conservatives. If the Liberals in Journalism and in public life insist on calling everyone from Robert A. Taft to Barry Goldwater an "extremist," then perhaps they should clean up their own backyard, which is also cluttered with "Extremists."

N. FRANKLIN ADKINSON SAMUEL S. JONES, JR.

How He MIGHT Teach

The present situation of the younger university teacher is probably more exciting than that of any of his counterparts since the mid-seventeenth century.

The reasons for this are obvious. Behind the modern professor lies an enormously significant intellectual revolution, in front of him sit rows of students largely unaware of the implications of the revolution, and the question how to effect a vital engagement of the two forces is no longer unanswerable.

What is the answer? Like everything in teaching, it takes the form of an obligation, a duty.

When students bring him snippets of random sexology (unconscious slander of Freud's name, the teacher must confront them with a whole new vision of the nature of the mind.

When they appear in his classroom dressed in caps and cloaks of seventeenth-century psycho-dualism on which are applied, like tinsel stars, such nonce phrases as "relativity theory," "interderminacy principle," "existential gap," he must seek to turn them out (by drawing on whatever of the new psychology, physiology, and physics can be quickly taught) with an intuition of the "world" as a process, an uncertain act of continual human creation.

When they offer him gabble about conformity and the organization man, he must show them (by fur-

nishing relevant anthropology and sociology) that the old icon, the individual, is only another image in the civilizing but risky dream of the West.

When they brandish exegetical notes taken during prep-school sessions on "The Waste Land," he must press them toward the perception that a revolution has taken place in all the arts—a revolution made inevitable by the imagination's effort to master orders and systems of reality which, unlike those of the past, are in no part the invention of artists.

When fake issues, idle arguments of adolescent "Democrats" and "Republicans," or boyish current-events talk about Red China hating Red Russia, threaten to fog the glass, he must aim at the revelation of the mass state as the chief political and social phenomenon of the age. East and West. And at every moment he must insist on the necessity of bringing alive in reflection whole continents and civilizations that hitherto have barely existed in the Western mind.

His duty, in short, is to teach new heavens and a new earth, to show his students into the world of Now, to drive himself toward that full consciousness of the times which is the only armor left against mere irony or mere wanness.

—Benjamin DeMott, in an article in "Commentary," September 1960.

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING.....Editor
HARVE HARRIS.....Managing Editor
MARGARET ANN RHYMES.....Associate Editor
LLOYD LITTLE.....Executive News Editor
JIM CLOFFELTER, BILL WUAMETT.....News Editors
JIM WALLACE.....Photography Editor
CHUCK MOONEY.....Feature Editor
ED DUPREE.....Sports Editor
CURRY KIRKPATRICK.....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 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.