

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.

February 13, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. LXIX, No. 90

The New Left

The New Left, rather a loosely organized discussion group composed of individuals whose socio-economic and political views fall somewhere in the vast area "left of Kennedy," as they put it, seems to be about ready to make itself known.

On the bottom right of today's page, the group offers a brief outline of its general outlook, with an almost tacit invitation to sit in on a meeting.

To our way of thinking, the organization has been too long in the shadows—well outside the campus mainstream, functioning, for the most part, in silence. This is not to say that the group holds clandestine meetings at which individuals are indoctrinated into the mysteries of a secret leftist coterie—merely that its scope has been limited.

Carolina—indeed, any college or university—needs the kind of political stimulation that groups like the New Left can provide. Ideas are the meat of education. But they must be heard, discussed and dissected. If they are valid, they will stand. If they are faulty, they will fall.

The "Liberal-Conservative" controversy at Carolina has all-too-often been nothing more than a temp in a tea-pot which finds individual functioning purely and simply under their label, "Liberals" square off with "conservatives" in

much the same manner as school-boys in a rag-tag game of pick-up football, with team One against team Two.

Idea exchange is lost in flurries of name-calling and "you're another one" arguments which generally result in little more than a few frazzled tempers, overworked adrenalin glands and not a damn thing reconciled. Each camp pulls further back into its own territory to glare at the "enemy," exchange methods of attack and bolster the collective ego.

Meanwhile, everyone forgets exactly how he came to fall under the particular label of his group and loses the ability to re-evaluate his own position in light of whatever information—or misinformation—he has gained. The battle is the thing . . . the cause is often forgotten.

The New Left group, however, appears to be taking stock of itself first, defining its terms, so to speak. If the cause is there, then let it become an issue. If not, then the crusade is Quixotic, the "enemy" a political, economic or social windmill. This is the valid approach to pinning down and answering some of the questions that are becoming increasingly more ill-posed and nebulous.

The New Left gave its invitation. We hope those who are genuinely concerned will accept it.

Kindergarten?

The little quiz administered the other day to selected Marines was labeled by Charles A. Byrne, Stennis Committee functionary who gave it, as a test of "knowledge" of the Cold War.

It tests nothing of the sort. Only three of the 18 questions published in a recent newspaper account have directly to do with the Cold War. Such questions as "What are the populations of Russia, China, Cuba, France and the United States?" or "What didn't the Marine Corps like about 'Operation Abolition?'" or "What is the American Nazi Party?" may relate in some odd way to the cold war. They may even be desirable knowledge for the soldiery. But that is a matter of opinion.

In fact, answers to several of the questions themselves are matters of opinion, not "knowledge." Such questions as "What is the menace

of Communism to the free world?" and "Do you think the Communists are trying to influence the armed services?" require statements of belief and opinion, not recitation of "fact."

Now, it is one thing to test members of the armed services as part of a general training program on their knowledge of established and agreed-upon facts. It is another for petty employees of a Senate committee, behind the back of the chairman and its majority, to test a handful of servicemen for opinions on which Americans disagree strenuously, especially, when it is blandly said that any "leftist" responses—whatever they are—will be turned over, with the testee's name, to his commander.

This kindergarten-type seatwork reached a depth of absurdity when it asked the Marines to identify or describe "dialectical materialism." Probably not more than 5 per cent of the members of Congress themselves could define "dialectical materialism" except perhaps by quoting by rote a dictionary label. Indeed, there is a strong possibility that Karl Marx himself did not know what he meant by it.

Basically, the outrage of the whole affair is that it was designed to embarrass General Shoup, commandant of the Marine Corps and a Congressional Medal of Honor wearer, because he happens to believe that a Marine's business is to fight when called on and not to engage in political debate.

— Greensboro Daily News

What Next?

The NAACP reported this week that its "southern search for Jim Crow run-offs of the National Spelling Bee this week flushed out another offender . . ."

Come on now, a segregated spelling bee?

"Small World, Eh, Neighbor?"



ATTITUDES by Clotfelter

Textbook Cooperative Needed

In the past ten days students have suffered from an honest-to-goodness "monopoly": the textbook market on campus.

The University Book Exchange is in a position to give any price it chooses for used textbooks and can ask any price it chooses when reselling them. New texts are sold at regular commercial prices, with nary a discount to be had.

By no stretch of the imagination does the Intimate Bookshop deserve the title "competitor." Its existence in no way disturbs the monopoly.

There is, of course, a reason why the University cannot sell books at discount prices. The Umstead Act forbids state-supported institutions from competing with commercial enterprises ("competing in the genuine sense of the word, where the competitors cut prices, improve service, and increase variety of products . . . in order to take business away

from the opposition.) So . . . the book-ex annually returns a whopping profit to the University.

Because of this legislation the Book Exchange cannot be expected to help ease the student's financial burden in this area.

That the burden is heavy can be attested to by any student who has bought textbooks (or by those students who are either unable or unwilling to pay the prices, and don't buy books at all). The economic welfare of UNC studentry demands an attempt to solve, or at least modify, the present situation.

Several answers are possible: a student cooperative off-campus or on-campus; an individual-oriented national cooperative union; or the hope that the Intimate will begin to act like a competitor and cut textbook prices. The last solution is tacitly unrealistic.

An on-campus or off-campus cooperative would have the advantages that it:

—Would offer a great variety of texts, making it more useful to more students.

—Could be supported in part by student organizations and would have a greater chance for success in its early years.

—Could serve all UNC students.

—Would be able to diversify into other fields where students are in an economic pinch, such as clothing goods.

Unfortunately, a student cooperative on campus would almost certainly violate the Umstead Act, in the same way the book-ex would.

A much preferable system would have the cooperative established off-campus and sponsored by an independent student group, rather than student government. Off-campus student cooperatives have been success-

U.S. Movement Hurts Reds

THE FIGHT IS FORGING AHEAD

America's anti-Communist movement is hurting the Reds and the work is out to stop it at all costs. This is heartening news for those fighting the good fight who may not always be aware of how their joint efforts are succeeding.

Some interesting facts were released this fall from previously "classified" testimony before the Senate subcommittee on internal security. The witness was Edward Hunter, former government employee and psychological warfare specialist who has authored several books on Communist brainwashing techniques.

Hunter said the Communists' evaluation of the U. S. anti-Communist movement as a first-magnitude threat to Red world conquest plans was revealed by the inclusion of orders for its eradication in the 81-party manifesto of December, 1960. The order was unprecedented in Communist party history.

This means that the American patriots had best gird themselves for a psychological warfare onslaught that will employ every diabolical and dirty tactic in the Red repertoire of deceit, and every possible means of pressure.

Nobody realizes more clearly than the Kremlin, Hunter said, that "if the anti-Communist movement is not destroyed before it attains solidarity and stability and becomes sure of its ground, it will be fatal to the Communist movement everywhere."

The anti-Communist counter-offensive already is cutting inroads through the American national mind, discrediting, vilifying, smearing the sources of anti-Communist thought.

The purpose: Take the sting out of the anti-Communist movement. Here are the immediate targets.

(1) Make anti-Communism an unpopular thing to discuss or to express.

(2) Convince America that the Red

threat to this country is far away overseas, not at home.

(3) Lump all opposition to Communism under the label of "radical right-wingers."

(4) Make anti-Communism in Federal agencies a form of "sticking one's neck out."

The goal: Take the force out of the anti-Communist movement so that the Communist forces can win by default.

Americans can take heart that their patriotism is paying off, but all should be alerted, too, that the fight for freedom must be unrelenting.

N. Franklin Adkinson
Samuel S. Jones

A NOTE ON HISTORY . . . Perhaps Georgi Dimitroff was more prophetic than he knew when he told the Lenin School of Political Warfare during the early stages of Red Tide:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists."

"A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation or a retired general is worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

AN ETERNAL TRUTH . . .

The greatest Liberal of the twentieth century, Woodrow Wilson, had this philosophy of government:

Andrews Should Not Advance Liberalism

To The Editor:

The February 7, 1962 issue of the Daily Tar Heel contained a letter from the Rev. David Andrews in Defense of his "Pray-In" Conducted in Washington, D. C. on behalf of Morton Sobell. Several statements in Mr. Andrews's letter deserve closer consideration.

As reasons for his "Pray-In", Mr. Andrews says, "I did it because he is a human being, an American citizen, and an object of God's love." Using these three reasons as a criterion, one must admit that virtually every man in a penitentiary can qualify for Mr. Andrews's sympathy. But in the case of Morton Sobell, Mr. Andrews believes that justice was not done, and he says that he believes in justice for everyone.

Even such heinous evildoers as John Birchites, snake handlers, or men from Mars (I wonder who passed judgment on this choice group). After having studied the so-called facts in a book . . . written by a professor of law at one of our major universities," Mr. Andrews expresses grave concern over the manner in which the Sobell trial was conducted. Really, Mr. Andrews, don't you believe that the courts are more qualified to pass judgment on the facts and fairness of the Sobell trial than someone who has written or read a book pervaded with preconceived opinions?

Mr. Andrews has the following to say concerning his attitude toward Communism:

" . . . I am not, never have been and never will be a Communist. My

own economic philosophy is about as far removed from Communist totalitarianism as one could get."

Two sentences later he says, "I have never gotten around to studying Marx or Lenin . . ." Now, if a man admittedly has never examined the philosophy of another society, can he make any comparison, rational or not, between his philosophy and theirs?

Rev. Andrews refers to the attempts . . . to smear every active, honest liberal with red . . . and people persist in . . . equating Liberalism with Communism." The assumption must be that he is the "Liberal" in question since the first paragraph of his letter states that " . . . some people have gotten the mistaken idea that I am favorable to Communism." Isn't it wonderful Out of the dark ugly recesses suddenly shines forth the pure, noble, godly light of Liberalism.

I do not believe that Mr. Andrews is a Communist sympathizer in any way whatsoever. I am sure that he loves and believes in the American way of life and that he tries to be a good American citizen.

He is, however, reckless, ill-advised, and mistaken in his pursuit. Rev. Andrews's apparent use of his clerical position as a means to disguise the promotion of a political cause (Liberalism) is reprehensible.

—FRANK E. CELLA

Robinson's Ramblings

Public relations object lessons rarely hit the world's front pages. But India recently unwittingly gave all students of public relations, particularly those in government and business, a bagful of public relations "don'ts."

Every public official and businessman should study carefully the public relations aspects of India's speedy conquest of Goa. Begin with India's self-serving declarations prior to the conquest that administration in Goa was collapsing. Examine carefully the words leading to the fight between India's UN delegate and a newspaperman. In the end, read the unfavorable world reaction to the conquest of Goa.

There is something to be learned in each step of the shameful process of swallowing up Goa. Here are some of the "don'ts" to remember:

1. Don't make the mistake, even a small one, which erases many years of building up good public relations, based on good performance and good behavior. (Item: The conquest of Goa wiped out in minutes the image of India, laboriously self-built for nearly 15 years, as a nation dedicated to non-violence and spiritual leadership.)

2. Don't talk from both sides of your mouth if you want to win friends and influence people as part of a program of achieving good public relations. (Item: Years of holier-than-thou international declarations by India were cancelled out, probably permanently, by one swoop on Goa.)

—MIKE ROBINSON

Leftists Invite Discussion

Dear Editor:

Rather more than a year ago a group of graduate students who are interested in discussing contemporary problems from a liberal or socialist standpoint began meeting informally every two or three weeks. The group has since expanded to include a few faculty and undergraduate members, and it now counts regularly on getting twenty or more people to its meetings. It is still informally constituted (it has no elected officers) but it is run by an executive committee of six graduate students drawn from six different fields. It calls itself the New Left Club—a title borrowed from a movement that has been very active in England the last few years.

The group has deliberately avoided publishing a manifesto or a statement of policy. There is such diversity of opinion within the group that it would be quite impossible to achieve unanimity on a general policy. And anyway it seems inappropriate for a discussion group to publish a statement of political

conclusions; if the problems have already been solved, they hardly merit discussion.

The members can all be described as "left of Kennedy" but any more precise description would be inaccurate. There are several liberal Democrats, several democratic socialists and two or three Marxists; there are no Trotskyites, Stalinists or members of the Communist Party, though such people would be welcome at our meetings insofar as they would enliven the discussions. Anyone is welcome to join the group so long as he shares enough of the basic assumptions of the political Left to make discussion possible—such assumptions as that all political action should be grounded on a belief in humane values and in egalitarianism.

This semester the group will be meeting every two or three weeks. These meetings will be announced in the Tar Heel. The first meeting will be held this Thursday in Graham Memorial at 8:30 p.m., when Dr. Blackman will lead a discussion on the Draft Program for the 22nd Con-

gress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In addition, the New Left Club is setting up two study groups to meet independently of the regular meetings. Each of these groups will devote intensive study to a particular problem. One will deal with industrialization in the South, bringing the combined efforts of historians, sociologists, economists and political scientists to bear on this topic. The other will read and discuss Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution," the great classic in Marxist history. It is hoped that by the end of the semester these people will have extended their knowledge of both Marxism and the Russian Revolution. Anyone wishing to participate in either of these study groups should be sure to come to the meeting on Thursday.

Nicholas Bateson
Dick Ginnold
Bob Drake
Max Milton
Marty Prinnack
Charlie Parrish

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING.....Editor
HARVE HARRIS.....Managing Editor
Associate Editor
LLOYD LITTLE.....Executive News Editor
JIM CLOTFELTER, 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.