

## 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.

April 8, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. LXIX, No. 136

## 'Smelly' Movies?

The Raleigh Times was apparently disturbed this week with the public's taste in motion pictures. Taking a cue from the Academy Awards nominees, the Times asked "What does it take to make a good movie?"

It then goes on to answer its own question:

It's a little hard to figure the answer to that one. But judging from the list of nominees for the Academy Awards this year, the movies has to be about some unpleasant subject, preferably something unpleasant sexually.

One of the cleaner nominees is a sympathetic view of lawless street gangs in New York. Another is about a call girl and a gigolo. Still another features a refugee woman who is notably free with her charms. Another concerns a spinster who sees folly in her chaste ways and picks up the first salesman who comes along. Another tells the story of a girl who went to the insane asylum because of the strain of having refused sex with her sweetheart. Still another stars a reformed child molester. And another nominee tells of a whispering campaign charging two teachers with sexual perversion. The last of the sorry lot tells the story of a woman who procures Italian boys for lonely American women.

All this, presumably, is art. It all seems to fit into the pattern that if it smells bad enough it is really art.

The really sad part of all this smelly stuff in the movie houses is that if the public didn't support it by buying tickets, it wouldn't be art long. And if the public would stop going to the movies

which feature these things, pretty soon the public would begin to get some good—and decent—movies.

Although we're not sure of all the movies the Times is referring to, we gather that "The Roman Spring of Mrs. Stone," "West Side Story," "The Mark," "Two Women," "Splendor in the Grass," "The Children's Hour," and "Summer and Smoke" are among those falling into the Times category of "smelly stuff."

We will have to agree with the Times that at least two of these movies are pretty "smelly." But even these two aren't offensive because they deal directly or indirectly with sexual themes. They stink because they're poorly done.

The Times, however, is apparently not interested in the quality of a production, but whether it is fit fare for Aunt Minnie's sewing circle. And while Aunt Minnie makes great doilies, she's not exactly noted for her critical ability.

What the Times seems to overlook is that art, to a great or small degree, imitates life. Today's motion pictures are just beginning to reflect some of the realities that exist whether the Times likes them or not.

Some movies, unfortunately, deal with their themes poorly; some, as the Times implies, aren't interested in theme at all, but purely in box-office receipts.

Some of the new freedom gained through gradually relaxing censorship has manifested itself in slipshod attempts to cover up bad art with blatant sexuality.

But this does not mean that there is no place in movies for sexual themes. Indeed, these themes need more, not less attention.

## OAS Indicts Itself

If there remains any doubt in the mind of any as to the level of barbaric ruthlessness to which the French Secret Army has sunk, let that doubt be dispelled now.

There was a time when the OAS symbolized a cause which it could not be condoned, could be under-

stood. The OAS consisted of men who felt strongly that Algeria should remain French. They felt strongly enough to fight and kill.

But the French people have indicated, by their support of President Charles de Gaulle, that the will of the majority is that Algeria be governed by Algerians.

When a peace treaty was negotiated between the French and the Moslems of Algeria, the OAS called upon the French people to rise in revolt. They promised to bathe Algeria in the blood of Moslems.

But the French people did not rise in revolt. And the OAS, castigated now by both the French and the Moslems, has turned its cause into a bloody vendetta of hatred and revenge.

The battle reached its lowest, most depraved depths when OAS gunmen walked through a Moslem hospital, killing defenseless patients in an orgy of death.

If there remains any Frenchmen—or any persons anywhere—who still delude themselves into thinking that the OAS fights bravely for a proud cause, this senseless slaying should overcome the delusions.

The French government, supported by the French people, should spare no effort in tracking down every member and bringing him to justice.

—Charlotte Observer

## "They All Say They're Good Friends Of His"



Steve Lindell

## Please—No More Bunk About Banning The Bomb

On the campus scene has appeared another "peace" group. This one is called the Chapel Hill Peace Study Group. Just what this group will produce no one knows, but the prospect of its producing something of value seems almost hopeful.

Set up "with the purpose of studying and discussing proposals for peace and disarmament put forth by various governments," this group seems to have started off by lending a touch of realism to what in the past has been a hopelessly idealistic movement.

The product of past "peace" groups seems to me rather simple in nature. As I size them up they start and end with the line of attack:

1. The Bomb is poisoning the atmosphere.
  2. This causes nasty things to happen.
  3. Therefore, the bomb is bad.
  4. Therefore, we must ban the bomb.
- To this I say;
5. This is BUNK.

But such runs the black and white argument of the pacifists. They completely blot out of the argument the whole problem of cause, i.e., What is the prime motivating factor behind the building and testing of the bomb? Is there a need for it? And, is this the lesser of the two evils?

The pacifists seems to hope to refuse to admit, or simply deny, the existence of the Russians, Soviet Imperialism and Communism as forces which are operating with the goal of the overthrow and destruction of our values—religious, political, economic and social. It is as if the ban of the bomb movement, the latest degeneration of the peace movement is a form of mere escapism. Perhaps it stills the fears of the pacifists but banning the bomb does not by any means solve the problem—or even touch upon it. Indeed they seem blind to the problem itself—Communism.

It must be remembered that, at this point in time one of the key deterrents against such a cataclysmic overthrow of our society is the bomb. This may be an unpleasant thing to realize but it is a military fact of life that cannot be winked at. Whether we like it or not—and nobody really likes the prospect of poisoning our atmosphere (even by less than one percent)—this we must do.

Thus we have two evils:

1. our destruction—by bomb or surrender.
2. our preservation—by having a bomb.

We are damned if we do and damned if we don't. But we stand

less of a chance of being damned if we arm to defend ourselves. Then why do these tests go on? Do we not have a bomb now? Yes, but the possession of an out-of-date bomb does no one any good. We must develop bigger and better—ludicrous as it sounds.

Our prime alternative is disarmament. Here we have attempted to reach agreement with our protagonist, but the time is not yet ripe and we can only hope and negotiate, and negotiate—still more. We have spent the last 16 years at this in Geneva.

## Dull Edged Frat Logic Is Blasted

It is now April.

The cherry trees are blossoming, the flowers are blooming, and the Arboretum is beginning to fill up in the evenings.

The season for snow is clearly past.

So let's get off it, pledges Strubing and May, and let the sunshine melt a little of that snow that you have been trying to heap upon us.

There is a rather elementary axiom in logic, pledges, which states that if A equals B and B equals C, then A equals C also. Therefore, pledges, when you say that fraternity membership is based on congeniality and that sharpness is the reason that a member is congenial, I really don't think that you have shown that (I quote you) "a fraternity is based on congeniality, not sharpness . . ."

As for selectivity, pledges, you are quite right. I am selective in choosing my friends and I am quite willing that you should have that same privilege. It's just that I like to think that my selections are based on reasons a little more logical than those of race, religion and that dirty old word, money.

I also think, pledges, that a two minute rational reading of my previous letter would perhaps suggest that I do not believe, as you seem to think I do, that the donning of a fraternity pin brings about a rise in IQ.

And finally your statement that a fraternity is burdensome, but not really burdensome because you love it so much, really needs no comment.

—Bill Wuamett

## 'Russian Letter' Cites 'Benefits' Of Communism

As evening lowers, Mikhail Suslov, a student at the University of Moscow, writes to an American friend overseas:

"Dear Roger,

"I was glad to get your last letter, in excellent Russian—you really keep in practice, don't you? I'll keep writing in English, just to see if I can match you. I'm glad you've made the dean's list again, but let me save that for another letter. Right now I'll take up your new ideological points which have bothered me for several days.

"You start out by saying that Communism destroys incentive by throttling the individual. Now stop and think—don't you know you're just repeating old slogans that the wisest American observers have dropped? In the capitalist system a man can only advance himself at the cost of his fellow workers. An employee getting a raise feels nervous and uneasy, for he sees the envious looks of his companions, and knows that their loss is his gain. In their hearts the capitalist laborers know they are being exploited, and so the phrase 'Every man for himself' is a popular one in all the capitalist-enclaved nations.

"Here under socialism you can feel the difference. Our unvoiced slogan is, 'Every man for everyone else.' And the only restriction is that which we find in the basic principle: From each according to his ability, to each according to his need. In socialism there is no jealousy, for a worker, in advancing himself, promotes the others along with him. 'Every month brings us closer to Communism, the perfect altruism of a free, coopera-

tive, and classless society.

"Marxism is palpably near. Khrushchev hopes to attain it by 1981. The magic phrase, 'builder of Communism,' fits him superbly. As we build it day by day, and see it rising in farm and factory, we throw with proud excitement. But what have you to look forward to under capitalism? Many of your political leaders are actually looking backward, calling themselves 'conservatives.' And these are perhaps the most realistic, for they seem to admit that no one, apart from the property class, has any real future in a capitalistic economy.

"And how can you tell me—I translate your own remark back into English—that Communism 'strangles the religion instinct?' This is pure jargon, the jargon of an exploited people. You can hang the 'instinct' label on anything you don't understand. Orthodox religion is not an instinct; it's a habit. When Communism is established people will see that the real brotherhood of man lies not in the worship of a medieval deity but in the voluntary, unselfish cooperation of fellow laborers in the classless economy promised by Marx. When this true fraternity is with us, religion will perish—not from state decree, but from obsolescence.

"I have to study now, but I'll write again in a few days. I hope to see you again next summer.

"Regards,  
"Mikhail Suslov"

He seals the letter. Outside, the twilight settles eerily on snowclad Moscow.

—Wade Wellman

can alter drastically the positions of the negotiators. Thus if we lose the arms race, we lose all as well. We have to gain in the race in order to have hope of winning—or at least tying.

But we must talk on for this is our only hope as I see it. We must keep talking and keep testing for they go together. To ban the bomb gets us nowhere—and it will have us lose.

To understand why we will lose requires a study of what Communism is and hopes to be. The Reds want

the world and they won't stop until they get it one way or another. But not only do they want the world but they also want it their way. They want our way of life—and we are dedicated to protect it. How we protect that which we love may be a bitter pill to swallow but it is a necessity, that demands it.

It is important that we as Americans realize what the leaders of the Communist world have in mind. It is not co-existence. This may come about, only if we resist takeover long enough. This co-existence is only the latest tactic—a smoke screen to neutralize the weak-minded and the weak-willed in our society who cannot comprehend what the power struggle is all about. The history of man is written in terms of power struggle of one sort or another, but this one is not the hot war guns-type of struggle. It is the cold war, bread and butter brand and we must understand and realize the nature of this new form of religion called Communism.

But for the sake of ourselves, let us hope that the resultant form of action of this new group is not the usual putrid run of fickle idealistic drizzle somehow destined to be designed to attract the sympathy of some dubiously sophisticated collection such as the DAR or some auxiliary of frustrated old women in Sanduskee.

Seek out all and investigate all of the related problems here. The problem cannot be handled any other way. So, please, no more BUNK.

—Steve Lindell

## Minister's Book Analyzes Sit-Ins

By FRANCES GOINS

Diary of a Sit-In by Merrill Proudfoot. UNC Press, 1962. \$5.

The diary of the Knoxville, Tenn., lunch counter sit-ins, June, 1960, fostered by the Negro students of Knoxville College, is written by their professor and active sympathizer, Dr. Merrill Proudfoot, an ordained Presbyterian minister.

Dr. Proudfoot, white, writes a detailed, factual and appealing account of the movement against racial discrimination in Knoxville with his ears tuned to the prejudiced retorts of the "first class" southern citizenry.

The diary is the actual chronicle of the events as they transpired. No names, places, incidents, or comments were invented by the author. Attached to his diary is Dr. Proudfoot's evaluation and moral explanation of the sit-ins.

Spurred by the success of students in Greensboro, N. C., February, 1960, the Knoxville demonstrators desegregated at least 16 lunch places where Negroes were not eating before. The sit-ins were aimed at the counters in the variety and drug stores downtown.

The sit-ins were non-violent in nature and conducted by well-disciplined Negroes and white sympathizers. Clashes with enraged whites and with the city police force were minimized. The plan was to demonstrate and then to negotiate with the controlling businessmen in that order until desegregation of the counters was accomplished. The climax came when the Negroes effectively boycotted downtown Knoxville.

The Negroes were divided into small groups and schooled on how to conduct themselves in a sit-in. Dr. Proudfoot, a regular participant in the daily noontime sit-ins, was charged with training the new recruits. He devised and revised rules for non-violent sit-ins:

1. Each delegation must have an adult Negro leader.
2. Stay in your seat facing the

counter; no wandering around the store.

3. No knives or other sharp instruments, no smoking; men will not wear hats at the counters. (To avoid a tough look.)

4. You are to "ignore heckling, blows and other attempts to provoke." Do not make caustic remarks.

5. Do not eat or drink at the counter unless it is served by the employees.

6. Do not hide your face with your hands.

7. If you chew gum, do it so people hardly notice it.

8. Hot weather demonstrators "should always be neatly dressed in clean clothing, and should be careful to avoid 'B.O.'"

Although under constant strain, Dr. Proudfoot found glimpses of humor in the situation. In the all-day picket against Rich's department store, a Unitarian sympathizer, Harry Wiersma, carried a sign reading "We Are All Brothers in Christ" until his pastor came to his rescue with another sign.

Dr. Proudfoot notes the effect of the sit-ins "on the way of life of the average Negro has been small, but on his morale the effect has been tremendous." A slumbering giant—the Negro population—has been awakened. "For the first time many of our Southern communities have become aware that their Negro residents constitute an economic and political force to be reckoned with."

In the foreword, Dr. Frank Graham, former president of the Consolidated University, gives the effect of the movement an even broader scope. He writes, "This Southern youth movement . . . is a local expression of a world revolution of the colonial, colored, and exploited peoples of the earth."

The book is a keen insight into the nature of sit-ins and gives the basic philosophy of non-violent movements.

## 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.

## Accident Prone?

NEW YORK (UPI)—A test to predict whether a person is likely to get into traffic accidents and violations will be developed by the Safety Research and Education Project of Teachers College, Columbia University.

The test will stem from a three-year study of the psychological characteristics of drivers. The project is supported by a \$12,000 grant from the Accident Prevention Division of the U. S. Public Health Service.

## The Daily Tar Heel

### EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING, Editor  
MIKE ROBINSON, Associate Editor  
HARRY LLOYD, HARVE HARRIS, Managing Editors  
LLOYD LITTLE, Executive News Editor  
JIM CLOTTELLER, BILL WUAMETT, News Editors  
JIM WALLACE, Photography Editor  
CHUCK MOONEY, Feature Editor  
ED DUPRE, 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.