

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 12, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. XLIX, No. 139

The DTH, The J-School And A Generation Of Nice Guys

Near the end of his term of office last year, Editor Jonathan Yardley suggested that the Daily Tar Heel should place its news and sports desks "under the aegis" of the School of Journalism in an effort to solve the problem of inadequate staff.

Always understaffed, the DTH yearly suffers from inadequate coverage on its news and sports pages. Early deadlines, lack of a strong reporting staff, hurried writing and copyreading are problems that plague every college newspaper; dailies in particular suffer from them. The DTH gets its share each year. Affiliation with the Journalism School would doubtless help to solve most of them. The Journalism School would benefit, in turn, from having a newspaper which would serve as a laboratory for practical journalistic training.

Despite these obvious advantages, other considerations tend to make a marriage between the DTH and the Journalism School undesirable. Regardless of any stipulation that might be laid down concerning complete freedom on the editorial page, the net effect of affiliation with the Journalism School would be to limit editorial freedom. This does not mean that affiliation would be an invitation to outright censorship. Practical considerations, however, dictate that any kind of formal arrangement with the Journalism School would necessarily make the journalism faculty or advisors in part responsible for editorial policy. Complaints would find their way to Howell Hall rather than to the editor's office, regardless of who set the editorial tone. No amount of explanation would eliminate the feeling that the editor and the Journalism School were in cahoots. Such a situation could not long exist without creating a feeling on the part of the journalism faculty that some advice or suggestions were in order. This, although not censorship in the strict sense, is nonetheless a control.

Needless to say, such a control would not be altogether bad. College editors as a group are possibly the most inherently unbridled lot

on the national campus scene. Give a college editor his head and he will usually manage to make some pretty glaring mistakes. But there is also a good chance that he will write something that will, in time, either through a negative or positive response, get some good results.

In a sense, if an editor is to be in any way effective, he must have the complete right to make an ass of himself. This does not mean, as a past editor of this paper once put it, that he should consciously try to be an infant terrible. But it does mean that he should write always as a student, prone to the foibles and frailties that make him a student, unhampered by some outside influence that calls conscience on him at the drop of a hat.

The rise of conservatism that is getting so much attention across the country is not confined altogether to the area of politics. Students are more reserved and more mature than they were 20, or even 10 years ago. At least so we understand from those who are in a position to compare. The era of the reserved, conservative college student seems to be coming into its own.

The trend toward a more staid, less impulsive studenty is not in itself wholly alarming. But we wonder if that trend is born of the students themselves, or whether it is one that has been manufactured for them by a frightened generation of older people — parents, teachers, counselors — the whole collection of elders who seem to be pushing today's students into a "mature" mold—not necessarily of their own choosing.

College newspapers are the last components of student life that should succumb to this false ideal of nice guy-ism and mealy-mouthed super-maturity.

If the editor of this, or any other college newspaper feels that the mayor, the governor, the chancellor, a professor, or anyone else is a bumbling idiot, he should be able to say so. If he's wrong, his error will not go unnoticed by the students. He doesn't need a journalism professor or advisor to tell him so. He'll find out soon enough, and in no uncertain terms. It won't be long before the campus lets him in on it.

There are many approaches to solving the staff problem. And it is, we are confident, one that will be solved. Affiliation with the Journalism School, regardless of the benefits that would incur from it on both sides, is not the best way of doing it.

Outlaw Flowers

Happily, the Town Fathers chose this week to ignore a complaint about the flower vendors that hawk their petaled wares on sunny days along Franklin Street.

Outlaw selling of flowers?

You might just as well outlaw falling leaves in the fall.

Argentina Is Tres Malade

By PHIL NEWSOM (UPI Foreign News Analyst)

On Martin Garcia Island in the River Plate, ousted President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina was reported suffering an illness generally attributable to shock and strain.

Also suffering shock and strain but with the symptoms more clearly defined was Argentina itself.

What to do about them constituted a problem under study in capitals from Washington to Buenos Aires.

It was clear that democracy in Latin America, which the United States is pledged to support, suffered a blow when Argentine military leaders elected to interrupt democratic processes on March 29 and depose Frondizi by force.

Military In Charge

Even the move which installed Senate President Jose Maria Guido in office as the man next constitutionally in line did not disguise the fact that military men were making the final decisions.

In only a little more than six months, military forces in South America's two largest countries, Argentina and Brazil, had stepped in to effect drastically the course of constitutional government.

In Argentina the military traditionally have expected to be consulted in government affairs, and since the fall of the Peron dictatorship in 1955 have been especially watchful that there should be no return of the Peronists to power.

Almost from the start, Frondizi has been under their suspicion. While denying any obligation to them, Frondizi was elected with the help of Peronists acting upon the orders of Juan D. Peron in exile.

Political Rights

In June 1959 the Peronists made public a document—denied by Frondizi—in which Frondizi allegedly promised to annul all anti-Peronist measures taken by the provisional government which replaced Peron.

Frondizi was not alone in believing Peronists should be returned to the national political scene. It was held that so long as they remained outlawed, they constituted a "corrupting" element without responsibility.

In October 1961, the ban on Peronists in politics was lifted.

It and contributing factors proved Frondizi's undoing. In last month's elections Peronists won sweeping victories in 10 out of 14 provinces. Contributing factors had been a new and unpopular austerity program, a mounting cost of living and Frondizi's own over-confidence in his ability to handle the military.

Don't Pay Ransom For Cuban Hostages

On the evening of April 7, 1962, the Cuban press notified the world that a military tribunal had passed sentence on 1,179 prisoners captured in the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion last year. The trial is said to be one of the largest mass trials on record. It was probably one of the most farcical too. The verdict, preposterous as it may sound, was an exorbitant ransom for each prisoner. The individual ransoms range from \$500,000 for some of the "leaders" downward to \$25,000. The total ransom for all the prisoners is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$62,000,000. The alternative is that they will spend the next 30 years in Cuba's dank, overcrowded prisons. The verdict could have been death: it would have been justified. The crime was clearly treason.

It will be recalled that last year shortly after the futility of the invasion was blatantly proclaimed to the world, there was a movement in the United States to pay a ransom of 500 tractors. Despite the appeal of an ageing, sentimental, democratic stateswoman, the plan was not successful. Castro had a dire need for those tractors. He now needs money. Cuba's present economic picture is bleak. Meat, soap, eggs, and other staple items are rationed heavily. The loss of United States trade threatens Cuba with eventual economic ruin . . . possibly. The machinations of the Communist world to help Cuba's economy have not been overly successful. Economic ruin could well bring Cuba's three and a half year old dictatorship crashing down around Castro's ears, while he bombastically decries

"If I've Explained This Once, I've Explained It A Thousand Times!"



Please—No More Bunk From Lindell

Upon first reading Steve Lindell's statements in the Daily Tar Heel of last Sunday my first reaction was to scratch my head, then re-read what he said, then scratch my head some more, and finally to try to answer some of the misconceptions and totally fallacious remarks that he wrote down and passed off for truth.

Some of the "non-truths" and "half-truths" of Mr. Lindell's are: it is "Bunk" to ban-the-bomb; past peace groups have been "hopelessly idealistic;" peace movements are escapist in nature; maintenance of nuclear weapons is not the "problem itself;" and, well here I get confused again. Mr. Lindell puts forth two alternatives for the United States . . . "1. Our destruction by bomb or surrender. 2. Our preservation by having a bomb." But a few sentences later he states "Our prime alternative is disarmament." Mr. Lindell contradicts himself by saying we cannot disarm and we can disarm. One wonders which he really means, assuming he knows himself.

To begin with, why is it bunk to ban-the-bomb, (because it is "poisoning the atmosphere . . . even by less than one per cent")? Now maybe I think of myself too much, but somehow I do not wish to be poisoned by any per cent of fallout of a nuclear bomb. What really does "less than one per cent" mean?

Well, according to Linus Pauling, (that misguided Nobel Prize winning physicist), 160,000 children would be born with "gross mental or physical defect," between 200,000 and 1,000,000 humans now living would have "their lives cut short by such radiation-causing diseases as leukemia . . . four million stillbirths, embryonic, neonatal, or childhood deaths and viable children with gross mental or physical defect . . . these numbers apply to the whole world."

Now Mr. Lindell may not care if his children are born dead or if he contracts leukemia, but somehow I would rather this did not happen to me. One other thing: the Atomic Energy Commission did find Dr. Pauling's statistics incorrect—they came up with twice the deaths due to testing. Pretty picture? (A recent paper done by E. H. Sniford and H. E. Massengill titled "Radioactive Fallout from Nuclear Testing. Is It a Hazard to Health? Can Individuals Reduce This Hazard?" will further enlighten other uneducated persons to the dangers of fallout. It is all documented as opposed to Mr. Lindell's conjectures.)

They Get Results

Mr. Lindell then states that past peace efforts by peace groups have been "hopelessly idealistic." That false assertion can be refuted by three examples: H. Stewart Hughes is running for the Senate in Massachusetts in 1962 on a disarmament platform; in 1960 the British Labor Party was forced to change its official stand on disarmament from a

people and their friends and relatives, there is but one choice. The individuals must suffer in the hope that the regime can be brought to its knees sooner. \$62,000,000 could prolong the Castro government through its present crisis. Most intelligent people find the existence of the Castro regime unpalatable and look forward to its demise. A refusal by all agencies to pay the ransom will be a step toward helping the regime to its doom.

The Cuban Families Committee is an organization which has as its primary objective the freedom of the prisoners. It is a group which has a considerable amount of support. It is believed that close to \$26,000,000 is available to the committee, most of which seems to be offered by private American sources. Anyone who contributes to this fund is potentially strengthening the Castro government, which needs the money far more than it needs prisoners. It may seem callous to not agitate for payment of the ransom, but higher goals are at stake . . . the potential ruin of the Cuban economy and the demise of the Castro government.

It is to be hoped that the United States Government is not going to permit itself to be involved in any manner with the payment. In such an eventuality the United States would appear to be displaying a guilty conscience about the invasion by freeing the prisoners. The United States does not have a guilty conscience and we certainly should not feed the snake that bites us.

Hays R. Browning Jr.

Pick Summer Job With Great Care

To The Editor:

It has come to my attention that the Vita Craft Corporation is again recruiting student salesmen for its summer program. As an employee of Vita Craft last summer, I wish to state that Vita Craft's recruiting tactics are extremely misleading and to advise that all students interested in working for them exercise the utmost caution in dealing with this company.

The principal point of danger and ambiguity is the nature of the guarantee. Vita Craft's posters (which do not even bear the name of the company) lure the student with the promise "Earn \$80 a Week." But in order to fulfill the conditions of the guarantee which would provide that sum, the salesman must make an average of 10 displays a week for thirteen weeks. Last summer, out of the eighteen boys who began the summer in my sales group, only one ever fulfilled his weekly quota—and only during two weeks of the

necessary thirteen.

Yet the almost impossible task of meeting the guarantee conditions is glibly glossed over in the recruitment meetings by such statements as "We've only had two boys who've ever had to fall back on the guarantee."

Therefore, if the student is to make money with Vita Craft, it will be by making sales, not from their worthless guarantee. And the fact that only five of the original thirteen students (less than 1/3) were still working at the end of the summer is clear testimony that selling pots and pans is not as easy as Vita Craft would have you believe.

I again plead with all interested students to exercise the utmost caution with these people who would so willingly mislead them. And anyone desiring further information about Vita Craft practices may phone me at 968-8796.

—Jeffrey Lawrence

traditional NATO-Cold War philosophy to a unilateralistic one as a direct result of peace group strength in the party; and the example which has had most press coverage in this country—the riots which kept Eisenhower away from Japan were protesting the signing of the Japanese-American Mutual Defense Pact that the United States forced on Japan. No, Mr. Lindell, peace groups are not hopelessly idealistic, they do get results.

If anyone is an escapist it is Mr. Lindell. He thinks that by having nuclear supremacy the threat of Communism will go away. No ban-the-bomb advocate thinks this. Conversely, they think the United States will stand a better chance of influencing the emerging new nations on ideological grounds than will the Communists. I believe that with all the faults present under the "American way of life" this nation's ideology can not only hold its own but can make headway when faced with Communistic ideology. Does Mr. Lindell think so? Perhaps not, for he insists that we keep a big club handy just in case.

Then we come to the "problem itself." Mr. Lindell thinks that peace groups believe Communism is not the problem itself. Where on earth did he get that idea? Could it possibly be that some people read how the United States refuses at Geneva, all Russian proposals on disarmament regardless of how straight-forward and how realistic they may be? (For example demilitarization of Central Europe or a denuclearized Africa). Or could it be that some of us heard John Kennedy say the United States might strike first? Mr. Lindell, the "problem itself" is not so simply defined as you would have us believe. Yes, the Soviet Union is partially to blame for stockpiling, but so is this country with the "military-industrial complex." For example, do you know the lobbying power of the defense industry? Do you know that recently North American Aircraft made an 802% profit before taxes and that 99.5% of their business was contracted with the U.S. Government? Before limiting the problem itself to Communism, let's find out the true implications of stockpiling and testing.

It Sounds Ludicrous

Mr. Lindell implies that the United States is in possession of an "out-of-date bomb." He also says "We must develop bigger and better—ludicrous as it sounds." Ludicrous it sounds indeed. Where on earth he get the idea that the United States has an out-of-date bomb? (Probably from North American or Boeing Aircraft). He knows that to try to document such a statement would be impossible. Here are a few facts that can be documented: a. The United States is not behind the Soviet Union in the development of nuclear weapons. (The Atomic Energy Commission.) b. The United States has developed its weapons to the level that an overkill of from 12-1800 bombs exists. (Hans Behe and Hanson Baldwin, military critic; New York Times.) c. "There is no doubt that our nuclear bomb designs are more 'advanced' than the Soviets' . . . (they) are more easily deliverable than the corresponding Russian bomb" (Linus Pauling).

The whole idea so prevalent in this country, that we must build bigger weapons just doesn't hold up, there is too much evidence to the contrary. Why then, do people insist upon saying that we do need to keep testing? Perhaps it is the same situation that one finds himself in when he analyzes the threat

of Communism and the Soviet Union: is something a fact just because the Department of Defense, the Associated Press, and President Kennedy says so? Why? Why should the statements of these men be taken as absolute fact? Should one believe Mr. Kennedy when he says we must test and most physicists say we do not need to? The only solution is to find out for oneself. Mr. Lindell is willing to accept the words of laymen over the words of professionals. So is the rest of the country, for that matter.

Mr. Lindell's only fleeting remarks on disarmament had to do with the Geneva conferences. He "knows" what most Americans "know"—that the Soviets are always wrong and the United States is always right. This is not a Cowboys and Indians affair . . . this is a situation where neither the United States nor Russia is always right for one reason or another. Yes, we have been negotiating at Geneva for a long time and such attitudes as "keep talking and keep testing" will keep us there much longer.

Mr. Lindell obviously has not solidified in his own mind exactly what he believes. The one thing transcending all of his remarks is a pronounced defeatist attitude. One sees this attitude in such remarks as: "The Reds want the world and they won't stop until they get it one way or another . . . We are damned if we do and damned if we don't (have bombs or surrender) . . . Thus if we lose the arms race we lose all as well." Perhaps this may explain the gross contradictions which Lindell wrote—he desperately wants to hope a peaceable solution of the Cold War is in sight but he just does not think that possible.

I, too, hope a peaceable solution of the Cold War is in sight. For me the way to solve the problem is to stop building weapons, stop testing weapons, and stop discrediting every proposal that the Soviets make. Start helping the situation by making sensible proposals at Geneva and when the Russians accept them take them on face value and follow through. I do not advocate unilateral disarmament, rather I favor peripheral steps that will eventually bring about peace and harmony between the two powers. Is that too naive to ask for?

—David Cheek

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.

Key Job

SAN FRANCISCO (UPI) — Every time a Matson liner returns to its home port of San Francisco, the company's shoreside keymaker is in for a busy time.

Passengers are apt to leave their ship with the key to their stateroom still in their pockets. And before the ship turns around to go out again, duplicate keys must be supplied to a whole new shipload of guests. On one typical arrival recently, more than 700 persons debarked — and 400 keys were missing.

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 CLOFFELTER, 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 8, 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.