

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.

May 9, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. XLIX, No. 154

Thanks

Another blow has been dealt to the force of ignorance, and we would like to thank pharmacy student Benjamin Brown and his wife for striking it.

After being denied twice the right to register for the Chapel Hill primary, Brown and his wife persevered and returned for a third try. Their patience paid off, and the Estes Hills registrar, while mumbling, "I hope I don't go to jail," listed them in the book.

By meeting all of the super special specifications, Brown and his wife have succeeded in breaking through the previously almost impenetrable

wall of ignorance that have kept qualified University students from voting in past Chapel Hill elections.

By getting into the registration books, hopefully, the Browns have managed to set some sort of precedent for the future registration of qualified and interested students.

We would like to thank the swell town of Chapel Hill for recognizing that when a students meets the legal requirements, the extra-legal requirements, and the extralegal requirements, he might just be qualified to register, perhaps even to vote. (cw)

POGO-LAND MYSTERY CRAFT!



K. Pig & Castro

Deepest, darkest Pogoland apparently has been invaded by two strange creatures from faraway lands. One, who very much resembles a Caribbean Savor-style dictator, is a goat named Fido.

The other is the lovable Mr. K. Pig. (However, it is doubtful if he is any relation to any of our cam-

pus's famous Capitalistic Pigs, lovingly called "porkers.") K. Pig, shown above with his friend, intends to upset the economy of the United States with a fiendish plot involving "inner-state trade." The exploits of these marvelous beasts will be carried in Pogo's daily strip in the DTH. (jc)

Joan Baez

Tonight, Joan Baez, one of the most talented and spell-binding folk singers of recent decades, will grace the stage of Memorial Hall.

Much has been, and undoubtedly will continue to be said about the voice and skill of Miss Baez. She has performed at Universities across the nation and without commercializing her style, has left audiences raving.

Those of us who have only been fortunate enough to hear her two recordings, and we are in the majori-

ty, must hold our breath in anticipation. Those of us who have managed to attend a personal performance may hope she is only half as good.

Her Mexican-Irish parentage is considered by many to be the ideal heritage for folk music mastery. Her professional career has been relatively short but widely acclaimed.

That Graham Memorial Activities Board was able to book Miss Baez is quite a feather in their collective cap. That Carolina students will be able to enjoy her performance for nothing is certainly virtually amazing.

But of all the things that may be said about tonight's performance, there is one statement that cannot be left unnoted.

Would all of you rude, ill-mannered, and annoying animals that ruin German's concerts, or that simply can't sit still for the duration of one song, or that don't appreciate true talent, and have you please go somewhere and have a beer. And let those who deserve this program enjoy it. (cw)

Incomplete

Several persons have pointed out omissions in yesterday's recount of some of the major individuals in the Student Party past. For those miffed by our selection, the list is here lengthened to include Bill Mackie, Curtis Gans, Sonny Evans, Peggy Warren, Ken Penninger, Norman B. Smith, Don Furtado . . . (Fill in your own choice.) (jc)

"For Services Rendered"



Letters To The Editor

More On Derby, Gans, Tradition

S. Chi Dubs
Sir Wuamett

To the Editor:

Every year for the past eighteen there has been a Sigma Chi Derby, this year no exception. Every year also for the past eighteen there has emerged some puritanic crusader against either the "immaturity," the "vulgarity," or the "plain senselessness" of the event, this year being no exception.

The crusader for 1962, a Bill Wuamett, assailed the Derby in the unique manner of the intellectual. His jousting of the Derby was as entertainingly witty as it was edifying. If you read his article in the Tar Heel you undoubtedly learned about the sex-life of the pagan pole-dancers and you were asked to chuckle at his analogistic description of the Sigma Chi "orgy." He

seemed to think that the Fraternity was a bit amateurish in its reenactment of the ancient rites of fertility.

Crusader let me brief you first on a little history and then a little fact. Since Adam and Eve there have been clothes. The evolution of the fig leaf of Eden has accompanied that of man as have the guilt, shame and subsequent inhibitions associated with it. The Sigma Chi's are not to blame for the advent of clothing, and as our social mores as well as the laws of state and University make it impossible, the parading of the entire feminine physique, admissible as it is, is out of question. Now as for your reasoning—it was as unsyllogistic as your comparisons were illogical, and since unbacked literary name-calling would be as childish as your crusade, I'll tell you why:

First of all, being the back-slapping, rib-tickling extrovert your article makes you seem, you must be aware of the trend the anecdote has taken in the past one hundred decades. Since clothes and Sunday School Teachers and as a result of that bad old serpent and all the shame and guilt he caused us to feel humor and entertainment have taken a turn to relieve us of a modicum of our pentup desires (viz—urges), or at least to alleviate their disturbing existence by making it a laughing matter. Which do you advocate—the normal, healthy and permissible belly-laugh or the more normal but strictly forbidden orgy?

Out of compliance with University regulations, we did all we were able to prevent alcohol from being spilt on the field of humor; the inevitability of that which slipped by may perhaps be explained by the where-there's-strife-there's-bud theory. You state that Carolina boys "will be boys," and in a manner

Reactions By Wuamett

YAF Contribution

"The man who beat the bond issue" is the label that has been applied to A. G. Whitener, a candidate for congress in the Democratic primary in the sixth district and the leader of the North Carolina Conservative Party.

Whitener spoke to the Young Americans for Freedom Monday night and outlined his views on what the modern Conservative believes and advocates.

It is good that Whitener was not received too enthusiastically, but YAF has chosen the wrong grounds on which to criticize him.

After his speech, numerous members commented that Whitener was a very poor political speaker, and that he had apparently not crystallized his own views enough to be able to present them intelligently. But very little criticism was heard of the opinions that Whitener was able to present in his own rambling way.

Whitener, for instance, opposes the Alliance for Progress by calling it a "one-world globalism." He also opposes "atheist communism," but he apparently has no idea of how to prevent the spread of communism to Latin America without spending some money. The people of these

countries want a better standard of living whether it comes by reform or revolt, and it should be rather apparent by now that revolts by impoverished peoples rarely lead to democratic governments. Yet no YAF member questioned Whitener on this plank in his "economy platform."

Whitener also opposes the Peace Corps by stating that it promotes "one-world" communism and socialism, enriches foreign politicians and gangsters, inflates the native economy, and forces Americans on these people who neither understand nor appreciate the native cultures. No YAF member opposed him on this point, either.

Disarmament and the United Nations are also opposed by this Conservative stalwart. The first, he says, is "strategic surrender," and the second with "the world is not ready for the UN." Once more, there was no YAF opposition.

Does this mean that the views of A. G. Whitener are the views of YAF? I think not. The lack of criticism by YAF members seems to indicate rather that they endorse a frequent fallacy of today's Conservative. They seem to feel that candidates who call themselves Conservatives are good no matter how reactionary their views may be.

It is precisely this viewpoint that endangers the growth of a rational and respectable Conservatism today. Far too often the far-right reactionary is accepted with the rationalization that, "sure he's too radical, but at least he's on our side."

Barry Goldwater stated in "Conscience of a Conservative" that the Conservative is not to be necessarily "against" things (although he seems a little hazy as to what he is "for"). If the UNC-YAF agrees with Sen. Goldwater, why did they not point out some of the absurdities in Whitener's platform? Why did they not mention that the purpose of the Peace Corps is exactly the opposite of what he states, and why did they not state that it should be the objective of the Conservative to see that the Peace Corps is intelligently administered, and to insure that it is not infiltrated by Communist organizers?

The realistic Conservative should realize that spending and foreign aid are necessary to our survival. Why then did no YAF member point out to Whitener that it is the Conservative's duty to see that the Alliance for Progress is economically administered, graft-free, and not extended to countries which refuse to initiate reforms in education and land distribution. Instead, there was silence on this issue by these "indigent young intellectuals."

If YAF is to make any contribution to this campus and to the world outside, it must do more than endorse candidates such as Whitener by silent vote.

There seem to be two courses open to this organization, and its choice will determine if it is to gain a respected and influential voice on this campus. If it shares Whitener's views, or allows men such as he to call themselves Conservatives without a challenge, then its efforts are futile.

If it can, however, purge itself of reactionaries and return to the path of rational Conservatism, then it can fill a pressing need by challenging the liberalism that seems to be accepted here as the one and only true word of God.

—BILL WUAMETT

ing their cumulative ignorance in the dormitories and fraternities or their collective impotence in Harry's or Byron's". I feel strongly repelled by his articles.

I am not a member of any fraternities, and am not prima facie defending them; I simply feel that the articles mentioned above require comment.

—DENNIS F. GALLAGHER

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.

SATURDAY REVIEW

Success Costs Less

When the fighting ended in Korea in 1953, this was the reckoning: 800,000 Koreans homeless; 415,000 Korean soldiers dead; 56,000 U.N. troops from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Turkey, Australia, France, Colombia, Ethiopia, Greece, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, New Zealand, South Africa, Thailand, and the Philippines dead.

The dollar cost to the United States was \$18,000,000,000—and we haven't finished paying for it yet. The current expense of maintaining armed forces in Korea, as well as policing the truce, runs in excess of \$100,000,000 a year.

The question that many people asked about the Korean War at the time was whether the U.N. might not have been able to prevent it from occurring by having troops at the highly volatile dividing line between the two parts of area. In a more general way, of course, people have asked why the U.N. has to wait until a crisis develops into a shooting war before it is able to act.

These questions are being answered today. For this is precisely what the U.N. has been doing in the Congo. All the elements of a super-Korea were present in the Congo in July, 1960, when the Congo became an independent nation. The Congo is situated in the heart of Africa and has radiating power throughout a large part of the continent. It is one of the richest nations in the world in terms of material resources, being a prime producing center for copper, tin, uranium, and cobalt.

The Congolese were not prepared for self-government. The result was the kind of disintegration that made it a potential arena of conflict among outside powers. Belgium's troops returned in an attempt to restore order. The Soviet Union sent tanks, trucks, and planes to the Congo at the personal request of the then Premier, Patrice Lumumba. The United Nations sent troops to restore order

and reduce the danger that the vacuum in the Congo would be filled by the Soviet Union or any other outside nation, large or small. The United States government supported the action of the U.N. in the Congo both because of its commitment to an independent Africa and because Soviet troops in the African heartland might have forced a U.S. decision to go into the Congo with force of its own.

In any event, the only agency in the world that was in a position to head off a showdown situation acted in time. It sent 20,000 troops. It also sent large numbers of teachers, engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, business and trade experts, agricultural specialists, road builders, mechanics, communications and transportation experts.

Danger in the Congo has not been fully dissolved. But for the first time since July, 1960, when the trouble began, affairs in the Congo seem to be in hand. The threat of the big-power confrontation has sharply diminished. The United Nations still faces an ordeal in the Congo, but it has already made its most important contribution to world peace since its founding.

It costs money to fight a war. It also costs money to avert one. The cost of maintaining U.N. stabilizing operations in the Congo has been about \$10,000,000 a month. This is added to the cost of maintaining U.N. emergency forces in Gaza. As a result, the U.N. will have an estimated deficit of almost \$200,000,000 by the end of 1962. The money has to come from somewhere. If it doesn't, the U.N. cannot continue. It is not a national sovereign government that can levy taxes or maintain a debt indefinitely. Therefore, the U.N. is asking the member nations to subscribe to a bond issue of \$200,000,000. The money would be repaid over a twenty-five year period with an

annual interest yield of 2 per cent.

The question now before the United States is whether it will subscribe to its full share. The United States, enjoying 80 per cent of the world's income, has a quota of only half the full amount of the bond issue, or \$100,000,000. This is equivalent to less than one cent for every five dollars we put into national armaments each year. It is far less than the amount we write off each year in false starts in manufacturing military equipment or in planes or missiles that are obsolete even before they go into general production. It is less than one-fifth of one per cent of the cost of putting a man on the moon. Finally it is less than it costs to fight a war in Korea for only one week. Yet an attempt is being made in the United States to block the required appropriation of funds—not a gift, not an assessment, but a loan repayable with interest.

What is being debated now is the cost of U.N. success. It might be useful to consider what the cost would be if the U.N. should fail. In the latter case, the amount of the bond issue could be multiplied by one thousand times or even ten thousand times and no one would have any way of knowing whether it would be enough. But the essential question has nothing to do with dollars or bond issues or deficits. The essential question is whether the peace of the world can be kept without a world organization and, also, what has to be done to develop that organization into an agency with the responsible powers of enforceable law. For if the U.N. can evolve into such a body, then the people on this earth have a reasonable chance of staying alive, improving the conditions of meaningful existence, and advancing the prospects of human freedom.

—NORMAN COUSINS

Enough Silent Sams Already

To the Editors:

(In reply to Mr. Rosenthal's letter on campus traditions.)

Would not the desire for a University atmosphere conducive to active participation in campus activities and to creative student thought and endeavor be a better tradition to perpetuate than the dedication of the Old Well or the revival of the panty raid? I believe we have enough Silent Sams for the pigeons to commemorate.

—MIKE HALL

Writer Hits Gans's Article

To the Editors:

In reference to Curtis Gans' articles concerning Kappa Sig and public transportation, may I state that I am in favor of what appears to be his basic philosophy of "the individual student finding for himself the key to a richer fulfillment of his own person," but I do not construe this to give anyone the right to make unfounded remarks against a group or individual. I am speaking not against the original article, which leaves much to be desired as proper material for our paper, but against the inference in the May 4 article that the facts of the original article were not checked for accuracy and that justice was to be upheld by running a Kappa Sig article on the same page. The assumption here that whoever read one article would read the other is both invalid and dangerous.

I was prompted to write this letter mainly due to Mr. Gans' levity in explaining that his original article was not factually correct and in his implication that this is of no importance. Just as Mr. Gans feels strongly against students "express-