

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.

May 12, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. XLIX, No. 157

Patrick May

Patrick May is not the type of boy that runs around stealing tires, he is not the type of boy that one would even suspect of trying to steal anything. He is quiet, clean cut, and apparently intelligent. He may suffer from a bit of conformity, or from being overly polite—but not from kleptomania.

Yet, in a case swamped in confusion, May has been charged with larceny, specifically with attempting to steal a tire from the side of a home on Rosemary Street. This is rather interesting in light of the fact that May neither owns a car, nor collects used tires.

However, May readily admits to picking up the tire? Why He could find nothing else handy with which to accost a prowler that he had frightened away from the home of James Bowman. He apparently made the mistake of getting involved in problems not his own.

For his trouble he was shot in the leg.

Mr. Bowman, who does not want to press charges, or involve May in any scandal, accidentally shot May in the legs with a shotgun, while attempting to frighten away the prowler that apparently both May and Bowman's daughter had seen.

The rapidity with which warped versions of the story have spread

about points out two deplorable situations.

First is the overly eager manner in which people jump to conclusions. If a story is confused or complicated, then the facts don't seem to be too important. What we all want to hear is the juicy bit of gossip that floats on the top; we enjoy the misinformed hypotheses that permeate ignorant speculation. We want to hear the "story," then we may listen to the facts. But first, the "story."

Also deplorable is the way in which the great American Press will pick up a case of this sort and run the comments, without waiting to hear the verdict. Papers must sell, and confused accounts of "prowling" incidents no doubt sell quite a few; public taste being what it is. If a student is involved in an incident, it may be news worthy, but then again, so are the facts.

It would seem that several papers have printed stories, relayed to them by a stringer operating in this area, that do not make overly clear all the facts, but that do make for interesting "public-taste-type" journalism.

So let us be aware of all the facts, let us be conscious of the persons involved, let's give Patrick May a break. (cw)

Sincere Interest?

Legislature's Thursday night vote not to appropriate \$5,000 out of the surplus to set up a DTH-press-fund appears to have been another case of overzealous hair-splitting by the legislators.

They didn't want to set up a fund because it was "unnecessary," a partly-valid charge. It is true that new legislation would have to be introduced if the money were to be used. It is true that the appropriation would serve no major purpose except psychological.

But . . . If Legislature is afraid to set aside \$5,000 this year, will it

be any less reluctant to appropriate \$10,000 next year, if the committee decides a press should be bought?

Legislature was hesitant to take too positive a step into a new area, understandably. But passage of the appropriation part of the bill would have shown a much more sincere interest in the possibilities of a press, and would have shown that Legislature's daring sometimes goes beyond setting up yet another committee. (jc)

More Confusion

Chapter two of Roberts-Rules-Raped: members of the Student Legislature Thursday night overwhelmingly defeated a motion to bring the DTH press bill to an immediate vote. The \$5,000 appropriation part of the bill had just been defeated, and a vote was moved on the portion of the bill which sets up a press-investigatory committee . . . the motion was defeated.

Then—silence. Apparently the legislators didn't know what they were voting on . . . a not too unusual situation.

After a minute of embarrassed noiselessness, Speaker Mike Lawler advised the body that it "has defeated its own purpose," since obviously no one wanted to speak on the bill. Eventually the legislators managed their way out of their self-imposed parliamentary confusion. Perhaps in the future they will be more mindful of what legislation they're blithely passing and defeating. (jc)

"Where Did This Darn Stone Come From?"



PROF. WALTER BERNES

Professors Must Be Involved In Politics

(Prof. Bernes, known as the "out-spoken individualist" of the Department of Government at Cornell University, recently wrote this article for the Cornell Daily Sun, student newspaper.)

OUR PROFESSORS MUST ADVOCATE DEFENSE OF CIVILIZATION

The purpose of the university places it in a position of uneasy tension with the community, and the tension is likely to increase with the extent to which this purpose is fulfilled. Devoted to the discovery of truth, it is likely to be unmindful of what passes for truth in the community, of those opinions that, nevertheless, form the very basis of the community. The notion of the absent-minded professor and the contemptuous reference to "ivory-tower thinkers" are merely peculiarly modern expressions of a tension that originated many years ago in the relation between Socrates and Athens, a relation that may be characterized as the tension, and sometimes the deadly hostility, between philosophy and the polis, or politics. According to the thought of classical antiquity, this tension might be reduced, but it cannot be overcome: what is good for the polis — let us say, obedience to the law and the customary — is not good for philosophy, or science, as we would say; what is good for philosophy — let us say, a questioning of the law and the customary — is not good for the polis.

FREE INQUIRY

What is good for philosophy or science is free inquiry, but out of free inquiry came the Bomb, and the Bomb is quite evidently not good for the polis; and if the Bomb were the only consequence, it would be difficult if not impossible, to make a case for free inquiry, for science, for philosophy as it was once understood. Fortunately for those who are devoted to it, the Bomb is not the only consequence. To say nothing of the material benefits that have come from modern science, one can say that it is from the tradition of free inquiry that originated with Socrates and is today institutionalized in the universities that civilization has come: one can say that the university civilized the polis. To know this is also to know the existence of the ever-present danger of re-barbarization, and that it is one of the continuing purposes of the universities to prevent this from happening.

Just as it is the duty of the military to defend the civilized polis against the hostile strength of the barbarian (fortunately there seems to be no lack of willingness on the part of the American military to do this), it is the duty primarily of the American universities to remind the country of what is at stake in our struggle to survive in the same world with the Soviet Union and Communist China, and thereby to foster the will to survive as a civilized country, even at the price of

considerable material sacrifice and of living with a very clear and always present danger of death. To survive as individuals (within the measure of our mortality) is easy; we need only succumb to Mr. Khrushchev's threats and disarm; to survive as a civilized country requires a fortitude that can arise only from the knowledge that, where as life can be sweet and death terrible, the death of the country that makes it possible for life to be sweet is worse than the death of any of its citizens. So to survive in our time requires a knowledge of the difference between civilization and barbarism. No more than Socrates — indeed, considering the alternative that faces us, even less than Socrates — can the universities afford to ignore the political world.

ACTIVE PROFS.

Our university professors cannot be accused of neglecting political affairs; indeed, since the Cuban invasion of a year ago the professors have intervened in politics with such frequency that they may now constitute one of the most active political groups in the country. Individual citizens in large numbers wrote the President after the Cuban fiasco expressing their sympathy with him and their willingness to support the resort to arms against Castro, but the professors, apparently somewhat shocked by the behavior of a President whom they had come to regard almost as one of their number, combined to denounce the ill-fated invasion, and the policy embodied in the invasion, in full-page advertisements in the national press. When the President proposed an expanded civil defense program, some 175 professors from the several universities in the Boston area pooled their funds and the authority attached to the names of their institutions to buy newspaper space for another "Open Letter to President Kennedy," in which they reminded the President and the rest of us of the horrors that would attend thermonuclear war and denounced the idea of a shelter program because, they said, not altogether convincingly, it would increase the probability of such a war. Then, even more recently, it has been the professors and their students who have marched in protest against the imminent resumption of nuclear testing by the United States.

SURVIVAL?

The theme of this professional intervention in politics is survival — but not, unfortunately, survival as a civilized nation. In fact, in many cases it is survival by means of surrender. In their "Open Letter to President Kennedy," the 175 Boston area professors said: "By buying a shelter program which does not shelter, and thereby believing that we can survive a thermonuclear war, we are increasing the probability of war. This probability increases . . . because we may be more willing to 'go to the brink' if we think survival is possible . . . What this means is that without the

"sense of security" (whether justified or not) that a shelter program would bring, we would be less willing "to go to the brink"—i.e., less willing to stand up to our enemies, less willing to resist the constant pressures, less willing to say to them, this far but no farther. The argument of the 175 Boston professors is a disguised version of unilateral disarmament.

Whether out of ignorance of the probable consequences of thermonuclear war or because of a greater willingness to accept that risk in order to survive as a free and civilized nation, the American people as a whole have thus far displayed a greater resistance to the easy-way-out than has the university community. How long they will be able to maintain this resistance depends, in part, on their ability to ignore the now massed voices of these professors who are united to deprive the nation of its will to accept the risk of war. (Voters in the 33rd New York Congressional District will be put to the test this fall, for although the Voters for Peaceful Alternatives do not as a group advocate unilateral disarmament, their candidate for Congress, Professor Harrop Freeman, does — or did before he was nominated.) Considering what is at stake, this is a strange reversal of the respective roles of university and community. Two factors may account for it. The professors, for reasons that are not readily apparent to anyone familiar with the Soviet Union, have managed to persuade themselves that "peaceful alternatives" and a "positive program for peace" will somehow attract the support of Mr. Khrushchev. (It is worth commenting that no member of the Department of Government at Cornell is associated with the Voters for Peaceful Alternatives, and of the 175 Boston area professors only one, a Miss Betty Burch of Tufts, teaches government or political science.) The other factor has to do with the professors' alleged greater concern for the future of mankind, or "humanity."

"HUMANENESS"

Whether they do speak out of a greater concern for humanity depends on how one defines the word, whether it is understood in the sense of "the suffering masses" or in the sense of "humaneness," of human excellence, that is, of those unique qualities that distinguish man from beasts and civilized men from savages. With respect to our policy toward the Soviet Union and Communist China, it makes all the difference in the world how we understand the humanity we are morally obliged to defend. The so-called humanitarian argument against nuclear arms and shelters sometimes takes the form that morally and politically nothing matters except the survival of human life itself (as if we in this country had no experience of humanly imposed conditions under which it is better to be dead than alive), and that every nation is obliged to avoid any act that is

likely to threaten mere existence, especially the existence of the world's innocent "masses."

In a letter to the *Ithaca Journal* last November, one of Cornell's most distinguished professors concluded a protest against the shelter program with these words: "If we are willing to contemplate living in a world in which millions of our innocent friends and neighbors have been horribly and senselessly murdered (in a nuclear war brought on in part by a shelter program that 'encourages us to think of nuclear war as a tolerable possibility . . .'), we have already committed moral suicide." (Addressed to the British and French in 1939, the same argument would have gone as follows: "If you are willing to go to the defense of Poland, you will bring on a war in which millions of your innocent Belgian, Dutch, Norwegian, etc. friends and neighbors will be senselessly murdered. If you are willing to do this, you have already committed moral suicide.") Surely a thermonuclear war and its aftermath are terrible to contemplate, especially in our state of unpreparedness, but it is emphatically not senseless to prepare for such a war if one has every reason to believe that one's preparedness will deter Mr. Khrushchev and if one has every reason to believe that while human life will continue under Soviet rule, humanity in the only meaningful sense will not. For if nothing matters except the survival of human life, human life itself does not matter.

MUST PREPARE

Was it senseless to die on the beaches of Normandy or in Bastogne or in Guadalcanal or in the unspeakable conditions of Iwo Jima? Many of today's professors did not so regard it at the time. What then was changed? Surely the replacement of Nazi Germany by the Soviet Union has not altered the fundamental situation. Can we not say that humanity or civilization, which in practice means civilized men, would have ceased to exist had it not been for the willingness of millions of men to risk their lives—in some cases willingly to give up their lives—in order to defend it against Nazi Germany? Their lives were not lost "senselessly"; they were lost unnecessarily. They were lost through the stupidity of the men who governed Britain and France in the 'thirties. They were lost because these men refused to arm their countries against Nazi Germany; because these men relied on economic sanctions and disarmament conference under the aegis of the League of Nations, the "peaceful alternatives" of thirty years ago. No sane man can want war, and it may be a paradox that the way to a civilized peace begins with the opening of our minds to the possibility of war, but our experience confirms the sense in which this is true. One has a right to expect university professors to know these things.

Robinson's Ramblings

What is the state of press freedom in Carolina?

If the DTH co-editors were to answer this question, they'd probably say they have almost complete freedom to print anything they chose. Within the bounds of good taste and not so subtle pressure from South Buildings not to print the names of UNC students who get arrested, the DTH is free to print or to OMIT whatever news it pleases. As a newspaper operating in the student interest, the DTH uses its discretion in picking particular news stories the same as any commercial newspaper does.

But there is a big difference. Commercial papers print as much "hard" local news as they find. The DTH does also, yet a curse hangs over its head that goads the editor(s) into delaying news stories until "convenient."

This was the case of the Students for a Democratic Society who met on campus last weekend. The DTH "hosted" the group, which included the Catholic-Socialist Mike Harrington and many freedom riders, yet the DTH first mentioned it on Tuesday—after the conference was over.

The leaders of the group had asked Clotfelter and Wrye not to print anything in the DTH until the conference was over and they agreed. It is beside the point that their secrecy smacks of the same mystery as their most deadly foes—the KKK, the White Citizens Councils and the Birchers. If militant integrationists expect to gain support, their meetings must be free and open, or at least they should permit responsible reporters to gather news of the meetings unhampered.

With the co-editors help this out-of-state group used UNC facilities but nobody was supposed to know what or who they were.

Many people, including this writer, will not take issue with how worthwhile and valuable is this group's work toward the progress of the South. But the DTH has a definite obligation to the student body and faculty. This suppression of news was extremely ill-advised from the standpoint of the Society's public image, but more important it has further impaired student confidence in the DTH.

The DTH can help repair the damage by showing in the future that it will not show favoritism to integrationists or anyone else.

A newspaper should be impartial, objective and accurate among other things. If the DTH wants to retain its status as a newspaper it must unequivocally adopt these tenets.

I'll step down from my soap-box now, but before I go, might I suggest that Journalism 191 could be very helpful to future DTH editors, or even to the present editors. Yes, that's J 191—Functions and Responsibilities of Contemporary Journalism.

On the lighter side, there is a self-help article in a national magazine that gives answers for the cliché questions people keep asking each other:

- Q. How are you?
- A. A poor insurance risk.
- Q. Think it'll rain?
- A. Where?
- Q. How was the party last night?
- A. Why ask? You weren't invited.
- Q. Do you love me darling?
- A. Only on Sundays.
- Q. Think you can handle this problem, George?
- A. No, prof, you've got the Ph.D.; you tackle it.

—MIKE ROBINSON

In conclusion, one can say that the role of the university has in no way been changed by the threat of thermonuclear war. It is still the duty of the university—specifically, the duty of its faculty of the liberal (or liberating) arts—to promote the truly humane studies, or, one might say, to promote humanity truly understood. The university can best perform its duty, and thereby justify its position in the community, not by reminding its students of the nuclear peril (I know of no Cornell student who had to be reminded of that), but by continuing to be what it has traditionally been, the home of the scholarship that, as someone has said, is "meant to be a bulwark of civilization against barbarism."

Gettysburg Address—New

To the Editors:

Four score and seven days ago our big brother brought forth in this country a personal vendetta, conceived in mordacity and dedicated to the proposition that some men are more equal than others.

Now he is engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this firm of that company can long endure. We saw the great battlefield of that war; we saw him desecrate a portion of those firms to their final resting-place so that his bombastic ego might live. It was altogether foolish and pompous that he did this.

For, in a larger sense, he should not desecrate, he should not mutilate these firms. Those brave new world men, Marx and Engels, are masticating them far above his poor power to add or to detract. The people will little note, nor long remember what big and little brother said then, but they will never forget what he DID then.

It is for those of us still living, rather, to be dedicated to the task remaining before us—bounce big (and little, and littlet) brother; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that the people of the government, by the government, and for the government, shall not perish in spite of everything. (With apologies to A. Lincoln).

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 no name will be returned.

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Co-Editors

Wayne King Managing Editor
Bill Wuamett, Dow Sheppard
News Editors

Ed Dupree Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick Asst. Spls. Ed.
Bill Hobbs Night Editor

Matt Weisman Feature Editor
Harry DeLung, John Medlin
Asss. to the Editor

Jim Wallace Photography Editor
Mike Robinson, Garry Blanchard
Joe Masi

Contributing Editors
TIM BURNETT
Business Manager

Mike Mathers Advertising Mgr.

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: \$4.00 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.