

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 19, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. XLIX, No. 159

Study?

The University Housing Office has released notices to residents of men's dorms that they must be out of their rooms by June 1. Which means that they must leave on the 31 of May, that is, the last day of exams.

Certainly there are reasons for this evacuation date. There must be rooms prepared for parents attending Graduation exercises, and there must be rooms available for alumni returning for their class reunions. And the rooms must be prepared prior to their planned arrivals. However, the highly undesirable prospect of a boy's having to spend needed study time, frantically packing his belongings, ought to under all circumstances be avoided.

The temptation to let the books slide and procrastinate wholeheartedly is strong enough now, without having some authoritatively approved reason for doing something other than studying.

However, there are other indications that the "powers that be" are

not overly concerned with opportunities for student study. We are thinking specifically, in this instance, of the elimination of the reading day. Granted, there must be some reason, known to those who make the decisions about student life, but we've yet to encounter a student who knew what it was.

Also worthy of consideration is the "ruling," that comes out in the form of a statement attached to the exam schedule, that "Quizzes are not to be given in this semester on or after Wednesday, May 16, 1962."

We have often wondered just what this actually means.

Does it mean, perchance, that if you happen to be in one of those classes that has a quiz scheduled on or after May 16, then you do not have to take the quiz?

Or does it mean that if you are a professor, you aren't supposed to give quizzes on or after May 16?

Or does it in actuality mean absolutely nothing? (cw)

Growing Pains

A number of leading British universities recently approved a plan "revolutionizing the procedure for entry to most universities in the United Kingdom." It is designed to meet the impact of the high post-World War II birthrate, due to hit colleges in 1964-5 and following years.

Under this system a candidate for admission to any of these colleges for the following fall, will apply on a common form not later than Dec. 31. He may list up to four universities, stating his order of preference. His application is then multi-faxed and sent along with his school reports to the university of his choice. It is up to the individual schools to interview the student and make their decisions.

Cambridge and Oxford, under this plan, have been required to complete their selection by the end of January. All other universities, if they have been named as the

candidate's first or second choice, will notify him by March 25 whether he is accepted. Third- or fourth-ranked colleges have to notify students by May 25.

Students getting an unconditional offer from a first-choice institution will be required to accept or reject it at once. If he accepts, his other applications will be withdrawn immediately.

This system, to be used on a trial-basis this year in Britain, might be valuable in the United States.

It would eliminate uncertainty on the parts of students applying to major universities and would give universities a more accurate idea of how many students would be enrolled for the next year. Administrative time and money could be saved if a central office were set up to handle all applications.

This plan is one of many which American colleges should consider, to ease the growing pains of the next decade. (jc)

Whiskey

Only in Mississippi.

State legislators have refused to repeal Prohibition, but nevertheless continues to levy taxes on whiskey.

The State sales tax on wine and whiskey was raised from 8 to 9 percent during the current legislative sessions. There is also a ten percent black-market tax, on "the sale of any tangible property of which is prohibited by law."

A third tax proposal, now before the Legislature, provides for an assessment of \$1 a case on whiskey and 50 cents on wine—and, to make the ridiculous more sublimely ridiculous, all revenue from this new tax will be used to establish treatment centers for alcoholics. (jc)

"Eh? What Say?"



Plague On Both

King: On Gans And Baker Articles

To the Editors:

A recent edition of the DTH contained articles by a liberal, Curtis Gans, and a conservative, Earl Baker, setting forth their respective ideologies. Although this debate was a refreshing relief from the YAF letters-to-the-editor which usually dominate the editorial page, it was a disappointment in that neither writer seemed to have any sort of realistic orientation to the world around him, neither writer seemed able to step off his treadmill of conservative platitudes or liberal pipe-dreams to offer us a tenable guide to action.

MR. BAKER, YRC President, opposes governmental intervention in the economy and the use of the machinery of the state to overcome social problems on the grounds that such reforms tend to undermine individual liberty: "Liberals SAY they favor liberty, yet turn to controls to meet problems . . . The essence of true conservatism is expressed in . . . opposition to statism." Baker SAYS conservatives are opposed to statism: but let's just for once look at the irrefragable facts of the case, the voting record of conservatives in Congress. The facts are that conservatives never oppose statism in areas of policy where it would protect and increase the profits of Big Business. Conservatives support our military budget of fifty billion dollars a year, the greatest single source of profits to the corporations. Conservatives support government subsidies to industry, subsidies which come from the worker's pocket by way of taxes (A clear case of robbing the poor to pay the rich!); and it's obvious that these subsidies, although they violate the conservative principle of "free enterprise," don't exactly harm profits. Perhaps the most obvious example of conservative statism is our federal highway system. Without this "socialistic" road network the distribution of goods so vital to profit making would be greatly hindered. While supporting these above measures, conservatives OPPOSE social security, federal aid to education, civil rights, urban housing projects, etc.—forms of "statism" which would not directly contribute to corporate

profits, forms of "statism" which would merely increase the welfare of the common man. Thus we see that to the conservative politician, the political tool of the corporations, any form of federal action which increases corporate profits is non-statist and hence good; but any form of federal action which aids the people without aiding the corporations, especially any which in aiding the people endangers corporate profits, is statist, or even Stalinist, and hence bad. The corporations are perfectly willing to rob the taxes of the people in order to increase profits, but they will only incidentally allow their own taxes to be used for the benefit of the people.

This contradiction in Mr. Baker's thinking can be traced back to his semantically deceitful definition of liberty. The conservative's "liberty" is not the noble ideal that its "patriotic" use implies. In the name of "liberty" conservatives are blocking all efforts to halt the rapacious profiteering of the drug industry. At the same time, and also in the name of "liberty," conservatives are attempting to destroy the Bill of Rights! They have instituted the thought-control McCarran Act, an anti-constitutional attempt to destroy those political groups in America who wish to put an end to profiteering, to the domination and exploitation of the American people by finance capital. Thus it is clear that what the conservative really means by "liberty" (based not on what he says he means but on the objective referents of the term) is freedom of the corporations to MAKE BIGGER AND BIGGER PROFITS—this and nothing more. Anything which abets this aim is good; anything which threatens this aim must be destroyed. PROFIT is the Almighty God of the conservative.

From the sociological point of view, Mr. Baker's ritualistic rant in about statism and liberty are a shrewd reflection of his class interests. From the rationalist point of view, they are sheer infantilism. The "liberty" of the conservatives, the "liberty" of the corporations, the "liberty" of the capitalists, is not the liberty of the people: we must look elsewhere for an expression of a truly democratic political philosophy. Does Mr. Gans offer it?

GANS' ARGUMENT seems to indicate that there is a Will to Progress inherent in liberalism: "They envision a world in which all men can live together in peace, freedom, possessing human dignity . . . in which greed and ambition have been

replaced by love and creation." But a Will to Progress is no good without a Way, and the closest thing to a Way that Gans offers is " . . . someday through education better than we have now, through interaction, and through understanding there will come an end to the hate and bigotry that infest all parts of the world." If "education," "interaction" (whatever that means), and "understanding" were enough to make dreams come true, then the Christians would long since have ushered in their City of God! No, the liberal solution to the social dilemma is inadequate. At best, it is Utopianism, a fantasy of wish-fulfillment; at worst, it is naked hypocrisy. Considering the fact that twentieth century liberal parties have tended to ally themselves with fascists more often than with the broad mass of the people; considering the fact that Mr. Gans himself is more concerned with witchhunting campus Marxists than with sincerely proselytizing his liberalism; it is safe to say that the blessings of liberalism are not meant for the people, that they are the proverbial carrot on the stick so far as the people are concerned. Even if an individual liberal happens to be sincere in his ideals; still, because of his class prejudices, he does not and cannot point to those social forces which are alone capable of putting the highest ideals of humanity into practice. I repeat: A Will to Progress is no good without a Way. And where the Way is no more practical than Mr. Gans' Way, there is strong reason to suspect that there is no SINCERE Will. "The obstacles (to progress)," says Mr. Gans, "are real, and the

people willing to meet them are all too few." Few indeed! And the liberals don't exactly swell the ranks.

Even, however, if we take what Mr. Gans and Mr. Baker say at face value, it is clear that neither liberalism nor conservatism offers any hope whatsoever for the solving of our nation's domestic and foreign problems. Mr. Baker says that we should NOT attempt to solve our problems, because any practical solution would necessitate the loss of cherished freedoms. Mr. Gans says that we SHOULD solve our problems and paints a glowing picture of a problemless world, but cannot offer any plan of action. Such are the contradictions one runs into when one refuses to base political theory squarely on reality, when one repudiates the scientific approach to society and attempts to think solely in terms of manmade ideals, "existential absolutes." Political theory must arise from FACTS rather than from ideals. Ideals are the product of facts, the product of the material conditions of society at a given time. As society changes, its ideals will change. Anyone who attempts to hold absolute ideals (such as Mr. Baker's ideal of unrestricted freedom for capitalists to exploit workers) will soon find that history has left him far behind, that his ideals have become estranged from material reality. When ideals become estranged from reality, they also become estranged from Man. As Man is the only thing in this universe worth bothering about, then ideals estranged from Man are no ideals at all.

—DENNIS KING

GOP Chances In States

By RAYMOND LAHR

WASHINGTON (UPI) — The GOP dream of winning control of the national House of Representatives next November, but it is almost equally concerned about retiring a bevy of Democratic governors.

Republican hopes are riding on men like former Vice President Richard M. Nixon in California, Rep. William W. Scranton in Pennsylvania, state auditor, James A. Rhodes in Ohio, former Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton in Nebraska and George Romney, the compact carbuilder, in Michigan.

In their realistic moments, Republicans admit they have only faint hopes of gaining the 44 seats needed to take over control of the House next year. But they are convinced that there are many vulnerable Democrats in the new preponderantly Democratic lineup of governors.

Although governors have faded somewhat as contenders for the White House, their offices are still the seats of great political power,

particularly in the big states.

GOP Has 16 Governors

The GOP now holds only 16 of 50 governorships. In the pivotal states, those which will cast more than 15 electoral votes in the 1964 presidential election, they now hold only the New York base of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

Rockefeller himself must win reelection and win big next Nov. 6 to stay in contention for the 1964 presidential nomination. In their floundering search for a candidate, New York Democrats offer their national party little hope that Rockefeller will be eliminated this year.

In the other big states—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Texas and California—Democrats now hold the governorship. The GOP lost its chance in New Jersey last year when Gov. Richard J. Hughes stopped former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

The Illinois governorship is not at stake this year, and Texas is still not a major Republican target comparable to Pennsylvania, Ohio,

their welfare above everything else.

But this Student Government found that it was not concerned about the welfare of the Student Body. How could it afford to be when it had the welfare of the entire world to consider? So when a student hung himself, Student Government could not even find time to ask why. (Thousands were being killed in Algeria. What's the life of one student compared to this.) When over 300 hundred students flunked out after the first semester and 200 more dropped out, Student Government did not even notice. Why should it? All it meant was that the University was rid of 500 apathetic students, and besides the Berlin situation was beginning to get hot again. There had to be a committee meeting at once to adopt a resolution warning the president to be careful about what he did in Berlin.

And so the heavy problems of the world fell upon the shoulders of this Student Government, and it struggled with them with all the insight and experience that college students are blessed with when dealing with world problems. But then someone noticed that it was almost time for Spring elections, and that Student Government would be forced to take a look at the student body for a while.

But when the leaders of Student Government took a look at the student body, they were immediately informed by both the Students and the administration that Student Government had died. It had died some time between the Berlin crisis and the Algerian peace.

Don't ask me why it died. It just died.

OTELIA

Speaks Out

To the Editors,

We all agreed as we drove up behind Hill Hall to hear the UNC Symphony orchestra that we wouldn't live anywhere else in the world, especially this time of year, except Chapel Hill. And I will have to take back what I said about local concerts often not being as worthwhile as the FM concerts over radio.

The Band concert on the lawn and the WC and UNC Glee Club recital on Parent's Day I enjoyed very much. It was a perfect day for a lawn concert.

I thought the University Symphony was equally as good as the North Carolina Symphony orchestra of last week. Hats off to Mr. Slocum and his musicians. Both the N. C. and the UNC orchestra happened to play my favorite—Enescu's Rumanian Rhapsody, No. 1 on II, which brought down the house. Enid Katahan was deserving of special mention. She was gracious, lovely to look at, and her playing was superb.

The next event to look forward to with more than ordinary zest is the Alumni Luncheon on June fourth at Lenoir Hall. Mr. Prillaman is taking off for the National Convention of College Restaurant Managers in Chicago, where he will get some fancy ideas for the luncheon, and incidentally, will address the Association of School Accountants. You better get your tickets for the luncheon early, because they might run out.

—OTELIA CONNOR

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Co-Editors

Wayne King . . . Managing Editor
Bill Wasmeth, Dow Sheppard
News Editors

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

Matt Weisman . . . Feature Editor
Harry DeLung, John Medina
Assts. 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: \$4.50 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.

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 one will be returned.