

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.

September 29, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. XLX, No. 9

'Responsible'

In a recent feature on this summer's National Student Congress the New York Times magazine used phrases such as "earnest, brass-tacks meeting," "serious demeanor" to describe the student delegates. This view was compared with the common misconception of students as "cold-mindedly intent on quick success, or frivolous in all matters."

In other words, the Times was trying to tell us that the delegates representing over 250 schools, including UNC, were "responsible."

Responsible . . . just like father. Grown up.

But this is not a true picture. Rather, it is not the whole picture.

The student delegates to the Congress, like most students in and out of student governmental structures of any form, felt their prime obligation was to be "responsible"—and as this word is generally interpreted, that means to create a favorable image of themselves in the non-student world. A favorable image so that their fathers and their fathers' friends wouldn't dismiss them as "just kids."

But at the same time, the delegates were being asked by some of their fellow students to be not only responsible but responsive. It was a request to stop cowering to the wishes of their elders and to respond to the situations facing them as the young and the educated.

This was the challenge of university freedom imperilled by the cold war and the preparations for the hot war—a situation which "responsible" students should not see.

. . . The challenge of a more complex civil rights situation—where the problem is no longer, Pro or Con on bigotry, but "In what form, bigotry?" And demands to act in the area of discrimination honestly and immediately, but possibly not "responsibly."

There was the challenge of meeting the issues of campus importance with the same vigor expended on national problems—being able to tell the same thing to your Dean as you wrote to your Congressman. What about due process in campus honor trials? And civil liberties and academic freedom on the campus—your campus. "Responsibility did not include action in these areas."

Most basically, does the student have any place in the total community—or is he a man-child in limbo between the days of childhood protection and the full citizenship of manhood? Does he have any obligation to perform the duties of the educated citizen, and thus justify his education—or is he not yet capable of speaking and acting?

These challenges and others were thrown at the student delegates.

To be responsible, to be accepted within the outside world, "Can we condemn U. S. nuclear tests?"—Would that be responsible? More basic, Can we ever condemn the actions of our government—actions taken after much thought and study—can we ever condemn these actions and be "responsible"?

These thoughts troubled the students at the Congress—they vaguely felt that their parents were giving them the America of 1962 and they must accept it—it would seem almost unloyal to their fathers and mothers, to repudiate the work of their generation. So the delegates kept telling themselves, we must be responsible. Responsible. What will dad think.

But always, never ceasing, came the demands to respond, respond positively, to the aching, ever-crying-out problems which face the student, as citizen and as the one American allowed four years of freedom, responsible finally only to his own mind.

Can we neglect the matters, the matters of vital life, to which students, always and forever the students in all countries at all times, have responded—discrimination, all encroachments on freedom, injustice anywhere . . .

And with these demands came the recognition that action in these areas would bring no awards from the Rotary Club, no articles from a Chamber of Commerce editor. Parents and friends of parents would say little and frown. But in the final voting, after hours of debate on all major topics, the delegates responded—in an intelligent, responsible manner . . . but few people will call them "responsible."

. . . Because they responded as students will usually respond when shown the facts and presented the alternatives—against inequality and discrimination, in favor of freedom in its many forms, impatient with injustice.

The so-called "conservative" and "middle-of-the-road" students at the Student Congress did not make the massive frontal attack on the "liberal establishment" which they made last year. Instead they used a more subtle language, a language which struck close to the delegates: that of "responsibility" and of the respect which is supposedly necessitates. But in the end that view was repudiated.

Repudiated because that brand of "responsibility" means surrender and abdication of the traditional responsibility of the student, apart from his great obligation to his own education. This is the responsibility to awaken his society to the evils within it. And if his society does not awaken, to act independently of his elders—sometimes rashly, sometimes recklessly, occasionally even "irresponsibly"—but always honestly. Forever and brutally honest. (JC)

JFK

Way back around the first of 1961, in a speech hailed by many as absolutely great, President Kennedy said: "Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain master of its own house."

In light of the confidence that flowed from that statement, and in view of more recent developments and Kennedy statements about the Cuban situation, it might be more interesting to reserve inaugural addresses for times that truly inaugurate or initiate presidents into office.

Little Bundle From Congress



Letters To The Editors

Di-Phi, Debate

The Editors:

Debate has occupied my time and attention since I was an undergraduate at the University of California and a graduate student in speech at Northwestern and the University of Iowa, a few years back. Bill Dowell is correct. Debate is worthwhile. The Di-Phi is important. However, the Di-Phi does not offer "the last place on the UNC campus where people can get together and actually exchange ideas." It is not "the last unified body on the campus capable of talking about anything other than violations of dormitory quiet hours." It does not represent "UNC's last ditch attempt to convince the rest of the world that it is something more than a country club for Southern gentlemen." It is not the one and only group in the University "that could conceivably make North Carolina a University capable of leading the State and the South towards some goal."

Debate is not dead at UNC. The Congressional style of debate, as practiced by the Di-Phi, has simply been replaced, as it has been for years in other universities across the country, by collegiate or orthodox debate. Congressional style debate is excellent training. It is, however, only one type of debate. To give you an example, there is:

1. Three-man-team debate
2. One-rebuttal debate
3. Split-team debate
4. Direct-clash debate
5. Direct-question or dialectic debate
6. Heckling debate
7. English-style debate
8. Problem-solving debate
9. Symposium debate
10. Radio-TV debate forums
11. Intercollegiate forum debates
12. Three-team debate

Actually, the Congressional style, as practiced by the Di-Phi is only one of three forms of debate usually listed under parliamentary session debate: (1) Congressional, (2) Legislative, and (3) Mock-trial.

For the past three years I have been Director of Debate here at the University. This coming year I will assume the duties of Executive-Secretary of the North Carolina High School Debate Union in addition to directing the University Debate Team. To illustrate my point that debate is not and will not be dead in the near future on this campus, let me briefly list the activities of your University Debate Team for the coming year:

1. Host to two debate tournaments; a Tar Heel Invitational on October 6th and, the Atlantic Coast Conference Tournament the first weekend in January.
2. Host this year to the Oxford University debaters.
3. Active participation on the part of a debate squad of approximately 30 members in intercollegiate tournaments all over the Eastern United States.
4. Host to a series of 7 WUNC televised debates.

This coming year we will be debating the national debate proposition: Resolved, That the non-communist nations of the world establish an economic community. In addition to this query, each of the seven televised debates will be on a different question current at the time of broadcast.

If anyone on this campus would like to exchange a few ideas that can come to Bingham Annex any Tuesday evening at 6:30. No, should the Di-Phi die, and I hope it does not because I believe in training students in parliamentary debate, debate will not be dead on this campus. Should they decide to somehow link their program with that of the University Debate Team, this could be their finest hour.

—Dr. Don Springden

'Ins And Outs' In

To The Editors:

Congratulations on the very amusing article appearing on the editorial page concerning the "Ins and Outs" On New Frontier." After careful reading, I determined most of Congressman Frelinghuysen's comments were true. Keep on placing a few of the more overall views of political situations, including contrasts in opinion.

It might be much more interesting to campus readers if you would be more critical or questionable of local and national politics and happenings.

—Jim Rector

Wrye Is Trite

To The Editor:

Chuck Wrye's editorial in Thursday's paper denouncing the lack of "dichotomy of interests" between the two campus political parties is only trite, but it is an excellent example of what the Tar Heel has formerly refused to recognize in fraternities: diversity and individualism. The editorial rationalized that since both party chairmen were in the same fraternity, there must be little or no difference in their respective policies.

The opposite is true. The two parties not only differ on a number of campus issues, their collective characters differ greatly. The Student party has always tended to be the more liberal of the two, always ready to jump on the Administration for the slightest abridgement of student rights. They have always been strong on integration and civil rights. The University party has tended to be more conservative and has provided a large number of the better student government leaders. It was a UP man who initiated the experiment of the "quiet dorms." I might add that Chuck Wrye owes something to the SP as he ran on that party's ticket last spring. He must agree with at least some of their policies.

Certainly the two party chairmen do not think alike merely because

they are in the same fraternity as Thursday's editorial would have us believe. There are differences in the two parties and in the ideologies of the two chairmen. Yet they remain good friends and good fraternity brothers.

In the fraternity debate during orientation week, it was argued that fraternities stifle the individual. The above example is only one of many that demonstrate that individual thought does exist in fraternities. In fact it is my firm belief that individual thought and action must exist in these organizations in order that they survive. Closer examination by the Tar Heel editors and by other critics will reveal that the more successful fraternities are the ones that stress individualism rather than suppress it. As soon as a fraternity does suppress the individual, it stagnates itself and becomes less effective in all its activities.

This reader is tired of the numerous negative editorials on fraternities, student government, and the honor system. It would be a welcome change to see some constructive criticism in the Tar Heel.

—Peter Wales

UP Chairman

To The Editors:

At present there seems to be some concern about the internal situation of the University Party. Frankly at the beginning of school there was some confusion—confusion due to a problem peculiar to student organizations.

Last spring I served as UP Chairman, but was compelled to resign this position at the end of the school year. This was due to my appointment as Chairman of the Campus Entertainment Committee, and my desire to keep politics out of student government committees. As my resignation came during exam time, it was impossible to hold an open meeting for the election of new officers. The need for continued leadership caused the executive committee to appoint Don Curtis as temporary Chairman.

However, Don did not return to Carolina this semester—thus leaving some doubt as to who was leading the party. As I had held the office, the executive committee appointed me to the position.

The University Party will hold a membership drive from October 8th-23rd and with our membership for the year established we will be able to hold an open party meeting the week of October 14th to elect our new officers. I shall not be a candidate for chairman—the two leading candidates appear to be Mike Chapin and Al Sneed.

I hope this clears up any confusion as to who is actually chairman of the University Party. Nevertheless the University Party is already going ahead with its organizational plans for the year, and invites any interested student to participate.

—Phil Smith

FILE HOBBS

Don't Be Cowards, Student Legislators

As might have been expected, the Student Legislature started off the year with an action which was hypocritical, cowardly and stupid.

This action came last Thursday when Representative Bob Spearman introduced a resolution "in support of the efforts of James Meredith to gain admission to the University of Mississippi." Immediately after the resolution was introduced, Representative Rufus Edmisten suggested that it would be improper to consider it at that time since so few of the legislators were present. Spearman then urged the legislators to consider it immediately since events were moving so rapidly in Mississippi.

The legislature voted, by a large majority, against considering the resolution at that time.

BUT THEN, not five minutes later, the same legislators passed two bills of considerable importance. No more members of the legislature had come in, and yet, somehow, perhaps by the miracle of Carolina Student Government Goodness, the same number of legislators which was not enough to consider one resolution was enough to consider and pass two others, one of which allocated student funds.

Now, before going any further, let us say that Representative Edmisten's point was well taken. There were indeed too few legislators present to consider a resolution. One could not expect a resolution passed by those present to be a true reflection of the feeling of the legislature. That is true. But then WHY should the very same group be qualified to pass two other bills? How can we think of these bills as legitimate student laws when the very same legislature that passed them had just admitted that it did not have enough members present to consider

legislation? Why would the legislature do such a thing?

The answer is simple: the majority of student legislators, at least the majority of those present Thursday night, are afraid.

Many of them would not want to vote in favor of James Meredith's admission to "Ole Miss." But do they have the guts or the integrity to come out and actually say what they believe? No. They do not. Instead they say, "There are too few of us here to think about this." What they mean is, "We don't want to have to make a decision on this, because we aren't sure Meredith should be admitted, but we are sure that it is not fashionable or politically wise to oppose integration as UNC students."

But will they ever come out and actually say that they are opposed to Meredith's admission? Will they consider the resolution on its own merits? No. They will continue to avoid the issue in any way possible.

In short, the legislature has refused to come to grips with a problem which is of vital concern to UNC students. As our elected representatives and leaders, the student legislators have an obligation to consider and make some decision about this question, to express our views.

Last Thursday, these legislators cowardly avoided the issue. Let us hope that their cowardice and hypocrisy will not continue.

Let them speak for James Meredith, or let them speak against James Meredith. But do not let them stand idle and afraid to speak at all.

We implore you, gentlemen: say "Yes," say "No," but for Christ Sake, say something. Get up off your collective cans and make a decision!

Pieter Voorhees

'Black Tights' Is Well Worth Students' Time And Money

A MELANGE

Black Tights is far from the usual run of movies seen in Chapel Hill. The only explanation for its presence is that the management of the Carolina has finally decided to beat the Varsity at its own game, but not being as discerning in such matters, decided from the title that Tights was another Immoral Mr. Tees. This regrettable as it may be to some, is not the case, in spite of the movie's having been made in France. One would assume from the lack of blood'n'broads that the French have lately been taking their meals at Lenoir and their wine at the OhBoy.

But so much for what the film is not. Specifically it is a confection by the Ballets de Paris, l'Orchestra de l'Amoureux, and the House of Dior consisting of four scenarios. The principals of the film are Cyd Charisse, Moira Shearer (a British ballerina), Zizi Jeanmarie, and Roland Petit, the last two being Bulgarian expatriates, of course. The scenarios are as follows:

The first is entitled *La croqueuse de diamants*, a typically Gallic story of a girl (Zizi Jeanmarie) who led a band of pickpockets in Les Halles and who had a voracious appetite for diamonds. This would not be unusual by any means except that she ate them, and now we know what Jean Valjean was doing in the sewers of Paris. In the story, she falls in love with a young man who has delivered a banquet to a cafe that's too small for it. To accommodate the banquet, a hole is knocked in the wall of the cafe, and the young man finds himself in Zizi's lair. She has already tried to pick his pocket, but he's broadminded, so they love, or until the rest of the band returns. At this point, we give up. Only a Frenchman could get into a situation like this, let alone dream it up, so we'll leave him to get out of it.

Leaving the second scenario until later, the third is another typically Gallic piece called *Deuil* on 24 hours, in which one fop (Roland Petit) tries to seduce the mistress (Cyd Charisse) of another fop in a sidewalk cafe. The two fops duel, the poacher wins and after a suitable interval (24 hours), the mistress takes up with the poacher after doing a genteel and very amusing (if you're inclined to laugh while Cyd Charisse rolls off her stockings) strip tease in the middle of Maxim's. All of this took place when the late fop refused to buy his mistress a dress. Will she get it?

The second and fourth scenarios are condensations of, respectively, Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac* starring Moira Shearer and Roland Petit, and Bizet's *Carmen*, starring Zizi Jeanmarie with Roland Petit.

All four scenarios are excellent in every way. The sets and costumes, the choreography, the music (Dizy Damase, Constat, Thiriet, and Bizet, in that order), and above all the dancing. Cyd Charisse, probably familiar to most, surpasses herself. Moira Shearer, well-known to those familiar with ballet (as we discovered last night), is exquisite. Mlle. Jeanmarie shows latitude as well as excellence in her roles as the diamond thief and then Carmen. Roland Petit, who also did the choreography, is almost too brilliant to be believed. Aside from the inexplicable presence of Maurice Chevalier, *Black Tights* is well worth the money and the time.

University Needs More Listeners Like Pete Mullis

To The Editor:

I was a member of one of the last classes that Pete Mullis taught in this University. It was that wonderfully relaxed Hygiene II, which all of us at one time or another endured.

But the atmosphere in Pete Mullis' classroom was different. Yes, it was relaxed, but there was the feeling when Pete started to speak seriously that something important was about to be said.

And usually when he spoke seriously, he had something to say about the University. His most frequent word was: "This place needs more listeners . . . somebody you can go to when you have problems . . . somebody just to gab with."

He had a lot to say about health and physical upkeep but somehow you got the impression that the thing nearest his heart was this place "on the Hill" as he used to say. He had fears about Carolina becoming too complex and bulky to concern itself with individual problems. He preached that everybody needs somebody to talk to, and when YOU wanted to talk, Pete Mullis was always there—he practiced his preachings. He was that kind of man.

Now the University trustees are in California to study methods for solving the problems of an expanding institution. One of their answers passed away September 29th.

The world needs more people like Pete Mullis. I would even go so far as to say that UNC needs more people like him. Let us hope he was NOT one of the last great listeners. If he was, God help us all.

—Bill Walker

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

Bill Hobbs — Associate Editor
Wayne King — Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors

Bill Waunmett — News Editor
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. Ed.
Chris Farran — Matt Weisman
Feature Editors

Harry DeLung — Night Editor
Jim Wallace — Photography Editor
Mike Robinson — Gary Blanchard
Contributing Editors

DAVE MORGAN
Business Manager

Gary Dalton — Advertising Mgr.
John Evans — Circulation Mgr.
Dave Wysong — Subscription 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 8, 1970. 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.