

The Daily Tar Heel

In its seventieth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the University administration or the student body.

All editorials appearing in the DAILY TAR HEEL are the individual opinions of the Editors, unless otherwise credited; they do not necessarily represent the opinions of the staff. The editors are responsible for all material printed in the DAILY TAR HEEL.

October 19, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. XLX, No. 25

Disclaimer Removal

Editorial glee has been expressed in some corners over the dropping of the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), as signed Wednesday by President Kennedy. But there is some question whether or not the change was negated by several amendments to the Act.

The affidavit—which read that the scholarship applicant was not, nor ever had been, connected with a Communist organization—had proven completely valueless. As the president said, “It is highly unlikely that the affidavit kept any Communist out of the programs.”

“It did, however,” Kennedy continued, “keep out those who consider the disclaimer affidavit a bridle up on freedom of thought.” UNC apparently felt that way since it had officially protested the affidavit—and does not require such an affidavit for its own scholarships and loans.

In place of the disclaimer, three amendments have been added to the NDEA:

—It is a criminal offense carrying a penalty of up to five years in jail and a \$10,000 fine, for a member of a “subversive” organization to apply for NDEA aid.

—All applicants must list all criminal convictions since age sixteen.

—The NDEA commissioner is empowered to suspend funds to anyone if he believes the award “is not in the best interest of the United States.”

Defenders of the revised Act point out that the controversial disclaimer affidavit has been removed—certainly a sensible action, as the president’s statement indicated.

The removal of the oath probably will entice back many of the 30 universities which withdrew from the program. At present Harvard, Yale, Oberlin, University of Chicago,

Amherst, Antioch, Sarah Lawrence, and Swarthmore do not participate in the program. Chicago has given indications, apparently, that it will rejoin the program.

Another line of defense comes from those whose only objection to the disclaimer was its ineffectiveness—they say Communists and Communist supporters should not be allowed to apply for Federal aid, since their goal is to overthrow the government. By the same argument, the commissioner should have the discretion to withhold aid if he has reason to believe it is not in the nation’s “best interest.” The criminal record amendment is defended as within the acceptable domain of a group granting scholarships and loans to individuals.

Several college newspapers have protested these amendments; the Columbia Spectator labelling them a “cruel retreat.” One objection is that Communists are forbidden to apply for other forms of Federal aid (such as farm allowances). One newspaper said the government was fully justified in withholding “privileges” to Communists, but not in imposing “harsh penalties.”

Another objection points out the vagueness of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (McCarran Act), upon which the “membership” in subversive organizations is defined: “the giving, loaning or promising of support or money or any other thing of value” to groups “substantially directed, dominated or controlled” by Communists. Some people then object to the powers granted the NDEA commissioner to withhold funds without open review of the case.

The debate essentially narrows down to the question of whether the government should set political qualifications for its scholarship aid. The eliminating of the disclaimer affidavit does little to end this debate. (JC)

The No-Refund Trick

Well, it seems that the Housing Department has done it again, alienate scores of students, that is.

Although their job is trying and their hours are long, it becomes increasingly more difficult to understand or sympathize with the decision making powers that control student housing regulations. Year after year the administration comes forth with some ruling or requirement which makes dorm life continually unpleasant and highly confusing.

It may be that the Housing Office is caught in the middle between

higher-ups and embittered students. But whatever the situation, they seem continually to be the most antagonistic to student contentment or mere peace of mind; and in light of their unfortunate title, they immediately fall heir to any complaints centering around displeasing housing regulations.

Last year there were the requirements on dorm evacuation, which required students to vacate their rooms on the last day of exams, thereby necessitating packing during exam week, instead of studying.

Then, no doubt out of the hands of the mere Housing Office, but within their domain, was the proposal to make Ruffin an all-freshman dorm, thereby arbitrarily moving out those who were already living there.

Now comes the ruling on “no refunds.”

It seems quite peculiar that the administration would make a change in policy for encouraging students to move out of dorms to virtually “financially” forbidding them to move out, without some open announcement to students.

We cannot believe that this happened intentionally, that the administration figured it would save money by keeping students in the dark until they tried to move. We just cannot believe that they operate in that manner, underhandedly.

It would seem, rather, that someone made a foolish oversight or blunder. And that someone is in the administration, therefore they should stand the loss of money, not the unformed, foolishly trusting students. (CW)

“I Said. You Do Have Your Hearing Aid Turned On, Sir, Don’t You?”



Letters To The Editors

From Marxism To Laundry

Progressive Labor, Marxist?

To The Editors:

In an interview with the leaders of the Progressive Labor Club the DAILY TAR HEEL reported last week that the members deny that there are any Communists in their organization. The club’s spokesmen maintain that they are “Marxist-Leninists” and that Communism is, in fact, not far enough to the “left” to suit them. For the moment let’s not question whether or not they are Communism. Let’s just consider the problems these “Marxist-Leninists” have among themselves:

MARXISM: Economics determines politics. LENINISM: Politics determines economics.

MARXISM: Revolution comes after capitalism has reached its pinnacle and comes first in the most advanced countries: LENINISM: Revolution comes first where capitalism is weakest.

MARXISM: The revolution will come first in England, or perhaps in Germany or France. LENINISM: The revolution comes first in Russia where capitalism is weakest. Take over the backward and undeveloped countries cutting them off from the advanced, capitalistic countries thereby denying the capitalists their outlets and markets.

MARXISM: The working class is destined to develop its own consciousness, its own theory, its own organization, its own party, and its own revolution.

LENINISM: The working class left to itself is incapable of any but bourgeois thought. A revolutionary elite is the guardian of the working class. It rules the working class. It dictates to the working class. Power goes not to the “bourgeois-minded” and vacillating working class but to an elite vanguard party.

So we leave the enlightened young “Marxist-Leninists” to their problems at hand. There is just one question however. Abbott and Costello have been tossing it around for years. Who’s on first???

—Frank E. Cella

Anarchists, Or Anybody, Come

To The Editors:

A small amount of campus curiosity was evident Monday evening at the organizational meeting of the Royalist Seminar. Those present were of rather diverse political feelings, and it was decided to form a political which would embrace all political ones. The group did not decide upon a name for the new seminar, but they hope to decide upon one at the next meeting.

Each week one of the members of the seminar will present a paper

on a different form of government, which will then be discussed by the group. The first talk will be one monarchy. Other topics which will be discussed soon are Islamic influence on sub-Saharan countries and the socialist governments of Scandinavia. The group would like a few anarchists, technicians, plutocrats, and communists to attend and present short papers sometime soon. Anyone believing in democracy may attend also.

—Robert Bullard

‘Liberal’ Too Carelessly Used

To The Editors:

I have been a student at Carolina for about one month, and during this time I have become concerned about the frequent use of a certain word. Students who believe in the integration of the Negro and Caucasian races have been frantically branded Liberals by other students who don’t share this view. But what is a Liberal? Can this term be applied to a person who privately believes in integration, or must he actively seek to bring about this process through participation in “sit-ins”? Wouldn’t it be more objective also to find out this person’s views on free love or observe his manner in which he handles his finances, for instance? I think that I can accurately say that I am “liberal” in some respects and “conservative” in others. It is quite probable that no-one is completely “liberal” or “conservative.”

Isn’t one of the purposes of college to learn to access all the factors of a situation before coming to a conclusion? I’m going to want to know more about a person than his ideas on integration before I carelessly label him a Liberal.

—Tom Glymph, Jr.

Homecoming Queen Fairly Chosen?

To The Editors:

I gathered from an article in the Daily Tar Heel that a record number of contestants entered the Homecoming Queen Contest. I have also gathered from a number of contestants who participated, or tried to participate, that the contest was somewhat of a farce. Many of the contestants didn’t even get a chance to talk to the judges who judged the contest. Since when do judges not talk to ALL contestants who participate in the judging?

One girl remarked that she had a chance to talk to one judge but that she would have had to talk to him on her own initiative. There is no sense in holding a beauty contest in which the judges do not make it a point themselves to talk to all

contestants. Is it fair for the judges to talk to some contestants while they do not talk to others?

When the results of the seven finalists were published in the Tar Heel, their were cries of “fix” arising from many quarters on campus. It has now gotten around that some of the girls didn’t get a fair chance, and many people are furious about the whole situation; the least of which is not myself. Maybe the increased number of contestants was the reason why the judges could not get around to all the contestants. If this is the case then there should have been more judges. If this is not the case then there is no reason in the world why the judges could not get around and talk to each girl for a few seconds. If the judges of the Homecoming Queen contest cannot fulfill their responsibilities to the contestants, to themselves and to this University, then let us do away with the whole damn thing.

—J. Dan Moore, Jr.

An Open Letter To Inman Allen

To The Editors:

Enclosed is a letter to Inman Allen which we hope you will be able to publish in the Daily Tar Heel. Though it is a personal letter, we consider the Tar Heel to be the proper medium of expression in this instance.

If you are able to find room for the letter, we would also appreciate it if you would make it clear that this letter was printed at our request and not Inman Allen’s. The letter is unsolicited. Neither of us have met Inman Allen.

Both of us would like to. Dear Inman, It was with great pride and admiration that we read your recent statement concerning the admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi.

While most of the South’s leadership stood silent, your courageous and outspoken statement rang out clearly, in harmony with all the traditions and spirit of student responsibility that have formed the fiber of student government at Chapel Hill.

Having served in the position you now hold during the Little Rock and Clinton conflicts, we know how difficult such decisions can be, especially under the pressures exerted by fellow students, friends, and family when inflamed passions and doctrinaire assertions blind reason and blot out reality.

The obligations of your position are immense, particularly as the leader of what has been, throughout many years, one of the few positive vocal student governments of our South.

Congratulations on your forthright

Out Of The Fryin’ Pan...

By RON LEVIN

“Come to the fair, come to the fair;

Hey nonny, nonny and a helluva drive.”

(Old English Air: ca. 1534)

The “hey, nonny, nonny” may or may not be authentic, but the “helluva drive” part is for real, believe it. Tuesday evening, we spent the better—or worse—part of the time at North Carolina’s answer to Seattle, the State Fair—sort of a Play-boy Club with Pigs.

What is a fair? It is a chimera with cotton candy, a neon-lit behemoth, a fantastic fake with franks, where the people stare at the freaks, the freaks at the people and no one is quite sure who is on what side of which cage.

However, the fair does have its better moments, and a good many of these were spent by us in browsing through the Fine Arts Section, Elementary and High School Division.

We had long thought that any creative streams springing forth from the youth of this state—or any other—might long since have been drained by The Great Dessicator or The Tube of Doom in the Living Room; but we were happily wrong.

One look at these paintings and prints convinced us that somewhere—in several somewhere, to be exact—thirteen and fourteen and fifteen year olds are doing and thinking about what they are doing.

The livestock exhibitions were especially interesting in that it gave one a chance to observe the lower species of pen and pasture living in communal closeness—sort of a four footed togetherness; and to our smarting eyes, they appeared to be just as unhappy with their lot as were their human counterparts, gazing down at them with wrinkled nostrils.

The rides consisted of the usual collection of whirling demons and dervishes, but one in particular caught our eye, The Flying Cages. They’re exactly what they sound like, the object being to rock the cage as high as possible, thus attaining some sort of steely status symbol complete with giggles, gaw gaws and triple nausea.

good sense. Let us hope that the students at “Ole Miss” were listening.

—Don Furtado
Student Body President
(‘57-‘58)

—Eli Evans
Student Body President
(‘58-‘59)

A Policeman

Minus Judgment

Sunday afternoon I was walking on Raleigh Street in front of the Women’s Quad. Every parking place was taken on the sidewalk. A policeman had tagged two cars and was approaching the third car. I noticed the second car was being loaded by a young man and I thought the police should not have tagged that car, for there was no where else on the block to park while loading the car with baggage.

Just at that moment the young man finished loading the trunk and came around to get in the driver’s seat when he spied the tag. (There were two or three girls in the car.) He picked up the tag and came up to the policeman who was tagging the third car.

I said to myself, I had better go back and see how this comes out. I might get a good story for my column.

The young man was explaining why he parked on the sidewalk. I listened, and was going to put in my two bits if the worse came to worse. But the policeman took back the ticket and let the man go on his way.

This policeman exercised some judgment, which is more than I can say for another policeman at the hospital. I met a couple from Florida this past summer in Lenoir Hall. He told me that his little girl had a severe attack of laryngitis and they took her to the hospital. They parked where a sign said “Parking for Patients.” When they came out of the hospital they found a tag on their car.

They told the policeman their story. The policeman looked at the student permit on the car and said: “Students don’t count!” The husband had to pay the fine. Was this Florida couple burned up? You can be sure that they will never come back to Carolina.

It is a policeman’s job to enforce the laws. He wants to be conscientious about it, and it is no easy job, with the parking situation what it is in Chapel Hill, but if he is worth his salt he isn’t going to fine a patient for parking in the space reserved for patients, regardless of who the patient is. I don’t think I ever heard of anyone who

For those who prefer their entertainment in the raw, rough and not ready, there were two shows, which for lack of a better name, we’ll call Buff ‘n Muff, or Look Ma, They’re Alive. (Hint: don’t buy the box of candy when the sellers pass through the audience. We rather suspect they put some rauwolfia derivative in the product, thus gaining the dubious distinction of being the only burlesque show in the south serving tranquilizing taffy.)

In the Commercial Exhibit, we came away with three lessons learned. (1) North Carolina is growing—this bit of earth shaking news rocking us in the shavings. (2) Much new industry is coming to North Carolina. (equally as earth shaking) and (3) Don’t go to see the Commercial Exhibit—it’s a bomb.

During the course of the evening, we counted fifty three—then quit—different concessions hawking what appeared to be twelve inch sections of maroon garden hose, which turned out to be foot long franks. It’s some sort of game.

Try to finish this shake with slaw without getting chili on your shirt. We passed up this gastronomic had dream and had plain coffee instead, the metal spoon dissolving on the third stir.

The fireworks were—well, what can one say about fireworks. There was even a BOMARC missile there, complete with Air Force sergeant to explain its awesome workings to those few interested enough to ask. We were.

We asked him its range, and he explained it was designed to make contact within fifty miles. Then we asked how long that would take, and he further explained that since its speed was 2300 miles per hour, it would take . . . ah . . . er . . . about uh . . . We walked off, leaving him with this sticky bit of mathematics.

All said and spent, it was an enjoyable fair, and we look forward to missing the next one when it comes. There’s one thought, though, that gives us solace. Russia may be turning out more scientists than the U. S. but we have more ferris wheels.

Later . . .

exercised as little judgment as this policeman on duty at the hospital did.

He takes the cake.

—Otfelia Connor

Laundry Service Quite Poor

To The Editors:

How many times have you, student, written on your university laundry list in boldface letters two inches high, “No starch please?” And how many times has your laundry been returned to you starched to the point of petrification?

The numbers which answer these questions are equal and on this point alone the university laundry service should be condemned and put out of business. However, the apparent inability of the laundry service to read is not the only fault by which thousands of university laundry customers are sent into trauma each week as they look down upon their newly mangled laundry. A brief list of the existing conditions follows:

1. Smashed buttons
2. Scorched spots
3. Solidified starch granules stuck to the material
4. Lost sheets
5. Overcranked laundry bills
6. Wrinkled collars and sleeves resembling dried up leaves

The laundry courteously states that the customer may return any article which does not meet with his approval; but if this were done, the customer would spend half his waking hours returning articles, and there would be a line of disgruntled people stretching from Joyner’s basement to Kemp’s.

The laundry also says they will reimburse customers for ruined items (as they candidly admit they do ruin them); but for only five times the cost of laundering the item. A customer could only come out even on a pair of torn underwear.

There are only two points in favor of continued toleration of the university laundry: (1) Delivery and pick-up at the dorms and (2) Prices two to three cents lower than town prices. Nevertheless, these points certainly do not counterbalance their gross mishandling of laundry.

For one have withdrawn my laundry deposit and am having my laundry done in town. Anyone who cares a bit for their appearance and for the life of their clothing has no other course open to him.

Direct action such as this may alarm the university laundry service enough so that someday they may return to the customer decently laundered articles instead of poor excuse for heaps of clean dust cloths.

—Troy P. Lampkin

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

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

Bill Wauwatt — News Editor
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. Ed.
Chris Farran — Matt Welsman

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 Wyszog — 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, 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.