

# 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.

November 8, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXX, No. 42

## Anonymous Letter Writer, Afraid Or Confused?

The Greensboro Daily News recently ran a letter to the editor which they received from an anonymous student here at Carolina. The letter lamented the fact that the majority of the views presented both to and by students on this campus were in effect "liberal" views.

Specifically, the letter stated, "... students rarely hear anything other than harangues by all-knowing liberals. And, 'When you stop to consider that the 'other side' is never heard, it isn't so amazing that leftist group flourish on the Carolina campus. . . ."

Well, aside from the fact that we would never call the struggling attempts of a very few students to establish a Progressive Labor club on this campus "flourishing leftism," we find that the letter raises some interesting points about the type of speakers and entertainers who come to the Carolina campus.

The individual, whether a student or not, is obviously sincere and concerned that he does not have the opportunity to hear and applaud the views of some conservatives with whom he agrees. This may be a valid criticism, but the matter does not rest so easily, as this letter writer would lead us to believe, on the specific personalities of those individuals who have appeared on the campus.

But then again, what if the speakers to whom Mr. Anon refers are blantly liberal, and what if some folk singers sing about their aspirations for peace? This does not prevent any equally talented or vocal conservative elements from presenting their views.

The conservative element suffers only in so far as it remains silent and does not choose to present itself to the campus as a worthy and legitimate "search for the truth," to borrow a phrase from our mysterious, upset student. Certainly, when Fulton Lewis, Jr. was here he had some good points to make and some interesting approaches to current issues, and, no doubt, numerous students on campus would enjoy hearing him again.

Where is he? For that matter, where are the conservative speakers in general? Where are entertainers who would like to sing a chorus or two about

an invasion of Cuba or the glories of nuclear war?

Contrary to what said letter by supposed student would lead one to believe, various campus organizations have endeavored to get conservative speakers here, but in the overwhelming majority of instances the prices demanded by the respected, vocal conservatives have been way beyond the budgets of any campus group. They, quite simply, want too much money.

We would not glibly criticize them for their monetary demands. It may be the only way in which they can afford to come to the campus. It may be that they have so many requests to speak that they must limit themselves in some manner, and by imposing financial barriers they certainly do exclude themselves from many campuses.

But let all this be as it may, the really frightening aspect—the most disappointing thing about the letter was its writer's lack of name. Why would a student from UNC write a letter of complaint to the newspaper of another town, and why would he choose not to sign his name? This stimulates, indeed, encourages generalized speculation.

Was it a student who wrote that letter? We will never know, but we have our doubts. But then again, what if it was a student? Is the situation here at Chapel Hill such that those who lean toward a conservative stand are intimidated? Is there just cause for a conservative to fear being known? We do not think so. There are many on campus who are vocal conservatives, and who do not mind letting other students know that they are.

So, we must conclude that the "fear" is peculiar to this one individual. And that is a shame. For if the "student" is afraid to speak openly on behalf of what he believes, his plight is miserable, to say the least.

Furthermore, the anonymous individual is confused, or at least he confuses the issue, when he closes his letter with the plea, "... I do suggest that both sides be given an opportunity to speak;" and then refuses to sign his name—in effect, refusing to speak as an individual for either side. (CW)

## Fraternal Pressure

It is quite often, through varying media, pointed out that fratern-

ities require pledges to participate in numerous extra-curricular activities. There are the standard jokes about "pledge-points" and committee memberships, on threat of the banned, rumored, and frightful "rat court."

But when the joking is done. We must admit that system works. Or at least that the majority of student government committees are manned by individuals who belong to fraternities. And in most instances, these individuals, who may have originally joined the committees through fear of the almighty brotherhood, find that they actually enjoy their activities and that they have something to offer to the organization—and thereby, to the campus in general.

So, we may all joke about pledge duties, but let us not overlook the good that comes from some. The haphazard "joining" that is the result of fraternity pressure quite often leads on to an enjoyable and productive service to the campus by an individual who might, otherwise, never have taken the initiative. (CW)

## "Let's Get A Lock For This Thing"



## Federal Aid To Arizona: A Billion For Barry

By DONALD R. McNEILL  
In The Reporter

Mesa, Arizona—In the heart of Senator Barry Goldwater's home town of Phoenix, a new eight-story, block-long Federal Building has changed the desert skyline. Completed last year at a cost of almost \$4 million, the handsome black and gold structure is a striking symbol of the continuing influence of the Federal government in the lives and economy of the conservative senator's 1,400,000 generally conservative constituents.

With no particular sense of contradiction, most of these Arizonans—including ranchers with Federal farm loans, retired couples receiving Social Security payments, and businessmen with defense contracts—are proud of Senator Goldwater's growing reputation as the chief national spokesman for reducing Federal spending. "When it operates with as much absence of government interference as possible, the economy operates the best," the senator told Eric Sevareid on a national television broadcast last March. But in the same interview he conceded that Federal expenditures have had an impact on his state. "I don't deny that we take it," he admitted. "We do."

When Sevareid asked if Arizona had not accepted about \$84 million in Federal money in 1961, the senator replied: "Oh, I think that probably more than that was spent in the state...I think the total would be over \$200 million". Even that estimate is low. In 1961, the Arizona economy was bolstered by nearly a billion dollars in Federal money.

A recent report by the Library of Congress, listing only "Selected Federal Expenditures," showed that \$796,326,982 entered Arizona during fiscal 1961. Not included in this "selected" list are payments for the purchase, storage, and transportation of price-support commodities, defense subcontracts to Arizona firms from out-of-state industries, and expense of Federal agencies like the FBI, SEC, and Food and Drug Administration which do not break down their budgets by states. Moreover, direct Federal expenditures available in the state far exceed the Library of Congress's careful estimate. For example, Federal highway funds, listed in the report as \$34 million, actually totaled almost \$40 million in 1961.

What should Arizonans do about this vast and growing Federal spending? "We wish we'd never started it, and we'd like to get out of it, and the governor's working very hard to see what he can do," the senator told Sevareid. Senator Goldwater has not, however, advised the people of his state to refuse Federal funds. He just asks them not to come to Washington looking for money. They usually don't have to.

Like Senator Goldwater, Republican Governor Paul Fannin deprecates the power of the Federal government. In a speech at Salome, Arizona, in July, 1961, he warned that

"Any government with the power to give you anything that you want is strong enough to take everything you have". Five days later he telegraphed Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman asking that two Arizona counties be declared eligible for the Federal livestock feed program. They were. Just a few weeks ago, Governor Fannin again applied to Secretary Freeman for Federal aid to three drought-stricken counties.

The governor and the senator face formidable obstacles in trying to convince Arizonans that the Federal government should withdraw from the economy. "It's hard for me to find a farmer who believes in this agricultural program," Senator Goldwater once declared. "Yet when the chips are down and they get a chance to do something about it by voting against allotments, they'll invariably vote for more allotments and say, 'Well, we're in it. We might as well stay with it'."

What Senator Goldwater regards as inertia may merely be basic economics. Farmers might have found it difficult to operate without the \$40 million spent in Arizona by the Department of Agriculture in 1961. Some go to control cotton and wheat pests, some to combat livestock disease, and some to provide livestock feed during droughts. Wool-growers receive Federal incentive payments and cotton farmers regularly collect Federal subsidies. Arizona farmers look to the government for help in marketing their produce, for electricity and telephones, and for low-interest loans of all kinds. As a matter of fact, "it is difficult to see how the Arizona farmer, who generally works a natural wasteland brought under cultivation and maintained by artificial means and harassed by some of the worst pests and drought conditions in the United States, could survive without Federal aid—whatever the money may be doing to his moral fiber."

In one area, national defense, Senator Goldwater does not quibble with the amount of Federal spending in his state. The \$355,675,000 spent there by the Department of Defense during 1961 has kept Arizona industry booming. Motorola, General Electric, AiResearch, and other large firms are thriving on defense contracts and providing a much-needed diversity to the state's economy, which has traditionally been dependent on agriculture and the tourist trade.

Small businesses, too, have been getting their share, despite Senator Goldwater's complaint that the Kennedy administration is "browbeating business in the face of dangerous economic conditions". Smaller firms profit for subcontracts with the larger corporations, and in 1961 they received more than \$2 million in loans from the Small Business Administration. Arizona contractors in particular have reason to be grateful for the \$37 million spent by

the Housing and Home Finance Agency on the \$40 million by the Bureau of Roads during 1961.

Among Arizona businessmen and farmers alike, reclamation is almost an article of faith, since without it much of the state would still be desert. Senator Goldwater approves of the construction of huge reclamation dams like Glen Canyon Dam (1961 expenditures: \$35 million; eventual cost: almost \$335 million) which are obviously beyond the means of private enterprise. To be sure, the senator vehemently denounces Federal construction of power lines from the dams on the ground that they would constitute Federal interference.

Senator Goldwater's difference with the Department of the Interior often seem more political than economic. Secretary Stewart Udall, a fellow Arizonan, may be Goldwater's Democratic senatorial opponent two years from now. Goldwater has accused him of using the power of his position "to threaten congressmen from western states." Udall's "calculated seizure of patronage," Goldwater charges, "does not bring any great credit to Arizona." Many Arizonans, however, are likely to take a somewhat more tolerant view of Udall's activities in view of the fact that the Department of the Interior brought \$97 million to Arizona in 1961, funds that were employed to provide a good deal of impetus to both agriculture and business.

In his syndicated column of August 23, 1961, Goldwater asked: "When will the people of America awaken and shout down those liberal apostles who seek to convert this land into the central collectivized state where everything is for free?" "Can man be fed by superficially benevolent government and not lose the desire and ability to forage for himself?" he asked on another occasion.

The senator's contempt for deadbeats on welfare rolls has probably been received with more enthusi-

## Letters

### On First Magazine, Fellow Travelers

#### Magazine Story Struck New Low

To the Editors:

I suppose that all of us will cheerfully grant Mr. Roy Rabon's right to think of himself as a gay young dog. It's just that we'd rather he didn't try to turn the campus into one big fireplug. Without elaborating further on this analogy, I'll just say that his story—titled so cleverly as "Bov and the Woman"—may have hit a new low in taste, humor, and literary merit.

Let's I be accused of shocked "prudery." I'll admit having read stories like this one before—enough of them, in fact to make a few generalizations. One generalization might be that when breasts are described as "round," "shapely," or even "protruding," the situation may still be saveable. But when an author starts calling them "warm," "heavy," and "proud," there's trouble afoot, and weak men sink and strong men fail. Perhaps Mr. Rabon has succeeded in showing us what children do in such a case.

Another generalization might be that most of the rum-dums who write stories like these are still in a state of adolescent prurience, and they're more to be pitted than censured. Of course, to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that one of them has tried to pass his work off as "humor." Some day real soon, I'd like to meet the editor of your magazine.

If Mr. Rabon's story had been

funny or significant, or even well-written, it might have been justified. Instead it is a travesty and a waste of time. By now you must have guessed my horrible secret: I have three or four inhibitions I'm actually proud of. Wait till Rabon hears about this!

—Kevin J. Kerrane

### Bombs Won't Fall On Chapel Hill

To the Editors:

With the Cuban situation everyone in Chapel Hill seems to have suddenly become concerned about civil defense. There are now shelters for 12,175 that we never knew we had before.

Actually we don't have to worry at all. If the Russians ever make a natch on the U. S., Chapel Hill is about the last place they would think worth wasting a bomb on.

In the first place this is a conflict based around industrial power, and we all know what an important industrial complex is situated on the Hill.

In the second place Chapel Hill has such an unusual ratio of regular Americans to fellow travellers that I doubt the Russians would want to exterminate so many friends.

So forget the CD routine; if it ever happened you couldn't be in a safer place.

—Thurman L. Smith

the criminal all share the benefits. Wherever an Arizonan turns, the monuments of Federal aid loom before him: airports, highways, parks, schools, hospitals, dams, even weather stations.

#### Double Your Money Back

In "The Conscience of a Conservative," Senator Goldwater wrote: "The people of my own State, and I am confident that I speak for the majority of them—have long since seen through the spurious suggestion that Federal aid comes 'free.' They know that the money comes out of their own pockets, and that it is returned to them minus a broker's fee taken by the Federal bureaucracy. They know, too, that the power to decide how that money shall be spent is withdrawn from them and exercised by some planning board deep in the caverns of one of the Federal agencies. They understand this represents a great and perhaps irreparable loss—not only in their wealth, but in their priceless liberty."

The loss of liberty may be debatable, but there is no loss of wealth. In fiscal 1961, Federal tax payments by Arizonans came to \$351 million. At the same time nearly a billion dollars in Federal funds flowed into the state. In other words, for every Federal tax dollar paid out by Arizonans, they received nearly three Federal dollars in return.

In the Sevareid interview, Senator Goldwater boasted that his capital city and home town of Phoenix had not raised taxes in thirteen years. "We've had surpluses in the state government of \$17 million and \$12 million in the last two years. This doesn't happen generally throughout the United States, but maybe it's one of the virtues of being able to be close to your government."

Grand as it is to be close to one's local government, it definitely does not hurt to be close to the Federal government, too.

## In Case Of War, Break Glass

By VANCE BARRON

It is comforting to see that the administration is planning for the future, or rather for the lack of one. In addition to fallout shelters we should hope that they have made provisions for an emergency chain of command (like that of the Pentagon) in order that the University will continue functioning after a nuclear disaster. For if not then, when is the maintenance of learning and clear, rational thinking more important? We must be prepared to rebuild.

In a practical vein, the best place to be in case of an attack will be the library. Civil Defense experts tell us that nothing is so efficient as a stack of books in absorbing deadly radiation. There is a useful purpose in having a library. Besides protection, the books would

serve a double purpose of providing diversion for the long days that would have to be spent in the shelter. Who knows, but that the intelligent may be the only ones to survive.

Speaking of diversions, we predict a mass exodus toward the Nurse's Dorm or Cobb at the first sign of a rumble. After all, it might be a long seige.

If precedent can be depended on, the large number of fallout shelter signs decorating the campus may soon decrease. The decor of dorm rooms is often improved by a sign or two, and the prestige of a fallout shelter sign would be even greater than the infamous Evacuation Route signs.

One wonders what unconscious motive the Freudians would assign

to the inclination to seek security in fallout shelters. Regard for the finer sensibilities of some readers prohibits us from conjecturing here. The image of 1209 people huddled in the basement of Cobb Dorm, incubating in the heat of the blast, is too frightening. We shudder at the thought.

Somehow the conception of fallout shelters has always seemed similar to the idea behind first aid kits. They are completely adequate for the small injuries that don't really matter, but when the big hurt comes, they don't really help.

As a parting note, perhaps we ought to consider the thoughts of Poor Richard. Was it not he who said, "an ounce of protection is worth a pound of cure?" Rest assured, brethren.

## The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOFFELTER  
CHUCK WRYE

Editors

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

Art Pearce — Dow Sheppard  
News Editors

Ed Dupree — Sports Editor  
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. Ed.

Matt Weisman — Feature Editor  
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 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.