

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.

December 6, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXX, No. 60

NCAA Vs. AAU

Who Is Anti-American?

Although we would stand readily corrected on several matters pertaining to the Amateur Athletic Union, we would just as readily question some of the excited statements which have recently been made by the president of that organization.

We wonder just what prompts the AAU, through the statements of their president, to label the actions of the NCAA as "un-American."

Certainly the AAU must be willing to admit that more than just a "few" individuals are apparently dissatisfied with AAU control over track and field in this country. Regardless of what the AAU would have the country believe, they are not the grand savior of amateur athletics throughout the United States.

Certainly, we would never want to deny the AAU has done a great deal to promote and sustain amateur competition in practically all areas of athletic endeavor. But we do not feel that the AAU has been the only pious organization to ever sponsor a sporting event. And we do not feel that the AAU is justified in apparently demanding to have the final say on all open competition.

But alas, we, as the greater majority of individuals interested in sports in this country, feel totally in the dark as to the actual charges and counter-charges being tossed about by the NCAA and AAU. The

whole sordid mess seems to be confined to the smoke-filled rooms of crowded convention hotels. The general public is informed of the actions and decisions of the "powers that be" only through press statements which carry little but rantings from excited participants in the great war.

We read of coalitions, agreements, sham coalitions, and phony agreements, but only those lords who preside over the apparently inconsequential athletes seem to know what it's all about. The public at large will have to be satisfied with some shallow knowledge of the fact that Johnny can't participate in the next Olympics.

The "why" of Johnny's ineligibility will lie somewhere in the great debate between the NCAA and the AAU, somewhere back in one of those smoke-filled rooms, somewhere behind the excited voices that made statements like the following:

"I believe it is the duty of the U. S. Congress to investigate the NCAA and its puppet federations from top to bottom."

The next charge may be that the NCAA is actually a Communist-front organization, which has been established to make our American athletes ineligible for Olympic competition, and thereby insure a victory for the Soviet Union.

After all, anyone liberal enough to fight the AAU must surely be more than merely "un-American," they must be anti-American. (CW)

The Woollen Gym Problem

We are glad to see that the State Affairs Committee has undertaken a program to present student needs to the 1963 N. C. General Assembly. More specifically, we are glad to see that the Committee has chosen the proposed addition to Woollen Gym as one of the items for which to plead.

The fact that the first two basketball games of the 62-63 season have been sold out prior to the day of the event in each instance is surely indicative of the inadequacy of the present facilities for the demands of an expanding student body, to say nothing of the fans who would like to attend from throughout the state.

But the tragedy of insufficient seating for home games is but one aspect of the Woollen Gym problem, and in a very real sense it might be considered the least important aspect.

The real headache stemming from

accommodating home games in Woollen centers around the necessity of moving temporary bleachers in and out as the schedule demands. The placement of the bleachers throws a huge wrench into the functionings of the required program in Physical Education.

Classes of 45 students are forced to learn volleyball on one court. Basketball classes, equally large, must also confine their activities to the one main court and the Tin Can.

The situation also cramps the Intramural Departments activities. Games must be postponed and rescheduled; and space on the floor of Woollen must be fought for as if 3,000 erstwhile athletes desired to play soccer in Y-Court.

So we would suggest that although the lack of sufficient seating for home basketball games is more often publicized, we would rather see the plea to the General Assembly based on the need for more space for the required and intramural programs. These aspects of the problem effect practically everyone. (CW)

Confusion

On the campuses of most colleges and universities throughout the world, the student newspaper has the uncontested position as most disorganized and confused organization in existence.

The DTH has undertaken to carry on the tradition here at UNC. That is why we view with alarm the functioning of the Elections Board.

Any student organization is able to create and sustain great amounts of confusion, but we all have our limits. And in light of the superb nonsense perpetrated by the Elections Board, the DTH must step down, and let the title of "Most Confused" rest elegantly upon the shoulders of an organization so overwhelmingly deserving. (CW)

"Well, Invite Somebody! Send For That Albanian"



Letters To The Editors

'Dook' & Student Gvmt. — Pro And Con

Primitive Arts Require Grossity

To the Editors,

I have read about the "Beat Dook" parade in your paper, and have enjoyed the interesting pictures you printed of the floats. Being new here, and unfamiliar with local customs, I failed to catch the event, but will make every effort to attend next year.

From what has been printed in your paper, it appears that there is some disagreement as to the manner in which this celebration should be conducted. My feelings on pagan rites (for this seems to be the issue here) are that the ceremonial rules were developed long ago, and that it may be extremely difficult to improve them overnight, so to speak, by censorship. I do not imply that censorship of future parades would be a breach of religious freedom. (I believe that the courts no longer recognize this particular religion as such.)

I cite the success of the parade last November 20 to illustrate how the universal curiosity and interest people have for their reproductive and eliminatory processes can make a powerful basis for common worship, and I submit that this is not necessarily a bad thing. Sex and well functioning bodies certainly are one of God's gifts (or one of the Gifts of the gods, depending on how you look at it) and I feel these are worthy subjects for Thanksgiving, public celebration, praise, worship, artistic expressions, etc.

Granting that deep down there is an animalistic "joy of living" basis for such efforts, there is still the problem created by the exhibition of the private social norm in public. I can only say as 40 million Frenchmen and others have said—the truth, I blush for it; but I cannot apologize—or words to that effect.

Seriously, now—the success of a public art can be judged in the light of the truth it reflects. If the "Beat Dook" parade was a success, (as I gathered from your editorials) we might well profit, each to his own, by the truth so revealed. This could be adapted by some, say a dean, to interpret the state of student morals. With some harsher types of censorship invoked, more devious and less informative means might have to be employed.

To sum up; my feeling is that if you are going to have a pagan-type exercise, it has got to be crude to be true to form. Any heavy-handed or unskilled censorship will show to great disadvantage, as everybody (or nearly everybody these days) knows the "goods" parade's norm. Girls and floral decorations on floats have their place, but a rampaging, stamping, unbridled primitive blast beats it when you want to

say you're glad you're living. P.S. Keep those parade and float pictures coming!

—Tom Atwood

Make 'Dook' Innocuous?—No

To the Editors,

May one small voice be raised in defense of the students and their shameful Beat Dook floats?

Granted the humor this year was heavy-handed and unsubtle. Agreed the boys (and girls) deserved a slap on the wrist. But by me it 'weren't all THAT bad.

The way everyone is carrying on they'll end up by making the Beat Dook parade as innocuous as the Santa Claus affair. The which Heaven forbid!

—Mrs. Paul Smith

Student Gov't Has Failed

To the Editors,

Finally, the time has come in which student government must squarely face the issue of 'campus grossness', and state distinctly just how far is too far! No longer can this growing trend of recent years be tolerated or ignored, for if student government does so, then it forfeits any claim to ever seriously exercising judicious restraint and self-discipline upon itself and upon the student body. For those who have seen recent Carolina parades, the past Beat Dook one was no surprise, but it was the most tragic abdication of the exercise of responsible student leadership even seen on this campus!

Herein lies the tragedy of this event, not the fact that a bad reflection was cast upon the University, but the fact that student government had numerous chances to exercise judicious control to prevent this display of 'grossness', and refused to do so, even in the knowledge of what last year's was like! For it is not enough to passively send out letter requesting 'no grossness'; someone must have the guts to enforce this! Surely among the Pika officers, the IFC sponsors, and the Panhellenic Council there must have been some 'leader' present or in charge. It's impossible to believe that none there recognized the need to draw the line and say this has gone too far!

YET THIS case is not an isolated incident; rather, it is symptomatic of a greater problem involving the whole campus and student government at large. For the above failure to exercise responsible self-discipline and leadership may be seen in numerous other instances quite clearly this year:

... failure manifest in the lackadaisical attitude of student legislature in which one rarely gets more than a quorum for meetings,

... failure shown in the consistently-held SP and UP caucuses to beg someone to occupy a vacant legislative seat which, if occupied, will probably be vacant again before the next election,

... failure shown in the fact that after the Beat Dook debacle, students felt that they needed a faculty member to help them handle their problem,

... a complete failure to understand how poorly and falsely this parade would reflect upon the University and many fellow students,

... a failure shown in the fact that the IDC began to correct overtly gross dorm newspapers only after these publications had been condemned by the administration,

... a failure unfortunately shown in some Honor Council decisions in which overt violations such as lying, cheating, and stealing, either alone or in combination have been inadequately dealt with in light sentences.

In cases such as these, student government has failed to meet its responsibilities. This is not to condemn student government in total; but it is to point out some glaring failures which can not be tolerated. Thus has the present crisis arisen—a crisis in which the essential issues are whether or not the student body will regulate itself without administration promptings; whether or not the student body will realize that student autonomy means self-discipline, not license; a crisis in which student government must say what it means and mean what it says and do it—whether this be condemning grossness within the context of the Campus Code or the restoration of respect among the elected that they must respond better to those tasks to which they have been assigned.

The administration in this recent episode has acted in the only way possible in face of this mass abandonment of student responsibility remains as presently envisioned, student government can never fully rectify for past failings in this area of its responsibility. Students must be willing to name the limits beyond which they should not go.

At present, the administration's policy is to review plans for floats, displays, etc., in advance. This process of prior censorship is re-

pugnant to the very idea of student autonomy and must be destroyed and replaced by responsible student leadership. But this will not be the case until student leaders overcome their present lethargy and indifference.

PROGRESS can and has been made in some areas of campus life where the problem of overt grossness and wavering leadership have existed. Dorm newspapers have come under attack and rightfully so, for though these publications are not intended to be culture sheets, there is still no excuse for them to consist almost entirely of vividly off-color remarks and 'Confucius' sayings that would make Playboy seem like a child's comic book. In this case, dorm presidents and editors have been notified that they are personally responsible under the Campus Code for their publications and that they will be judged accordingly. Much work remains to be done here, but at least dormitory government has begun to move in the right direction, though it had to be prompted by an administration uproar first! Perhaps other branches of student government will learn a lesson from this.

Surely student government must begin acting to deal with this greater issue of officials failing to take responsibility seriously. For until this is done and until student leaders begin to tackle unreservedly other glaring issues and quit being a mutual admiration society, then it will never be respected and never should be!

Perhaps in the final analysis, the student body does not wish to assume the responsibility necessary for sound self-government. Perhaps the campus feels the only way to have fun is to be publicly gross, vulgar, potted, and/or throw an occasional 'gotcha' in for good measure. Perhaps it wants the University to be a mother and baby-sitter and nothing more. If so, then let's at least admit these things and quit being so hypocritical and self-righteous about our "tradition of self-government and hallowed prerogatives of self-autonomy". Student government means one thing: self-discipline. Let's decide once and for all whether we want it or not; and if not, then bring on the proctors and baby-sitters—if so, then let's do things right!

—John Mitchener

Gil Expresses Corps Thanks

To the Editors,

Now that the Chapel Hill phase of the Peace Corps Venezuela Project in University Education has come to a close, we would like to

Reflections: Gloomy, Witty; Change Needed

By T. Y. GREET

A careful scrutiny of the cover of Chapel Hill's only true "little magazine" reveals the new scope of its ambitions: no longer simply "Reflections from Chapel Hill" but "Reflections from Chapel Hill North Carolina." In terms of this aspiration and of their efforts toward its fulfillment Robert Brown and his associate editor, Katherine Strong, are to be highly commended. Few magazines, after nearly twelve months of dormancy, could have come back at all, much less confidently as this one has, confident by virtue of its achievement of national distribution, at "select outlets," its offering of subscriptions for twelve future issues, its enlarged format and masthead.

But for all these symptoms of growth, the survival of the magazine must depend on its contents. Regrettably, a sounding of the current issue does not lead to a wholly favorable prognosis. The will, the energy are there; but a change of air and diet may be essential. The contents of this issue, unlike the past, are rather varied—General Hugh Hester on Berlin, Ralph Dennis again with his Sad Fat Man, poetry ranging from the lyric clarity of Michael O'Higgins to the caustic obscurity of John West. The excellent photographs of the sculpture of Edward Higgins and Miss Strong's decorations (even her advertising layouts) are, however, the only elements which provide a real change of pace and tone.

For one thing, it's rather gloomy.

Herbert Matthews of the "New York Times" provides a studiously restrained analysis of our plight in Latin America but only increases our frustration when he admits that "there is no simple or quick solution." General Hester with considerable hindsight accounts for our dilemma in Berlin and heightens its implications by his comments on Nazi influences in Adenauer's government. But when he concludes that we can in Europe fight neither a limited nor a total war, we are left wondering what, then, we can do. Oddly enough, even Professor Howard's flip coolness is depressing: "No, I can't explain the sculpture of Ed Higgins. But I know that all experience is a miracle and to experience the work this young genius is to hear it speaking with a loud silence . . . see what I mean?"

Frankly, I don't. I would appreciate Professor Howard's help in getting at Higgins's esthetic. Just as I would appreciate from Matthew and Hester some speculations about policy. Already a multitude of voices from the Left remind us that we are in a bind in Latin America, that to defend Berlin's honor at the cost of Berlin's life is absurd. If "Reflections" is to be more than a surer sense of direction, opening echo, its comments must provide a up a dialog with the reader.

I press the point because when "Reflection" treats current affairs it has tended to do with a certain stridency of tone which precludes such dialog. "To reflect" is to cast back light and heat, but here the latter element is dominant. The editorials of Mr. Brown and Leon Rooke are right-thinking but somewhat wrong-headed. No reader of the magazine is apt to disagree with it's Editor's attack on those who would defend Governor Barnett as a man, at least, "of conviction." Why not, then, a more controlled, penetrating comment? And the question is for Rooke as well. I am still uncertain whether he is condemning "Profs" (his word) Matt-hew and Prothro for being behind-hand in their racial concerns or praising them for being thorough. "To reflect" is also to meditate, and if the magazine is to grow in stature and substance, its editors must speak with more firm assurance.

Perhaps in this issue confidence is best justified by the short stories of Rooke and Ralph Dennis. In his "Return" Dennis' "Sad Fat Organization Man" is even sadder, Dostoevsky's "underground man" gone to pot. Putting aside his unfinished manuscript, "A Child's History of Autoricism," he emerges from his cellar for a perhaps fatal inter-his view with an ad agency. But he at least leaves us his journal, a wittily ironic and yet pathetic parody of all literary introspections—Proust, Faulkner, Sartre, Joyce.

In his "The Beggar in the Bulrush" Leon Rooke takes Joyce more seriously, almost as a model . . . As a result he reveals more concern with technique than with his grotesque cast of characters. Three school teachers out for a night on the town are caught in a nightmare. Pursued from terror to terror by a blind epileptic beggar, one of them makes a discovery about herself, an insight which seems to be the whole point, even where imitative, is excellent, but the cruelty of the story is gratuitous; the protagonist is a caricature, and it is unfair to put her and the reader through so much for so unsatisfying an outcome.

Thus even the stories are gloomy, though in a commendable way. Not is this review an altogether cheerful or cheering one. Perhaps I have seemed to attack the magazine not for what it is but for what it is not, but my primary concern is that "Reflections" justify in its accomplishment the excellence of its speak with more freshness and orientations. As the magazine learns to ginality, with real daring, the prognosis will become a very favorable one.

take this opportunity to thank you and the University of North Carolina student body for the warm reception which the trainees received while on our campus. They were indeed enthusiastic in their praise for both their stay. It is our opinion that the academic and social aspects of good impression carried forth by these Volunteers will be of great benefit to the University's national and international prestige.

—Federico G. Gil, Director, Institute of Latin American Studies