

# 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 9, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXX, No. 63

## Conservative Buckley, A Welcome Relief

Monday night at 8 p.m. one of this country's more sincere citizens and most enlightened conservatives will expound on "Freedom and the Welfare State." We would suggest that every member of the student body attend the lecture.

William F. Buckley will have, we think, something to say. And though we may not agree entirely with what he says, we do anticipate being entertained by the way in which he will say it. Buckley has a speaking reputation of which every conservative must surely be proud.

Need more be said? Well, perhaps just a little more. Namely, that we would stress a difference which should be apparent between the "conservatism" of an extremely wealthy (aren't they all?) and educated editor of the "National Review" and the conservatism of "negation" which is too often in evidence on the campuses of southern universities.

Conservative Buckley may not like the "New Frontier," but he apparently has the presence of mind to refrain from bleating about it. Rather, he has ideas of his own, or at least, of his own set, and it is with these ideas that he will confront his critics.

This may seem, initially, inconsequential, or at least inconsequential in so far as we presuppose that all political figures have ideas of their own, and that it is with

these ideas that they approach opposition. But to those of us who have repeatedly encountered conservatism as a mere "loud-lament" about the sorry state-of-affairs in which the "New Frontier" has placed the country, the fact that Buckley will speak instead of "crying" is hardly inconsequential.

We welcome to this campus, with open arms, a man of conservative convictions who rises above petty name-calling and negative lamentation.

We are tired of hearing everything left-of-the-American Legion being labeled as Communist and thereby summarily dismissed as unworthy of intelligent consideration. We are tired of seeing those who call themselves "conservative" put on shows that are worthy of the Mickey Mouse Club.

In essence, we are tired of seeing the conservative element on this campus permit a small, but vocal, group of weeping malcontents represent the causes and stands of a sometimes-valid political position. Indeed, "conservatism" as it is too often presented on this campus fails to be a valid political "position" or "approach." It becomes, rather, a mere anti-liberal lament.

And in view of this sad situation, the presence of William F. Buckley should be a welcome relief—a source of encouragement—whether one claims agreement with his ideas or not. (CW)

## Cover To Cover

Probably one of the most important intellectual events in the public sector to occur in the three years we have attended this University has been the birth and life of "Reflections" magazine. Perhaps one of the most pleasing occurrences of recent months is that Editor Brown has managed to get another (his fourth) issue published.

This "Reflections" is 64 pages of articles, fiction, poetry, drawings and sculpture—and possibly the world's most appealing advertising. There is much in the magazine which is pleasing, encouraging and exciting; and there is a little material which forces the reader to cry, "So what?"

From cover to cover, very briefly:

The cover itself—superb, marvelous use of color.

Size of the magazine—expanded in width, more readable.

Editorials—Brown and Leon Rooke on Mississippi, leadership and politics. These edits, shorter than in previous "Reflections" issues, are good and gutsy, with no holds barred—but, in parts, a little superficial by the magazine's high standards. The brief "awards" are somewhat useless.

"Poverty and Possibility" by Herbert L. Matthews—Timely in the context of the Cuban crisis, but applicable to all the problems faced by the United States in Latin America. The article is an intelligent, important reminder of the unfinished business of democracy within the nations of Latin America.

"The Tragedy of Our German Policies" by retired Gen. Hugh Hester—A very interesting piece with vital information concerning misinformation on the Berlin problem and general American policy in Europe. Its primary limitation is the propagandistic language (such words as "war-mongering" and "honey-combed with Nazis" appear several times in condemning Western propaganda).

There are two short stories, both excellent, by Leon Rooke and Ralph Dennis. The stories are probably this issue's best feature. The Dennis story continues the saga of his sad, fat, word man. There are also eight pieces of poetry and a series of pictures of Edward Higgins' welded sculpture.

In all, this issue follows its predecessors in offering dual visual and mental benefits.

But, to harp on an old point, the best aspect of "Reflections" publication is its publication. It is encouraging and pleasing by its very presence. (JC)

## "It Was Right Here Just A Little While Ago"



## Letters To The Editors

### Abortion, Bull Pledges, New Left

#### SSL Bills

#### Inconsistent

To the Editors,

Is it not strange that the SSL decided that capital punishment should be abolished (ostensibly because man does not have the right to take the life of another human being—this being the usual argument) and in the same breath saw fit to affix circumstances whereby a single man could do this—legally? This seems to me to be an outstanding inconsistency in thought here.

The students achieved further absurdity by the conditions they established, only one of which (No. 4—when the pregnancy threatens the mother's life), in my mind, even approaches justification of abortion. The first condition by which a doctor could legally perform an abortion if "convinced" that the baby would be deformed, is not far removed from the similar practice of the ancient Spartans, who at least waited to be sure that the baby would be deformed before they put it to death.

Suddenly Huxley's Brave New World does not seem so far-fetched after all. Do the students who represented UNC really feel that an unborn baby should be deprived of his life because of a misfortune suffered by the mother? (A silly question—obviously they do.) And since when can a mother of unsound mind not bear a healthy child? Either there is an error in my thinking (in which case I wish someone would please enlighten me) or the SSL has been guilty of some rash acts. How about it, delegates?

—John Hamilton

#### Faculty Ruling Discriminatory

To the Editors,

It has been said that there are two sides to every issue. With that maxim in mind let's study the recent Student-Faculty Committee ruling on bull-pledges and inactives. They have decided that being disaffiliated should mean specifically that bull-pledges and inactives cannot so much as enter their fraternity house nor attend any social functions, open or closed.

There are those who feel that this is a positive step in the right direction and that it should be commended. Perhaps such a harsh move is necessary to point out to these students just what their purpose at Carolina is and perhaps nothing else could have as moving an effect. Besides being a type of guidance for the bull-pledges and inactives, the ruling also serves as a protectorate for the fraternities themselves. Many are the inactives who enjoy knowing that they do not have to attend chapter meetings or have other obligations to the house yet can still receive all the benefits thereof. These students are in es-

sence mooching off their friends who in turn must take upon themselves all the obligations and expenses for both themselves and their disaffiliates. Under this light it appears that the committee came up with a basically sound and competent decision.

However let's look at the other side of the picture. There are cries of "Persecution" on many sides of the campus. Elsewhere the Negroes and the Jews are persecuted, yet here at Carolina it is the fraternity man who must keep a constant vigil, not towards the Ku Klux Klan or towards the S-S Trooper, but towards South Building.

When the Beat Duke parade was reviewed, who got kicked? The fraternity system. It is true that fraternities produced more unacceptable floats than did the dormitories; however when one considers the higher participation rate of fraternities this is a seemingly natural result. Dorms were censured also, but it was the fraternity system that was lambasted. Is the faculty unaware of certain happenings in the dormitories? Don't they know that on occasion girls have been known to spend the evenings behind the locked doors of dorm rooms? Perhaps this is perfectly alright since there is no curfew rule imposed in the dorms just as there is no rule that says a student must leave a certain dorm if he does not maintain a "C" average or cannot attend his dorm's social functions for the same reason.

How does the faculty propose to enforce such an autocratic ruling? Must the IFC post armed guards at all entrances to fraternity houses and parties with mug-shots of each disaffiliator to prevent their entrance? Has the faculty considered the possibility that ATO disaffiliates could easily attend a Zete party and vice-versa? More important, has the faculty forgotten that each student has certain unalienable rights...?

It would appear that South Building has acquired one trait usually assigned to the fraternity system—discrimination.

Does the faculty realize that total strangers, regardless of their Q.P. average, may come to the fraternity parties while inactives can hardly peek through the windows?

It appears strange that only those students who were so unfortunate as to have pledged a fraternity are the ones to be discriminated for not maintaining a "C" average. When will the faculty decree that no fraternity man possessing less than a "C" average may dine in Lenoir Hall?

Who makes certain that no dorm intramural team has members with less than "C" average?

In the past each fraternity had the final voice in selecting their members, but now this right must be shared with the institution referred to as South Building. Are we not now even more selective? Does the faculty not realize that right now no disaffiliator can eat meals at the house? That he can visit only

occasionally? That he cannot attend sorority mixers? That he cannot participate in intramurals? That he cannot engage in his chapter's business matters and decisions? Does the faculty intend to take away every right he possesses? It is not so preposterous to ask "may we speak to our disaffiliates in Y-court or sit next to them in class? Can we attend church with them? If they are seemingly so unfit that they shouldn't be allowed to visit the fraternity house, would it be proper to take them home to meet the folks?"

In conclusion it is evident that a certain minority of students have been denied their right to visit their friends when and where they so choose.

Does the faculty actually think that this ruling is an effective solution or do they somehow "subconsciously" realize that this is simply one more step towards the total banishment of fraternities from Carolina and the liberal community of Chapel Hill???

—Watts Carr  
Sam Simpson

#### Far Left And Right Condemned

To the Editors,

As this seems to be the time of year during which various societies of evidently extreme deviant character show signs of great activity on this campus, I somewhat question their purposes, and even more their means of achievement of these purposes. I am especially referring to the New Left Club, its elite, the Progressive Labor Club, and its antithesis, the Young Americans for Freedom. The New Left, according to the opinions of several of its ardent members, is theoretically seeking the establishment of Social Democracy in the U.S., a principle which is dear to many Americans, and is the obvious trend in American politics today; yet the New Left, by its association with various other organs and personalities, definitely, and beyond any doubt, shows pro-Soviet leanings, a characteristic which has slowed down the movement for Social Democracy more so in this country than in any other nation in the Western community of nations. Others within this area, such as the United Kingdom and Italy, have a Social Democratic parties, which, not desiring Communist co-operation, have made great strides in the establishment of true democracy. But when the New Left comes out with pro-Castro propaganda leaflets in time of government crises, then certainly people who have any respect for any aspect of American life, are almost forced into the conservative fold by no real choice of their own. Thus, by such activities as the New Left has been occupied with of late, the club has actually been working against its proposed principles, and having done so, has actually done

## GOP Gains In South -- Golden

Mr. John Tower, Republican Senator from Texas, made a post-election statement on television. The Republican gains in the South, he said, not only showed the emergence of a two-party system, but revealed a definite swing to the conservatives.

I subscribe to the first view but hardly to the second.

The two-party South is already here: the result of two basic factors: the intense industrialization of the South, and the assurance by the Republican candidates that they can be relied upon to maintain the system of racial solidarity. There is no question about this. No one can say Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas are solid Democratic states, any more than they can say Virginia, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Tennessee are.

But whether the folks voted for "the conservatives" is open to question. As a matter of fact Senator Tower himself serves in the United States Senate because he has received the support of most of the Texas liberals. Where Mr. Tower is openly, and with considerable pride, to the right of Barry Goldwater, his Democratic opponent, William Blakely, was openly, and with equal pride, to the right of Strom Thurmond. Indeed Mr. Tower's supporters secretly intimidated to the Texas trade-unionists that if they voted for the arch-conservative Blakely, they'd be stuck with him for life, whereas a vote for the less-secure Republican would give them a better chance of getting a liberal Senator some day.

In two Congressional races in North Carolina, the Republicans

probably won because they were less conservative than their Democratic opponents. This does not mean they were endorsed by Democrats but these two Republicans won House seats because they picked up most of the organized labor and some of the Negro votes in their respective districts. Charles Raper Jonas returned to the House for a sixth term as Republican representative from North Carolina's 8th district. It is no injustice to him to say that Mr. Jonas is considerably to the right of Dwight D. Eisenhower. His defeated Democratic opponent, Paul Kitchin, however, was to the right of John C. Calhoun. Both men were incumbents, running against each other, because North Carolina lost a House seat in the 1960 census redistricting.

In the 9th district, Republican James Broyhill defeated Democrat Hugh Alexander who was in close competition to see if he could be even more conservative than Mr. Kitchin. Republicans and Democrats knew they would split the conservative vote. The election depended upon who could swing the vote of the textile unions, the Negroes, and the supporters of social legislation.

The Republican candidates won most of these votes for the same reason Senator Tower did: because, as Republicans, their position is yet a little shakier in the South than their Democratic opponents who once elected, serve forever.

One has to remember, too, that the chief Republican winners, Rockefeller in New York, Romney in Michigan, and Scranton in Pennsylvania all talked about jobs, security, and "immediate help for the unemployed." I listened to a speech by Republican Romney of Michigan. I shut my eyes and for a moment he sounded for all the world like Henry A. Wallace, in his third party race for President in 1948.

Senator John Tower of Texas may think there's a Barry Goldwater Renaissance going on, the voters apparently don't.

—Harry Golden  
Carolina Israelite

nor for, if youth is an attribute of the spirit, Otelia Connor could not possibly be more than thirty-five. There are very few individuals around, but it was my pleasure to have lunch with one today.

—Donald W. Carson

#### Major Threat To UNC Seep

To the Editors:

Last Spring two seniors who obviously loved this place wrote articles for the Tar Heel on the meaning of the University. It may well be to add a midyear footnote to those articles, however ironically the footnote may contrast with the spirit of the original articles.

There has arisen a threat to this campus in recent years and it is fast approaching a climax. Any honest analysis of it must penetrate beyond consideration of "weejuns," "sharpness," and the Duke parade. The threat involves the whole University. It is best seen in the perspective of the University idea. This idea involves a community of scholars searching earnestly for the truth, ever maintaining intellectual concern and personal integrity in that search. Yet, at UNC the posture of the student is the antithesis of this concern. Casualness is the goal. This is exemplified in the spectator stance of casual clothes, casual feelings toward courses, casual relations with other students, and a casual refusal to become actively involved. There results an intellectual lethargy in meeting academic requirements of the University. In interpersonal relations there is not only a lack of any real warmth or affection, but there is in its place an affected friendliness that approaches manipulation. Most dangerous of all is the general flouting of anything that purports to be honorable and meaningful.

This casual posture has the potential of becoming a malicious force that may bring the ruin of UNC as a university. True, this general quality is ubiquitous in the outside world, caused as it may be by the World Wars, the potential of nuclear war, and the inordinate misuse of freedom that result from affluence. This is no reason, however, that it cannot be met here at UNC. How then? The answer is not clear. Certainly the threat should be met directly and acknowledged realistically. Beyond that, there must be reliance on certain qualities inherent and potentially forceful in the individual student, such as integrity, courage, verity, and a serious concern for searching out and fighting out a real kind of truth.

—Tom Iseley

## 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. Sp. Ed.  
Matt Weisman — Feature Editor  
Harry DeLang — 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 Wyson — 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, \$5 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.