

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.

March 1, 1963 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXX, No. 104

View Of Campus Politics: Dynamically Unimaginative

To most students campus politics is an enigma wrapped in a mystery enveloped in a labyrinth of non-sense.

Campus politics and the resultant brand of student government is respected by some students who know it well and understand it — for that reason; and is respected by others who do not know it well — for that reason. But for the great mass who have only a fleeting acquaintance with the political world of bus bills and honor systems, let us say it does make a difference to the student body who is elected, and on what platform they win. It matters because the student's money will be spent, because the student's activities for the next year will be planned, and because his academic, social and cultural life will come within the influence, such as it is, of student government. And it matters which people are elected, because there is a difference between the candidates.

Party are two groups, even more distinct than those in the UP. These groups could be called the Traditionalists and the Know-Nothings.

The Traditionalists believe in a liberal tradition, with its roots in the 1940s and 1950s and orders on tap from Raleigh and points North and West.

The Know-Nothings have one belief which they constantly reiterate: student government is too ignorant and incompetent to act in any manner at any time — and thus, it is safer to do absolutely nothing.

THIS, we admit, is a bleak choice for the students. But it is not absolutely hopeless.

The New Greeks within the UP and Traditionalists within the SP both have able candidates and respectably-sane programs — if they can squeeze the candidates past the orgy of party nominations and their programs past a dynamically-unimaginative student government.

CAMPUS politics, for good or bad, is based on the two-party system. Within these parties are several shades of opinion and several brands of potential candidates, as well as the difference between the parties themselves.

Within the University Party are two more or less distinct groups — the Old Greeks and the New Greeks. The Old Greeks, with little attempt at subtlety, favor continued absolute fraternity domination of student government, with its resulting Greek control of executive committees, legislature, Orientation, honor councils and other SG functions.

The New Greeks favor winning elections. And that means a basic admission that dorm men are human.

The remnants of the "third party" ISP has the potential of being a permanent Don't Care Fringe Group — a healthy addition to the campus political scene.

THE UNIVERSITY Party is given a choice between Larry McDevitt and Bob Spearman for the presidential nomination.

McDevitt is heir apparent for the Old Greeks. He is a Beta and a nice guy (really.)

Spearman is the New Greeks' man. Despite the political handicap of intelligence, Spearman is given a good chance to get the nomination.

For J. Rowan, the New Greeks' candidate for the UP vice-presidential nomination, is laboring under the illusion that student government can be made into a rational instrument for the student's welfare.

The Student Party is dependent more than anyone dares to admit on the decision of the handsome, intelligent, smooth-talking vice-president, Mike Lawler. He is the Traditionalists man-on-the-spot and the Chosen One by all alumni and faithful of the Student Party Way Of Life, and would be a very strong presidential candidate.

Per usual, the know-Nothings have no candidates and are reluctant to support anyone else's candidates and so will vote against everyone.

If Lawler doesn't run the SP has a mass of oblivion from which to choose. It would be difficult to single out the most mentally-oblivious in such a vast selection.

AND THUS the choice: between Tradition tempered with Nothingness, on the one hand, and Greek-ness tempered with Less-Greek-ness, on the other. In other words, the parties hold little hope.

But then what is a campus political party but a collection of outstanding or non-outstanding individuals? What makes up a great political tradition on campus, but a series of intelligent programs implemented by outstanding student leaders? There are several outstanding candidates this spring, if they can get by the organized mediocrity inherent in campus politics. (JC)

"What A Workout! I Hate People Who Hold Up Dinner Like That"



Right Wing: 'Boring'

From The Village VOICE

(A news story)

Noel E. Parmentel, Jr. is easily bored. And when he is, he does something about it. He talks to himself. He doesn't talk to other people, because he finds most other people boring.

When he does talk to himself, however, he does not, like a good reactionary individualist (he has no patience with respectable euphemisms like conservative), go off into a corner and do it. He talks to himself in magazines and before audiences—a practice which seems to indicate a concern for the social welfare of other people that could lead to the most dangerous kind of right-wing revisionism.

Parmentel recently talked to himself before the Greenwich Village Young Americans for Freedom in a room in the Hotel Earle conveniently adjacent to the bar. The occasion was billed as "An Evening with Noel E. Parmentel, Jr." There was some delay in opening the proceedings while someone went out for a tape recorder. Parmentel's lawyer, who was in the audience, would not let his client speak without one. Finally a dramatically bewigged Rosemary McGrath, Village YAF chairman, introduced Parmentel as "a political commentator and social critic" who has written for Esquire, the Saturday Evening Post, National Review, the Nation, and Common Wealth.

Parmentel rose to his considerable height and moved on shambling feet (which he later identified as clay) to a table at the head of the room.

'No Black Robe'

"Unlike my friend Bill Buckley," he drawled, "(Parmentel is a native from Algiers, Louisiana), 'I will not read you an article of mine from Esquire Magazine. Unlike Bill Rusher, I have no black robes to put on, and unlike Norman Mailer, I have no scatological poetry to read.'"

(A southern college has complained that William Buckley, editor of National Review, agreed to speak there for a substantial fee and then got up and read an article he had written for some publication. William Rusher, publisher of National Review donned black robes at Hunter College recently, where he played a Supreme Court Justice in a mock trial of the school prayer case.)

Parmentel then went on to inform anyone who cared to listen that "the right wing has become generally a bore to the American voting public." (Parmentel is a self-confessed and staunch right-winger.) "God knows what's going to happen to us now — we've managed to bore the American public and each other. We've done this by being boring, stupid . . . and . . . dishonest and by encouraging fools,

knaves, and hicks. . . ."

MISSED ITS CHANCE

The right wing, Parmentel observed, missed its chance in 1960, when, "Americans had right-wing aspirations . . . They had tried Eisenhower and got eight more years of socialism." The American people were embarrassed by the Russians, a bunch of "Asiatic barbarians," getting ahead of them in space, he asserted, and they "were fed up with socialism." In 1960, Parmentel said with some nostalgia, "we had a good candidate (Barry Goldwater) and some support." Goldwater, he contends, should have fought it out in the primaries then. "I don't think anybody could beat Kennedy in '64. . . . Now the nomination is worth nothing. In '68 he'll (Goldwater) be a tattered old property."

As for GOP Senator John Tower, a Texas conservative, Parmentel "once thought he could make it, but I don't anymore. He muffed the Billie Sol Estes bit." Tower, according to Parmentel, dropped his pursuit of Estes when a right-winger told him to lay off because Estes is a John Birchite (which, says Parmentel, he is). Evidently Parmentel viewed this hot-potato treatment of Estes as bad strategy because now he doesn't think Tower "has anywhere to go at all."

'DREARY BORE'

The right wing does have a magazine, Parmentel conceded — National Review. "Its frantic search for respectability has become a bore, it's become a dreary bore." Bored with National Review, he went on to YAF. "Now the YAFs. Aren't they a fine bunch of young people? Draft-dodgers, slackers. Two of their leaders were recently dragged into the U. S. Army kicking and screaming. I think it will do them a world of good."

"I wish the right wing well," Parmentel said graciously, "but I deplore its antics." He was asked about one of its latest antics — going into food stores and adorning items such as Polish hams with cards informing prospective purchasers that they were produced in a Communist country.

"If I were a grocer and any of those creeps came into my store . . . I'd give 'em warning and then give 'em grape shot. Those silly people from Yonkers. . . ."

He regards such activities as invasions of privacy. He also regards sit-ins as invasions of privacy. He is also opposed to public libraries. He thinks they are "an extension of socialism and an attack on individualism." He is for General Walker. Indeed, he admires him. The general, says Parmentel, is "an honest man" "who has been treated badly by fools and knaves

down in Washington." But if the right wing had an army, Parmentel would prefer to have it led by General MacArthur.

"Our home is in the Republican Party," he said of the right wing. That's the "only place we can make our influence felt" in the country. "The Conservative Party is a divisive force. We have to grow up and realize this is a two-party country and its always going to be a two-party country." And "we can mark off the Democratic Party, including the Southern Democrats — they're socialists in my opinion."

How does the right wing cease to be boring? Someone asked, getting back to the main topic of the evening.

"Bores are born, not made." "What do you think of the left wing?" "Liberals per se are bound to be bores . . . although some of my best friends are liberal . . . I had some hopes for the right wing, but it's beginning to act like the left wing."

'How can we stop being boring?'

"Clean house." "What do you mean by bore?" "Listen, sweetie, if you don't know what a bore is, I can't help you."

'What's wrong with being a bore?'

"I like bores," Parmentel rejoined.

Discussion then switched to the liberals' control of the communications industry.

"Liberals are always going to control the communications industry because they've got all the talent," Parmentel said simply.

Some in the audience protested that it only seems that the liberals have more talent because they set the standards in the communications field.

Parmentel didn't buy it. "There just isn't that much talent on the right, and I'm afraid there isn't going to be any . . . The left is always going to come up with more talent than the right . . . Talented people seem to go that way; I don't know why, but they do."

As for defense, he's all for it. He's opposed to NATO but not to unilateral precautions. "I'm for arming to the teeth. . . . the dirty bomb, I'm for the dirty bomb."

He does not, however approve of using armed might against sovereign states like Mississippi. He is for Meredith's right to go to Ole Miss and he is for the state's right to stop him. But he is against the federal government enforcing Meredith's individual right against the state's right.

Someone asked if there wasn't a basic contradiction in his logic. He wouldn't admit there was, and since he doesn't believe in public education anyway, he didn't see that it mattered much.

"What do you think of Thomas Jefferson?" was the next ques-

Federal Aid's Friends & Foes

Collegiate Press Service

WASHINGTON — The friends of President Kennedy's new aid-to-education program are once again killing its chances of becoming law.

It may seem ironical — but it's nothing new. Intersecting strife between groups backing increased federal aid to education have killed similar programs before.

Kennedy's sweeping new omnibus education proposal would assist American education from the first grade to the post-graduate level, through construction loans, matching funds and student loan plans.

Opponents of federal aid to education are this year relaxing while the measure's proponents kill its chances. Once again, the apparent cause of death will be the church-state dispute: the administration program would give \$1.5 billion to assist public elementary and secondary schools, with no aid to go to private schools at the same level.

The main antagonists in the dispute are the National Education Association (NEA), which considers the administration plan near-perfect, and the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which asserts the program is unfair to parents who pay public school taxes as well as extra tuition to send their children to parochial and private schools.

Backers of the administration plan assert that federal aid to private and church-supported schools violates the Constitution and the traditional doctrine of separation of church and state — while the opponents hold that the administration's way of going things would discriminate against Catholic and other taxpayers who also pay to support private schools. These op-

posing views are held by a sufficient number of Congressmen to block passage of the legislation entirely, as indeed happened in the last Congress.

There are some indications that the two factions may compromise to get some of the legislation through Congress, but the groups have yet to settle on a suitable agreement. Kennedy's program would give indirect benefits to private schools — but these are called inadequate by Catholic spokesmen. One feature of the plan would make construction loans for specialized classrooms and laboratories available to private schools, and another portion of the program would extend the "forgiveness" of National Defense Education Act loans to teachers in private schools.

Since the two opposing factions have yet to settle on a compromise, Washington educational circles and lobbyists are giving increasing support to a "salvage job" on the program, to get through what can be gotten through this session. In other words, colleges and universities are hopeful that legislation benefitting both sides will be divorced from the omnibus bills and passed.

Kennedy On Youth Problems

Greensboro Daily News

Greensboro has learned from its mayor's committee something of the local problems of youth — their mixed precocity and restlessness. There is, then, all the more reason to study attentively President Kennedy's message to Congress on Youth. For if there are "teenage" problems here, they would appear to be currents in a national tide of change that has put youth — not for the first time — out of kilter with our society.

Like previous papers on mental health and education, the President's is a popourri of hard statistics, arguable conclusions and debatable programs. But whether or not Congress passes the programs or agrees with the conclusions, it cannot dodge the hard statistics. They point up a serious national problem. Juvenile delinquency is still rising fast.

In the last decade juvenile delinquency cases brought before the courts have more than doubled, and arrests of youth increased 86 per cent, until they number almost 1,000,000 a year in 1960, 15 per cent of all arrests.

Mr. Kennedy, far from throwing up his hands in ritualistic horror or joining J. Edgar Hoover in advocating harsh treatment of the average minor offender, believes that juvenile crime is related to other changes in the economy and society. Employment, for example, is a growing worry for American youth between the school-leaving age of 16 and 24. Youth between 18 and 21 (only 7 per cent of the laboring force) already account for 18 per cent of our unemployment. And with the number of youth expected to appear on the labor market in the Sixties twice the number that appeared in the past decade, this chronic unemployment promises to increase. These young people flow from everywhere into an already flooded market. The birth rate is up, of course. But traditional absorbers of the labor pool are failing — farms for instance: "It is not likely," writes the President, "that more than one out of every 10 boys now living on farms will find full-time work in agriculture."

Here, in deceptively cold figures, lie the potential roots of more juvenile crime. Mr. Kennedy believes that "the malady . . . is a lack of opportunity," leading to "youthful frustration, rebellion and idleness."

This may put it too simply. Greensboro's own committee discomfortingly concluded that it is often just those who enjoy the greatest "opportunities" who are most bored and frustrated. What works for the predatory packs of the Manhattan streets may not work elsewhere; and vice versa.

Clearly, however, until someone discovers that magic social elixir that will revive youthful idealism and imagination throughout the ranks of American youth, prematurely jaded and shallowly precocious as they are now, strictly economic tragedies can be fought by economic means. Mr. Kennedy places several proposals for Peace Corps-like and neo-C. C. C. organizations on Congress' doorstep. Congress may not wish to pass them. All but bear careful thought. And Congress certainly cannot avoid the scrutiny of youth problems to which the President's excellent message summons it.

Letters Welcome

The editors of the Daily Tar Heel gladly accept letters from students and other members of the University community.

Letters must be free from libel, in good taste, and limited to 300-500 words. They should be typed, double spaced, if possible. Letters on any topic are welcome.

All letters become the property of the Daily Tar Heel, and may be published unless the writer requests otherwise.

No anonymous letters will be printed, regardless of subject matter or worth. Every letter writer should include his signature with a campus address that can be verified.

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOTFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

Chris Farran News Editor
Wayne King Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors
Harry DeLung Night Editor
Ed Dupree Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick Asst. Sports Ed.
Jim Wallace Photography Editor
Mickey Blackwell 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 6, 1879. Subscription rate: \$4.00 per semester, \$8.00 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.