

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 19, 1963

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. LXX, No. 119

McDevitt And Spearman: A Shotgun Marriage

The leap was too great and the leapers too hesitant, and the University Party, in an exaggerated parody of its old self, last week nominated a Larry McDevitt-Boo Spearman slate for the spring elections.

Several party leaders had hoped, in one great stride, to carry the party out of the clumsy grip of the Old Greeks, and into a firm, recognized position as the all-campus political party. The negation of these hopes came from a series of personal, non-political events, which in the context of political realities, made the McDevitt-Spearman selection necessary.

The nominations did not bring the head-on clash between New Greeks and Old Greeks, which had been expected by some. Things were worked out behind the scenes, and when the negotiators emerged, they had a unified party — unified with the lesser attributes of both groups.

The New Greeks had supported Spearman and Ford Rowan for president-vice president — in them, they saw a truly all-campus ticket, since Rowan would have been the first non-Greek to win a 'Big Two' nomination in modern history. (In his nomination of Larry McDevitt, Don Curtis said, "Some of my best friends are dorm men," — and he laughed, but no body else did. . . .) Problems arose for the New Greeks: For health reasons Rowan had decided to drop out of school; Spearman's plans concerning the length of his academic residence in Chapel Hill had changed. . . .

In the background was vice-president Mike Lawler, the square block

who refused to fit in the nice round hole reserved for him by the New Greeks. As the UP convention approached, it became evident that Lawler, who defeated McDevitt last spring, would run for president — and probably would win.

Meanwhile, party members were being warned of the 'dangers' of power politics, and were told that the New Greeks wanted to institute a power elite to run the party. (McDevitt said at the convention, "There is no place for power politics at Carolina" — as if everyone doesn't know the UP has always been in the hands of a 'power elite'.)

As the personal and political problems loomed larger and their determination became weaker, the party leaders swallowed their grand designs for the moment, and settled for the McDevitt-Spearman ticket.

It was a shotgun marriage, urged on by the threatening, gun-toting figure of Expediency.

The convention was a strange event. Somehow, the applause was more canned than usual, the speeches more set, the smiles on the faces of party leaders more false — there was the feeling you had seen this all before — that the sheep had been sent to the sacrifice altar before, and nowhere, was there that exuberant, uncontrolled optimism which marks the winning campaign.

So this is the University Party — faltering before its greatest opportunity, taking one step forward and two steps back, with hope for a better future, but with the prospects of a difficult spring. (JC)

Mediocrity & Moral Fibre

We have repeatedly attempted to draw the attention of the campus to the attitudes and actions of a worthy organization called the Society for Indecency to Naked Animals. We feel that, in this age of anxiety and despair, all fine Americans need to belong to some cause. Students should give themselves, totally and unselfishly, to the perpetration of noble ideals.

SINA offers such a fine opportunity to join, to belong and to martyr, one's self that we fail to see how students can ignore this movement.

SINA speaks for the student. This short excerpt from a letter by Clifford Prout (SINA pres.) demonstrates the sincere concern for ideals and truth that is so characteristic of today's younger genera-

tion:

"In spite of friendly classroom courses that teach idealistic knowledge, one must become a discerning and practical thinker in order to rise above mass mediocrity; you must seek and learn the truth first hand, so as to be more fully prepared to face and adjust to the outside world which is grim and often unreal. Without a wide variety of mental stimulations your moral fibre is at stake; your destiny, without purpose or direction, becomes vague and your only true identification is perhaps your social security number?" (CW)

NSA

Statements by candidates for the NSA Congress will be run on the DTH edit page Friday, March 22; Wed., March 27 and Friday, March 29. These 300-word statements should be turned in by 3 p.m. TWO DAYS before they are to be published.

The first statement for the 22nd, should give the candidates' overall views on NSA and its relation to the campus; and the role which NSA should play in the educational field and within the student community. The second statement should include the candidates' views on NSA and student government, on In Loco Parentis and student autonomy, on the rights and responsibilities of student groups, on what NSA should do in these fields. The third statement should touch on the wider scope of resolutions to be considered at the Congress — such as civil liberties and the McCarran Act and HUAC, nuclear testing and disarmament, the international student community and the "neutral nations", the University in the Cold War, etc.

"Why Don't You Soar?"



Letters To The Editors

Tar Heel Has 'UP-Slant'?

Why Was Brady's Chosen?

To the Editors,

If the State of North Carolina is dedicatedly against segregation; and if the University of North Carolina shares that policy; then why are the winners of the Sixth Annual Grail Mural Sports Jamboree to be "rewarded with a big steak" at Brady's, an avowedly segregated restaurant?

—J. Noel Heermann

'Black Court' Defended

To the Editor,

I am shocked by the opinion expressed by an educator in one of our nation's most distinguished schools—Harvard. Dean of the Law School Griswold "hits Black absolutism." This article in a recent issue of The Daily Tar Heel, smacks of Yankee cracker barrel conservatism and makes me wonder if the allegations of radical groups such as the Black Muslims are justified after all. Griswold censures Black for his interpretation of the first amendment to the Constitution which reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

The basic controversy is whether this means Congress may not establish religion in the sense of a state church, or whether it (government) should stay out of the realm of religion entirely.

Dr. Griswold wonders why America, as a country of toleration developed from "Christian doctrine and ethics" must give up her history and tradition for this toleration.

I would point out that our founding fathers didn't want to give up their history as Englishmen, but when they received no toleration they were forced to. The basic freedoms of the first ten amendments were an intrinsic part of the union and a guarantee against insufficient toleration. Proper toleration of individual beliefs guarantees "Christian doctrine and ethics."

Dr. Griswold says:

"Does our deep seated tolerance of all religions—or to the same extent, of no religion—require that we give up all religions observance in public activities? Why should it? It is hardly likely that it was entirely accidental that these questions did not even come up before the court in the first 150 years of our Constitutional history."

Perhaps these questions did not come up before the courts, but that is no indication that they were not present. Jefferson, when President, refused to designate a day of thanksgiving or prayer. He also refused to permit services on the property of the University of Virginia, a state supported institution.

The question of the establishment

of religion to the founding fathers was related to the sphere of religion, not a specific one or type. Even the tacit agreement in the doctrine of an almighty power is a sphere of religion.

—David Sheps

Poor Showing For Concerts

To the Editors'

Having recently observed that Kenan Stadium is far larger than Hill Hall, and realizing the low rating which chamber music generally has among students I was not surprised at the poor attendance at chamber concerts throughout the year. Nothing, however, prepared me for the pitiful size of Sunday night's audience—twenty is a generous estimate, and not all were students.

The works played are marvelous, and the quartet performed them excellently. To describe the concert further would be meaningless except to those who already have a love of this type of music.

Chamber music possesses a quality not found in other musical dimensions. People are fond of quoting the symphonies they know by Beethoven, Tchaikovsky, and others, if they know any others. They forget that it is almost impossible to understand a composer unless you are well acquainted with his so-called smaller works. It is in these that he often achieves a kind of intimacy lacking in the larger compositions.

If anyone considers chamber music boring or stuffy then he has obviously missed the delightful wit, the excitement, the tension, the beauty of the music in general, and of the three works by Haydn, Bartok, and Schubert played Sunday evening.

—Anne L. Morrow

DTH Editors Favor UP

To the Editors,

I believe that in the last week or two that I have begun to notice a definite University Party bias in the Tar Heel. A paper has the right to be biased, but on the edit page and not on the front page as his been the case with the Tar Heel.

In the lead article of the March 15 issue, the headline claims that the Student Party is vying for only 25 seats in the Student Legislature; whereas, in fact, they have already nominated 35 candidates and have the intention of nominating 15 more to have a full slate. Is it that the editors of the Tar Heel know of 10 candidates of the Student Party who do not intend to vie for their seats in the Legislature?

In a previous article the SP is criticized for having a lack of contests for party nominations. Nothing is said in this same vein about the UP nominations. Could it be that the Tar Heel is unaware that there

was not a single contest for the UP legislative nominations; that there was not even any discussion of the nominations? Or is it that the Tar Heel has a UP bias?

I think that it is high time that the Tar Heel declared itself as to which party it is supporting so that the readers will be able to separate the fact from the propaganda on the front page. Or if this editorializing on the front page is not the fault of the editors, they print an apology and put an end to this practice.

—Bill Straughn

Peace Group Urge Attend

To the Editors,

The members of the Chapel Hill-Durham branch of the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, in keeping with its policies, believes "that a vigorous and democratic labor movement is the best safeguard for the rights of workers, and contributes to the best interests of a sound economy. . . . We recognize that strikes are often labor's only effective means to obtain redress of legitimate grievances. We believe that negotiation of disputes between labor and management should be based on mutual respect, and both should maintain a strong sense of responsibility to the community."

We urge everyone to attend a meeting on March 20th at Carroll Hall at 8 p.m. when the plight of the miners of Hazard, Kentucky will be discussed by Mr. Behrman Gibson.

—Maryellen Bowers, President
Chapel Hill-Durham Branch
of Women's International
League for Peace and
Freedom

Correction

To the Editors,

I alone am responsible for a mistake which I think has occurred in including the Di-Phi's name as signers of a published letter headed "Support Urged for Hazard." The Di-Phi chose to sponsor Mr. Berman Gibson, strike leader from Hazard, Kentucky, on purely educational and not necessarily partisan grounds.

The letter in question was vague in its intent; it urged "attendance and support" of Mr. Gibson's talk, which the Di-Phi endorses. But the Tar Heel heading implied an exhortation to political or financial support, while the Dialectic and Philanthropic Literary Society has not endorsed as a body.

A recent letter from the Di-Phi to the Tar Heel made clear that we are sponsoring Mr. Gibson "to hear his point of view." We think to do so is important, and we again urge attendance at his talk. But we have taken no action for or against his cause.

—Hubert Hawkins,
Clerk, Di-Phi

TWO VIEWS ON EDUCATION PLANS

University Must Retain 'One-Ness'

RALEIGH TIMES

There is real danger in the fact that State College partisans seem to have won, in a House Committee anyway, their fight to win separate-ness for their college in the name-change proposal. The danger is not in the name itself, but in the fact that this brings a real sense of two-ness into a University system where the best interests of all North Carolina demand that there be a genuine sense of one-ness.

The State College partisans, in a real pressure campaign aided by some who don't give a hoot at all about the name of State College, have enough strength in the House Committee on Higher Education to have their institution named "North Carolina State University," the University of North Carolina." Educators and the Carlyle Commission on Higher Education had agreed on the name "North Carolina State, the University of North Carolina at Raleigh."

The name change was, and is, part of a sensible blueprint of the course higher education should take in North Carolina during the crowded and important years just ahead. The name change was asked to emphasize the fact that there must be just one real public University in North Carolina, a Consolidated University composed now of three campuses, in Raleigh, in Chapel Hill, in Greensboro. That one real University was designed in the plans to be the capstone of higher education in North Carolina, to be the real center to which all higher education roads would lead in this State.

That whole plan hinges on the very real necessity for having the very real sense of one-ness in the University. The whole plan of one-ness within the University was designed to make sure that North Carolina would channel her available resources into the most productive areas in the field of higher education. The whole thought of one-ness within the University was designed to see to it that there continued to be the one real University within the public education system. Otherwise, North Carolina would run the real risk of seeing local pride in various areas of the state bring into being a series of so-called regional universities, which would be

universities in name only. Such a dilution of resources could bring only a weakening in all the system of higher education in North Carolina.

There are many sincere people who have fought hard for the "North Carolina State University" name for State College. They had their own good, personal reasons for making that fight, and they cannot be condemned for having made it. It should be realized, however, that they have had the aid of people who hate Terry Sanford and who see in this an opportunity to embarrass him, for the name-change recommendations were made by a Commission named by him. They also have had the aid of some of those who want the Dixie Classic reinstated, not for reasons of helping higher education but simply because they want to see a good holiday show or because they want to improve their own businesses. They also have had the aid of some who have never given up the fight to de-consolidate the Consolidated University. They also have had the aid of those who have contended that President Friday of the Consolidated University has used higher education simply to further non-existent political ambitions. They have also had the support of people who feel that good government centers about cutting budgets and who would set educational brother against educational brother in the full knowledge that such a fight could lead to chances to whittle budgets.

There are all those unworthy things in this fight, and those who must make the final decision must, in fairness to themselves as well as in fairness to all the people of the state, must recognize the presence of those things.

If this name fight is to be lost by the Carlyle Commission, by the University Trustees, by the educators, then so be it. It will be important that all concerned know some of the basic reasons for its loss. It will be more important that all concerned realize the importance of shoring up the rest of the blueprint for higher education, to restore to it as much as possible the sense of one-ness which the University must have if the blueprint is to help North Carolina through the hard educational days ahead.

... Unconditional Surrender?

GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS

Rep. Carl L. Bailey Jr., a member of the House Higher Education Committee, remarked Wednesday that 99 per cent of North Carolinians believe the Legislature's omnibus higher education bill involves only name-changing.

This remark pinpoints the tragic-comedy of the matter. If Representative Bailey is right, rank and file Tar Heels have the unparalleled lobbying activities of interested alumni groups to thank for their ignorance. One would think that State College had been "State" longer than Padua has been Padua, or Oxford Oxford.

And the background of this agitation says little for the good "slith" of the State College alumni faction led by Charles Reynolds of Spindale. A Consolidated University trustee committee, led by Thomas Pearsall, weighed the name-changing issue at length. That committee, acknowledging the vociferous campaign of State College friends against the proposal that State become "the University of North Carolina at Raleigh," asked responsible State alumni to submit a list of alternatives. "North Carolina State, the University of North Carolina at Raleigh" — endorsed if not preferred by Mr. Reynolds — was one of those transmitted to the Pearsall group. The committee accepted it.

But if Mr. Pearsall and the trustees naively thought the matter closed, they did not consider the capacity of the State alumni for changing their minds. In fact, they seemed to change their minds very quickly. That, at least, is a generous interpretation of events. Their endorsement of "North Carolina State, the University of North Carolina at Raleigh" lasted from the day Mr. Pearsall's committee reported till the approximate day the Legislature convened. Then Mr. Reynolds and others buzzed down upon the legislators and began to lobby once again for the original "North Carolina State University" name. To the literal-minded, it may have seemed that the State alumni were running out on an agreement; but that is of

course a matter of opinion. It is anyone's prerogative to change his mind.

That omnibus education bill is now due a final hearing Tuesday. There are other vital matters to settle — such as the future of three established community colleges. The name-changing matter continues to dominate the discussion, and the House Higher Education Committee's patience is ebbing. Rep. Roger Kiser of Scotland County told one reporter that he had been "propagandized to death." His exasperation is widely shared. For it seems that interested alumni groups are so bent on ruling or ruining that the whole name-changing project is in danger of death or abuse.

That is too bad. If the Legislature fails to accept these carefully-considered proposals (including the name-changes) to steer the Consolidated University into a new phase of consolidation, it is the sons and daughters of this state, not the graduated alumni who make the racket, who will eventually suffer.

No mistaking it, the name-changes, while not absolutely essential, are vital to the higher education package. Woman's College in Greensboro cannot pursue its new projects in undergraduate and particularly graduate instruction if it cannot be, in name and truth, a full branch of the university.

Nor will Consolidated University officials warm to State College's projected undergraduate liberal arts program unless the alumni pressure groups signify their willingness to be (and be called) part of the University of North Carolina.

The designation "North Carolina State University" is a warrant for separatism, no less. And taxpayers in this state, who realize we will do well to have one first-rate university, let alone two, are not ready to issue such a warrant.

It strikes us that the Pearsall Committee and the Carlyle Commission, after months of hard work, have gone to great lengths to appease Mr. Reynolds and his group. Is the next step to be unconditional surrender?

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOFELTER
CHUCK WAYE
Editors

Chris Farran News Editor
Wayne King Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors
Harry DeLung Night Editor
Ed Dupree Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick Asst. Sports Editor
Jim Wallace Photog. Editor
Mickey Blackwell
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 sent as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to 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.
THE DAILY TAR HEEL is published by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, N. C.