

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 28, 1963

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. LXX, No. 126

That Soft "Click"

The confusion which has followed the firing of the freshman tennis coach has done little but irritate old wounds and demonstrate the well known fact that you can't please everybody, even part of the time.

Had Mr. Erickson not fired ex-coach Crais, there, no doubt would have been innumerable alumni demanding to know why. They would have made, perhaps, "vicious" attacks upon an athletic director who sat back while one of his staff criticized the department. Erickson would have been obligated to do a great deal of explaining to pacify individuals who make a great deal of every university's athletic program possible.

The fact that the DTH or the student body felt that they were wrong would not have made things any more comfortable for Mr. Erickson. Let's face it, he answers first to the alumni, and he is not alone in having to do so.

The issue of academic freedom or the right to criticize is rapidly clouded over, when individuals who

have harbored resentment for Erickson (or what they think Erickson represents) because of other incidents, quickly jump to points of contention in other sports or other mistakes.

What we have is a man caught in the middle. On one side he must face opposition which is extremely vocal and vitriolic, while on the other he encounters an opposition which, though more subtle, is vastly more influential.

Students throw words around . . . alumni, dollars.

So, although we must repeatedly and even heatedly maintain that Mr. Erickson was wrong to fire Crais because he fumbled, we must not overlook the fact that the "fans" watching Erickson are vastly more spirited, certainly more critical, and always more fickle.

An athletic director must, somehow, please supposed fans on both sides of the field. The fact that students may yell loudly cannot permit Erickson to ignore the other sides of the field. The fact that stu-soft but vital "click" of an opening-or-closing-purse. (CW)

A Money Club

A small group of resolute Economics majors has again set its sights on the establishment of an Economics Club, and we would urge any undergraduate student with more than a passing interest in the science of money to become a charter member.

Past efforts to form this club have succumbed to the peculiar apathy that haunts such noble intentions, and it would be a shame to see another discussion group falter without even being heard.

The organization will be established mainly for the interests and memberships of undergraduate students . . . not just undergraduate Economics majors. The doors are open to any interested person, and with a format of speakers and discussions such as the topic that will kick-off the first meeting ("Is success Spoiling American Labor Unions?"), we would suppose that acting president John Barrow should find Room 2, Carroll Hall filled this Thursday night.

YRC Leadership

North Carolina, like the rest of the South, is a traditional Democratic state. Like the rest of the South, however, it is moving steadily toward two-party status.

Republican presidential candidates have run stronger in North Carolina than in the rest of the South, and on the state level, the GOP has two U. S. Congressmen and an increasing number of state legislators.

As the Democrats have run the

state, the Young Democrats Club traditionally has dominated the UNC campus. But this is no longer true.

In the past two years—more particularly this year—the Young Republicans Club has shown itself to be more energetic, hard-working and dynamic than their YDC foes.

Under President Bud Broome, the YRC has proven itself innovative and imaginative—qualities exemplary in political groups on this campus. Broome's progressive leadership has made the YRC the campus political organization (a sad admission for a confirmed Democrat).

This year the YRC has already brought one congressional candidate, two state legislators to speak on campus—with three U.S. congressmen and another state legislator due to come next month.

The Young Republicans have abandoned the restrictive mold of most political groups and entered into all phases of campus activity.

They sponsored an All Campus Leadership Award and a "New Frontier game" at the Campus Chest carnival. Due during the next month are a party in the Legion Hut, crowning of a Miss UNC-YRC and a party with WC girls.

The UNC chapter also has sponsored a film on "New Breed in the South" and activity within the state YRC.

In all, membership has grown under strong leadership, resulting in a top year for the Young Republicans. (JC)

Letters To The Editors

Erickson Controversy; Editor Candidates

Question Of Integrity?

To the Editors,

Policy is established ultimately by the people who have the power to make it. There has never yet been any one policy that has pleased everyone whom it has affected, nor has there ever been any person in a position of power who has enjoyed the unanimous support of those he was responsible for. Human nature simply doesn't work that way.

Because there is inbred within any such causal relationship, a certain degree of dissidence, then there is going to be a certain degree of vocal, overt criticism aimed at the policy and the person who made it. This happens all the time in American politics, and it happens all the time on this campus.

Two such instances occurred this past week with the challenging of the authority of the Dean of Women and the Director of Athletics. In both cases student indignation and self-righteousness were extraordinarily quick to precipitate . . . "How can they do this to us . . . we're supposed to have student autonomy and stand for what is morally right . . . that's what it says in the catalogue and the DTH anyway . . ."

But there is one problem that perhaps the students have overlooked in their barrage of vitriolic criticism. Granted they have the right to criticize, and they should exercise this right, it is imperative that this right be used with a considerable measure of intelligence and integrity if it is to be effective at all.

To a considerable and praiseworthy extent, concerned students have expressed their disagreements with Miss Carmichael with the maturity and responsibility that they are supposed to possess. Regardless of their personal feelings on the matter of the apartment rule, most people, students and administration alike, would agree that there is a legitimate reason for complaint and dissatisfaction.

But this isn't the case with the sudden, out-of-the-sky attack on Chuck Erickson, the Director of Athletics. He fired a tennis coach, and as a direct consequence all the petty grievances harbored by an oblique faction of campus Don Quixotes have come to the fore. "Charge," they shout, "fight on the side of G-d and goodness and save the world from evil men like Chuck Erickson!" This all sounds well and good; it probably sounded even better during the McCarthy reign of terror in the 'early 1950's.

If all the clever little phrases and smug references to godheads and green pastures are stripped bare from the accusation, what is the fundamental issue at stake? Does anyone really know? Probably not, at least the ones who are so eager to send Erickson to the chopping

block.

Did it once, ever occur to the writer of that slanderous editorial in Sunday's DTH that perhaps Tom Crais was fired because he deserved to be? Did it ever occur that these charges on the lack of integrity by Erickson may be the very reason that Crais was dismissed? What if Erickson had written a letter to the DTH defiling the integrity of our honor system on the basis of unsupportable rumors? Wouldn't we expect, and justifiably so, that the administration ask for his resignation?

Quite possibly, and it is possible, Chuck Erickson is a black-hearted scoundrel only out for himself and his bankbook. Perhaps he really did fire Crais just because his policy of win at all costs was challenged. Perhaps Erickson is a man who lacks integrity.

But who knows? Who honestly knows? Does Tom Crais? Does the writer of the editorial? Does anybody on this campus?

In writing that attack on Erickson as Director of Athletics, its instigator is guilty of the most heinous crime that he was so eager to charge Erickson with—a lack of integrity. The writer has twisted a situation to use as a springboard for a despicable piece of muckraking, and as such it is one of the most contemptible pieces of journalism to ever appear in the Tar Heel.

If somebody has genuine, ascertainable proof that Chuck Erickson is not fulfilling his obligations to the University that he serves, then let that person come forward and speak. So far nobody has. Tom Crais apparently believes that there is something morally wrong, at least that's what he implied as a rumor. The student who penned that editorial also is a self-qualified expert at extracting fact from hearsay.

And this is the whole heart of the problem. Student leaders decry the absence of trust and co-operation on the part of the administration in their relationships with the student body. But how can we as students expect the administration to do anything else when we have students, running around, not in a comparable position of responsibility, tossing off unproven, slanderous charges. What can we expect?

—Louis Legum

Low Ebb In Hypocrisy

To the Editors,

The dismissal of Mr. Crais marks a low ebb in hypocrisy at Carolina. From a university that supposedly is liberal and open-minded and prides itself in encouraging freedom of thought, expression, and speech from students and faculty alike, this act was indeed quite surprising if not dismaying. Whether one agrees or disagrees with Mr. Crais' opinions is irrelevant; the question is wheth-

er Mr. Erickson was justified in infringing upon the right of an instructor to express his ideas because they were contrary to his own.

Mr. Crais' statement about "subterranean murmurs about grade changes and Honor Council concessions for athletes," was no reason for him to be fired. He merely reiterated what had been current gossip on campus at the time.

Perhaps Mr. Erickson sees it differently, but the criticism offered by Mr. Crais, I am sure, was intended to be entirely constructive. If Mr. Erickson disagreed with Mr. Crais, as he obviously did, he merely had to issue a statement to the Daily Tar Heel explaining his views . . . unless of course, he felt that there was a great deal of truth in Mr. Crais' arguments and felt that the only good dissenting faculty member is a fired faculty member.

Perhaps you would like to be chairman of the Dept. of History, Mr. Erickson, so you could fire those professors who teach that the South lost the Civil War?

—Kenneth Mann

Petition For Open Policy

To the Editors,

The Daily Tar Heel on 6 Feb 1963 announced that the Honor Council had convicted and suspended 6 students, acquitting a seventh, for cheating on the famous Archaeology final exam. Three days later, a front-page article released the information that there were three more trials pending from the same exam case. Then there was silence, apparently for lack of further information to the Tar Heel from the Honor Council. On March 9, the letter from Tom Crais appeared, quoting in part, "College coaching is a business or professional endeavor only in so far as it improves character and continues the learning process . . ."

May I remind us that the primary reason for the existence of amateur sports is, not winning, but learning and enjoyment . . . A few days ago, the student body was informed through the Tar Heel that Mr. Crais was fired a few days after this letter was published, and that the statement from the department of Physical Education professed ignorance as to the source of the rumors of Honor Council favors to athletes, and continuing, that the department did not share Mr. Crais' views on athletics anyway.

Two questions arise: (A) Is firing a critic a legitimate way of dealing with a question which in fact brings the University athletic policy into question, as well as the dealings of the Honor Council? (B) When is the Honor Council and/or administration going to make public its up to now secret machinations as regards the remaining trials, and when is the student body going to

become regularly and reliably informed as regards the actions of the Honor Council and the reasoning behind these actions?

In short, is the administration of, by and for students to be kept secret, even when the implications are of an order of justice to be taken completely on faith?

(Signed by 23 students:)

—Joseph Williman; Joe Greene, Marie Overby; Kenneth Dilks; Sid Waldman; John Kimball; David Snelling; Diana Harmon; John Bowers; Mary Stinecifer; Joe Gates; Vernon Bruffey; Michael Bost; Bryan Ballou; Norwood Pratt; Wayne Hardy; Jane Anderson; D. J. Impastato; Gloria Dicozzano; Jim Crouch; Jasper L. Jones.

Where Is Carrier Current?

To the Editors,

Last year during the Spring Elections, I remember that the candidates of the Student Party (Dwight Wheelless, Mike Lawler, Lindsay Ralford and Jim Weeks) used the fact that they were responsible for Carrier Current in their campaign. However this year I have noticed that they have said very little about it. Could the reason be that Carrier Current, as executed by the Student Party, was a flop?

Carrier Current could be a tremendous asset to our campus if it were well done. Let's hope the next time it is tried more money is appropriated and that better plans are made.

—Gerald Good

DTH Needs Organizing

To the Editors:

Incidentally, this letter is but one of those irate protestations over Daily Tar Heel policies and practices which make such frequent appearances on your editorial page. In my case, the straw which broke the camel's back was a simple omission. The "Duke's Men," a singing group from Yale, sang to a fortunate but sparse audience this past Sunday evening March 17. I would like to have been one of those fortunate few, but apparently the DTH does not consider that kind of event worth so much as a notice in the "Campus Briefs." Certainly, there was nothing in Sunday's edition about this group's appearance, and I cannot recall having observed any mention of them in any preceding issue. I discovered their purported appearance on Monday, March 18, gratis a sign in Lenoir Hall reading "tonight."

My sense of disappointment stems from the fact that, having attended Yale as an undergraduate, the opportunities to hear and enjoy both the "Duke's Men" and several comparable groups were ample. But this same disappointment, whether prompted by nostalgia or not, is merely indicative of a far larger disappointment where the DTH is concerned. I can find no better way to describe my impression of the present state of your paper than to say that it must suffer from crass disorganization.

If my understanding is correct, the "Duke's Men" (who have a first-class ensemble of both voices and personalities, in my opinion) were sponsored by Graham Memorial. Both the G.M. office and the DTH offices are in the same building. Surely communication is the problem here, but is it really so difficult under these circumstances? I would hesitate to venture other suggestions as to the source of your organizational shortcomings, and a comparison of this year's DTH to the Yale Daily News is certainly out of place.

But hope there is, in spite of all, if only on the horizon. At least one of the candidates for the editorship of the DTH holds promise of the kind of editor who would make your paper into a first-class daily, and I for one would suffer considerable despair were he and his running-mate not duly elected. I speak of Gary Blanchard and Dave Ethridge. Indeed, the marked difference between the organizational plans of these two hopefuls and your present performance is sufficient alone to prompt me to write. And I will only touch on the ideas—over and above organization—they have evinced, not only in conversation but in the varied accomplishments and abilities they bring to their task from past experience. Examples are myriad, but to cite a few: Gary's present positions with WCHL news and the Charlotte Observer, and recurrent offers from other news sources including a St. Petersburg,

Florida paper and several radio stations around this state; and Dave's editorship of two West Virginia journals, and his work with the Louisville Times, not to mention the considerable sagacity relative to the proper handling of a newspaper which must have rubbed off on him from his father, Mark Ethridge, a noted journalist of national stature.

And the DTH? (I will forego further comment on your present condition and concentrate on the future.) What other candidate has advocated a viable "beat system" for reporting which regenerates itself — and the DTH — by training associate reporters in the process of going out and getting the news, while preparing the "official" reporters for work of a more responsible nature? What other candidate has stated that all editorials, not to mention announcements of campus events, would be prepared a minimum of twenty-four hours in advance, and preferably 72 hours in advance? What other candidate is acquainted with such journalists, around the state, as Ed Yoder of the Greensboro Daily News, and Roy Thompson of the Winston-Salem Journal and Sentinel; or nationally, such as Anthony Lewis of the New York Times and Ralph McGill of the Atlanta Constitution, and Mark Ethridge, and — well, I'm out of breath and the list is much longer. What other candidate is actively seeking advocates of, at least, both ideologically-oriented political points of view with an offer to give a column on the editorial page to the most cogent and rational exponent of each view? Or what other candidate has expressed his own concern in terms of trying to provide a ground for the meeting of these views through the vehicle of his own editorials? Has any other candidate thought about his responsibility as editor to the extent that before he raises a question or flings an accusation he will investigate the problem in depth, analyze it comparably, and write his opinion only after this consideration? And still have it prepared at least twenty-four hours in advance, so he can re-read the editorial in, perhaps, a less emotional state than when he wrote it? One final query. What other candidate so enjoys the job of reporting that he will organize the DTH to that degree where he will enable himself to indulge in this job — a pleasure for Gary Blanchard — however occasionally the opportunity arises?

To be sure, I speak of potential in Blanchard and Ethridge where the DTH is concerned, but upon what else can you depend when you vote for editor? For my reading purposes, they possess the greatest potential by a fair margin, not only with respect to correcting the present state of organizational disrepair into which the DTH has fallen, but with regard to making remarkable improvements as well.

Now, I spent two hours quizzing Gary Blanchard about all this, and you are to be commended for providing each of the candidates space in which to express their views. May I suggest that you could further assist the student-voter in reaching his own decision by advocating a debate among the candidates, to be sponsored by you, or the Carolina forum. It could be that you would do the University community a service in this, and even indirectly effectuate the announcement of such events as the appearance of the "Duke's Men", to the infinite delight of such old and nostalgic law students as myself.

—Frank Christian Gray

Give New York Correct View

To the Editors,

I suggest that during the N. Y. strike, some attempt should be made to distribute the DTH to those "educated idiots in New York"—about who Mr. Clyde Wilson is so concerned. This would help correct the impression in N. Y. that "white women of the South are seducing Negroes." By reading the DTH they could learn that it is not the white women, but the white men — of un-named fraternities — who are doing "the seducing of Negroes." At least, this would correct any erroneous impressions about Chapel Hill.

—S. O'Hara

Weather—Ech; In Wrong Place

To the Editors,

Your weather forecasts would look much better in their proper place—in the comic section with Peanuts and Pogo.

—Harris Prevost

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

Jim Wallace Asst. Sports Editor
Mickey Blackwell Photog. Editor
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 at 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.

