



The Daily Tar Heel

70 Years of Editorial Freedom

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news — 933-1012. Business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Entered as 2nd class matter at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to Act of March 8, 1870. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.

Published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations, throughout the academic year by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc., 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is a subscriber to United Press International and utilizes the services of the University News Bureau.



© 1963 HERB LUBNER THE WASHINGTON POST

LETTERS

TO THE EDITORS

Hoax!

Editors, the Tar Heel:

In case you hadn't noticed, the Student Committee to Help Eliminate Insidious Subversive Speakers is a hoax. It was meant to carry to its logical conclusion ANY effort to deny someone in ANY way the pain and privilege of independent thought. The letters were written as satire; we hoped that by using the usual arguments to advocate absurdities we could point out the danger inherent in these arguments. We must learn in one way or another that hating Communism and protecting freedom are NOT the same thing. Only by actively protecting the American ideal of individual liberty and human rights against all encroachments can we hope to prevail over the dangers of Communism, or of any other system which does not place the rights of man first. There is a basic similarity between all enemies of freedom: in the previous letter, we used a quotation regarding the necessity of rationing liberty. To many of you vigorous anti-Communist patriots this may have seemed sound advice; you will no doubt be embarrassed to learn that the quotation is attributed to Lenin.

The real American ideal must prevail not only over its enemies, but over its friends.

Hansford M. Epes
Chapel Hill

for the taxpayers of this State to purchase copies of the works of such dangerous, Un-American "writers" as Lenin, Marx, Khrushchev, and others?" and have attempted to stifle the obvious rebuttle by suggesting that students learn about communism through the writings of J. Edgar Hoover, Fred C. Schwarz, HUAC documents, and from the "materials published by our freedom-loving friends of the American Legion." To answer the question of the necessity of such "unAmerican (note the capitalization) literature, I offer two analogies: 1) In a courtroom, the jury may be completely informed as to the facts of the case through the prosecutor's oration, but it may not make a decision until the defendant has presented his side of those same facts; 2) One cannot base a criticism of Shakespeare on the opinions of other critics, cannot even agree or disagree with those opinions until one has read Shakespeare.

I ask you to live and let live. Whether I purchase "pornographic trash" is my personal decision, not to be made for me by a state legislature (you must have very dirty minds to get anything pornographic from *Catcher in the Rye*). It is not that I wish to purchase such literature, but I like to know that I may if I so desire. The same goes for "insidious, subversive speakers." By denying them the right to speak here, you are infringing on my right to hear them. It becomes ludicrous when politics is confused with botany, or any other subject, for that matter.

Should you gain your desired majority in this state, there is still no bill you could have passed to restrict the right of all Americans to think and decide objectively. Students today not only are, but have to be, mature enough to make their own decisions. Before you rush to hide behind your shield of "patriotism" I suggest you consider the individual rights inherent in a democratic, free society. Gentlemen, live and let live.

William Hinton
448 Ebringhaus

Customs Change With Time

(Editor's Note: This is the third in a series of articles from a UNC student visiting India in the Experiment in International Living program.)

By MARGARET A. RHYMES

CALCUTTA—That we learn to live together by living together is a simple enough faith on which the Experiment in International Living has operated for the past three decades.

Here in India 60 Americans and Europeans have tested this out as sons and daughters in individual homes throughout the country.

Embracing several thousand people in 40 nations around the world each year, the Experiment stakes its effectiveness on the homestay period when students are thrown headlong into a culture rather than peering in as tourists.

With each Experiment in a separate home and as few intragroup contacts as possible, the natural tendency of foreigners to hang together is usually avoided.

Part of the impact that Experimenters make on foreigners, we're told is that they are "missionless."

"I expected a flood of propaganda about the States," said

one Indian "brother," surprised that we were here to learn, not to teach. That the Experiment is entirely free from government sponsorship is another hard point to drive home.

One of the major difficulties—at least in India—is that only one per cent of upper class families is usually able to afford an Experiment in their homes.

While these families are certainly a part of India, they often represent a more Westernized existence, far removed from the life of the average Indian.

Of course, were we placed in a typical village home, it is doubtful that they would know just what to do with us. Cutting across the language barrier would be only one of a myriad of problems.

This factor certainly puts added pressures on the Experimenters to dig deeper into the everyday customs and to discover "the real India," as we call it.

Our own host family in Calcutta has been an exception to that equation of wealth with Westernization.

While of the upper middle class (a car, a home and several servants), our "parents" were neither orthodox Hindus nor extremely Westernized, despite their wide travels.

Both received their master's degrees from Columbia University, in the U.S.A., and spent two years traveling on the Continent from England to Russia.

Our "father" Amalendu, in his early 40's (most Indian husbands are six or seven years older than their wives), directs an industrial and technological museum, the first in India.

His wife, Radha, is a very attractive and well-read young Burmese who left her homeland during the war.

Theirs seemed to be one of the more successful of arranged marriages, a custom still strongly practiced throughout India.

The tradition certainly has its merit here, since young people have little chance for contact before marriage and open dating is rarely done.

Another reason why arranged marriages "work" (the question is moot) is that the wife is expected to do most of the adjusting if the couple is incompatible. Divorce is extremely rare and was only legalized within the past seven years.

Of those today who oppose this custom, many are bitter over the quiet suffering they observe in "forced" arranged marriages.

However, the Indian woman is more gracefully adaptable—or resigned—to adjusting than the American female. And with her limited contacts, she doesn't have many opportunities for comparison.

Many young people have said they prefer a combination love-arranged marriage. This seems the most realistic idea. Seldom today does one find a bride setting eyes on her bridegroom for the first time on the wedding day.

Another tradition that is breaking down in this slow social transition is that of status determined by the number of sons a man has.

India is one of the few countries in the world where the government is conducting an all-out campaign for birth control. Family planning centers and billboards in dozens of languages encourage wise planning for fewer and healthier children.

The most frequent reason given for the program's failure in the rural areas, besides the lack of education, is that in isolated villages there is little other entertainment as such.

One of the unfortunate successes of this campaign, however, has been among the educated and upper classes. While the villages still increase their numbers by two per cent each year, the intellectuals and those who can afford education are decreasing in proportion to the whole society.

Our Calcutta family included two children: Urmi, a gregarious 13-year-old with a talent for classical Indian singing, and Shintu, an active six-year-old with round, horn-rimmed glasses and a decidedly British accent.

Both children attend Catholic schools, as do a high percentage of students from upper class families in all the larger cities.

None of the family, while extremely well-educated, somewhat modern and well-traveled, has lost its pride in the culture and history of India.

And this seemed a particularly wonderful quality to find in a world where more and more cultures are being white-washed with the sophistication and mechanization of the West.

Education: Too Few Ideas

By SIDNEY J. HARRIS

When Heine asked his coachman, "What are ideas?" the coachman pondered a moment and answered: "Ideas? ... Ideas are the things they put into your head."

Even today, most people might answer as the coachman did, for our formal system of education seems to consist of things put into our heads—names and dates and battles and multiplication tables and the three principal sources of raw material in the Malayan Peninsula.

Of course, these are not ideas. Ideas are what comes out of the head. Nobody can put them there, although a good education

can stimulate them, organize them, and give them a solid basis in reason.

Education, if it means anything, is a drawing out; it is not a pushing in. The human mind is not a sausage casing into which we can stuff knowledge; and, usually, the harder we try to stuff the more resistance we encounter. This is why so much formal education is a waste of time and energy.

A human being is a repository of ideas; the while trick is to test them against reality, to expose them to other ideas, and thus to sharpen and toughen them.

The greatest flaw in formal education, in my opinion, is that it has little respect for ideas and too much for information. Children can get easily bored with information, when it seems to have no relevance; but they are excited and interested in ideas.

I vividly remember how the subject of zoology was ruined for me in school by teachers who were concerned only with classification and memorization of insects and such. No attempt was made to relate the subject to the other links in the great chain of life.

Nor was this merely a defect in the teachers. It was, rather, their general attitude toward learning in my day; there is some evidence that it has improved a little, but still not enough. The "dropout problem" is largely economic and social—but a part of it is also pedagogical, that dead teaching turns students away from the classroom and toward more animated aspects of the human scene.

Every child's mind is teeming with ideas. Too often these ideas are systematically throttled or strangled in the school system, which looks only for the "right answers" that are in the back of the book. What is in the back of the head is rarely encouraged to move to the front.

agement of the National Defense Department to blackball the promotion of officers who waste public money. Or, you might expect some other action to discourage such inexcusably careless administration of the public business.

If Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara or any of his civilian aides has ever read any of the comptroller's reports, there is no evidence of it. The reports go, specifically, to the speaker of the House and to the president pro tempore of the Senate. Those elderly statesmen probably don't read them either.

President Johnson should make the comptroller's reports required reading for all cabinet officers and agency chiefs. When the Air Force throws a lot of money out the window, the responsible general should be chewed out in the classic military tradition. Are you listening, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Erickson & The Gator Bowl

Much hell has been raised in the past few days over the fact that most UNC students going to the Gator Bowl will find themselves watching the action from behind a goal post.

As usual, UNC Athletic Director Chuck Erickson caught most of the blame. And as usual, he didn't really deserve it. He took the best of what was available in the way of tickets, so any blame really should go to the Gator Bowl officials who made the school allotments—but the Gator Bowl is an expensive proposition and has to be run like the business operation it is.

Consequently, tickets are sold far in advance to make sure there will be enough money to underwrite the costs of the Bowl, which are considerable. To sell these tickets in advance, with no one knowing who will end up playing in the bowl, the choicest seats are served up.

So what we end up with, from the student fan's point of view, is a miserable situation about which nothing much can be done. It's hard to face these facts, but they are the facts and honesty requires that they be faced.

This, however, does not completely exonerate Erickson. He could and should have made these facts public when the tickets went on sale. We wager the tickets would have been snapped up anyway and nobody would have had any hard feelings.

As it is, a shadow has been cast over what should be an occasion of great exuberance and spirit.

But even here Erickson is not wholly to blame. He has innumerable arrangements to attend to in preparation for the game, and it appears that he just didn't think to make the seat-location information public before the tickets were sold.

Thus Erickson is revealed as his own worst enemy.

What's to be done? Let's put this ticket-hassle behind us and make the best of it. We've got a football game to win Dec. 28, and that requires we get solidly behind our excellent team. A torch rally, say, tomorrow night, would seem to be very much in order.

Make Your Voice Heard . . . Vote!

Students at Carolina are in a very funny position at election time: we are not eligible to vote here. And every year there are students who try to register here to vote in some sort of an election or other, and are mighty disappointed when they find they can't.

Voting is one of the most important rights we have in this democratic political system of ours, and the one we tend to take least seriously. Especially at this time and in this State, it is important for all eligible voters to register. Early in the new year, one of the most important amendments ever proposed for the North Carolina Constitution comes up for a vote by the people. And the passage or defeat of this amendment will color our lives, as citizens and as students, for who knows how many years. This is the proposed amendment which would change the number of representatives in the House of Representatives of the General Assembly.

Other important votes which will come up during the time we are normally in school next year are the pro-

posed school bond issue and the gubernatorial primaries in the spring. And if you're not registered, you can't vote.

And you can't vote here unless you're a permanent resident of Chapel Hill.

What are you, and we, to do?

Register at home during the Christmas holidays. Get your name on the books in your home county. Next, apply in writing to the chairman of your county's Board of Elections for an absentee ballot. This application must be made in writing. The ballots can be mailed to you, or you can pick them up in person, if you wish.

This is not the time to exhort you which side to take in the very important referendum, although our position is clear and well-known. But it is the time to exhort you, even beg you, to be sure to register while you are at home, so that when these important issues come up you will be able to cast your vote.

Your vote is your voice in this democratic society.

Are You Listening, Mr. Secretary?

Pentagon Wasting Money?

By LYLE C. WILSON
United Press International

The shocking waste of public money by the national Defense Department military brass continues unabated and unrebuked despite claims from time to time that national defense has saved another billion here and another billion there.

If the Pentagon were a private corporation, the stockholders would have fired the management long since. The comptroller general of the United States has been calling fouls against the Pentagon ever since the monstrous building was erected to house the consolidated armed services. The comptroller general is an arm of the U.S. Congress. The office was created to audit the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress. The comptroller's reports on national defense procurement consistently have revealed reckless waste of public money.

There are annually many such audits of national defense spending. These tales of what the generals and admirals do with the taxpayers' dollars are almost incredible. They belong in a believe-it-or-not museum. Here is an example, dated Nov. 29, 1963.

Toward the end of the 1962 fiscal year the Air Force discovered that it had a reserve of unexpended funds that had been appropriated for expenditure in fiscal 1962. The Air Force, of course, had asked for this money on grounds of urgent need. The facts seem to be that the Air Force did not need the money at all and was somewhat embarrassed to approach the year end with a large unexpended balance.

The Air Force had to spend the money or turn it back to the treasury. So, the Air Force spent \$323,000 of its surplus funds for new furniture it did not need. The comptroller gen-

eral called the expenditure largely unjustified.

"Such waste and extravagance illustrates the need," the comptroller's report said, "for a greater sense of individual responsibility for economy in government operations."

This outrageous waste of public funds is a pretty fair sample of the waste which has gone on year after year and which is reflected in reports prepared by the comptroller general. Rep. Earl Wilson, R-Ind., told the House in a recent speech that the Army had wasted about \$35 million in purchases of radio equipment without competitive bidding. The Navy has achieved even more spectacular feats of flushing public funds down the drain.

The most shocking aspect of this situation is that no one is doing anything about it. Or, anyway, nothing shows on the public record at this time. You might expect the civilian man-