

# The Daily Tar Heel

72 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.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8.00 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.



## Beat Wake Forest—For A Reason

Barring a Chapel Hill monsoon, Carolina's second pep rally of the year will come off tonight, and certainly we have reason to hope and expect a huge crowd and lots of noise.

After all, our Tar Heels enter Saturday's game fresh from one of their greatest intersectional victories. And the student body has already demonstrated its willingness to support the team through pep rallies (witness the record crowd of 4,000 plus which turned out on the eve of the State game).

But we hope that tonight's throng will be especially large and loud, and we'll tell you why—it's the Wake Forest "fan." If ever there was reason to hold a pep rally or win a football game, this is it, for Wake Forest fans are a breed apart from all other followers of sport. Their motto is "if you can't beat 'em, make 'em mad at you."

Carolina, like most everybody else, has had the good fortune to defeat Wake Forest in football for the last couple of years. Ordinarily, you might think that our victories would bring some complimentary remarks concerning our fine teams from followers of the opposition, but this is far from the case. We are frankly tired of hearing

Deacon followers scream "luck" and "dirty" and other unprintable expletives, and neither are we very amused by the fellow at home who hasn't spoken to us for two years following a Carolina football victory.

(But who is the first guy to call us when Wake beats the Heels in basketball? Yep! You guessed it.)

Now perhaps these descriptions don't apply to every Demon Deacon backer. Perhaps these are just malcontents who have become so irritated by losing over the years that they must go around banging on the enemy dugout at baseball games, wearing bright red socks, making an unholy amount of noise in general, and spending more time knocking the opposition than in cheering for their side.

But whatever the reason, it seems pointless to us. And since they don't get any better with winning (after their second victory of this season they were yelling "we're Number One"), we might as well listen to the anguished cries of a loser again this year.

So, if they want to scream, let's give them something to scream about. GET 'EM, HEELS!

## A Gamble That Must Be Taken

From The Franklin Press

"Isn't it dangerous to allow Communists to speak on college campuses?" asks a Press reader in a personal letter to the editor. "After all," continues our correspondent, "aren't most college students ill-informed about American history and woefully ignorant of the reasons for our form of government?"

The answer to both questions, of course, is an emphatic "Yes."

Consider the second question first. It is true that our homes and our schools have done a poor job in educating youth for American citizenship. Most young people know little about the history of their nation and have only the haziest of ideas about such things as our system of government checks and balances and the reasons for these foundation stones in our system of government.

But is the college student in worse position, in this respect, than the average American adult? Even many of the best educated and most intelligent adults, in other fields, are incredibly ignorant of American history and government. If we're going to protect the college student against the false philosophy of Communism, shouldn't we protect the adults also? And if we start doing that, what happens to the basic American concept of freedom of speech? If we're going to protect people

against Communists' ideas—by quarantining those ideas—wouldn't it be logical to protect them against other false ideas? Protect Protestants, for example, against the false ideas of Catholicism and Catholics against the error of Protestantism? Protect Democrats against false philosophy of Republicans and vice versa?

Of course it is dangerous to allow Communists to speak on college campuses! It is always dangerous to give people, students or adults, the freedom to choose between two ideas, two philosophies. But every freedom we Americans possess rests upon that one—upon freedom of the mind. That is why freedom itself is so revolutionary, so dangerous a concept. For people are never really free unless they are free to be wrong.

It's a gamble we have to take. It's a gamble the men who set up this nation had the courage to take. They recognized that sometimes people would make the wrong choice, but they were convinced that most people usually would be able to distinguish the true from the false.

It's a gamble we must continue to take today. It's a gamble we will take, unless we've lost the courage, the faith in humanity, that transformed the highly improbable American dream into the miracle of reality.

## Whither Goeth The Conservative Club?

We view the formation of the Carolina Conservative Club with mixed feelings.

The club, which languished about last year without doing much, seems to have a solid membership, and chances are it will succeed this time around. Such people as Britt Gordon lend a favorable aura to any outfit.

The club can go two ways. It can turn into a true conservative discussion group, or it can turn into just another dismal little club full of dismal little people who sit about and moan and groan of the ills of the world.

There is a crying need for more articulate conservative thought on this campus. For the most part, UNC student organizations are dominated by liberals, and many groups wither because they do nothing but sit about and agree with each other.

We need more and better conservatives in student government and stu-

dent legislature.

Too often we have seen campus right-wingers argue among themselves more than with the opposition. And several students who purport to be conservative are little more than trouble-makers who spend their time trying to undo rather than to do.

This can be the great accomplishment of the CCC. It can encourage conservatives to participate in campus activities, and can provide them with the necessary contacts to truly get on the "inside."

We hope the Club will respond to the needs of the campus, and not spend its time discussing the nastiness of Earl Warren, or other topics generally reserved for a meeting of the John Birch Society.

Conservatives—that is, TRUE conservatives—now have a chance to make themselves known and, hopefully, benefit the campus. We welcome them, and wish them well.

## 'That's Odd; I don't recall rushing Iota Beta Mu Sorority!'



### Letters To The Editors

## The Nature Of Prejudices

### Are Readheads Actually Red?

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I am sure there will be a great deal of sympathy for the ideas suggested by Mr. Murchison in his letter on Tuesday. I am reminded of the case of Hubert Osgoode who came here from somewhere to the east in 1962 and found that his roommate had red hair.

At first the three of us in the room opposite his did not realize what it meant to him, but after a few weeks, during which time he had become steadily paler and developed a nervous tic, he knocked on the door one Thursday evening dressed up and carrying his bags, he stood in the doorway.

"I can't stand it," he said, "his red hair. It is so embarrassing. I've tried coming in late at night after he had gone to bed, but it was no good."

"There it was, staring at me from the pillow; I used to spend sleepless nights trying not to look at it. I'm leaving. Will you return my sheets to the laundry? Goodbye."

And he went before we could reply. We learned later that his mother went into a convent as a result of the shock.

This tragedy and many similar ones could be avoided quite easily if parents were given forms to fill out when their sons were admitted to UNC. Something along these lines perhaps:

"I hereby give permission for my son to room with students who: (Delete as required) have red hair/ have Irish grandparents/ squint/ are not church-going Christians/ snore/ vote Republican/ vote Democrat/ are left-handed/ come from England."

J. A. Coles  
502 Craige

### Racing Drivers Are Sportsmen

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Speaking as a long-time fan of motor racing on two continents, and, more recently, as a reporter of Grand National stock car racing in the South, I would like to offer my two cents worth in reply to the article titled "Racing Fans Seek Violent Spectacles" in the Sept. 29 Daily Tar Heel.

As an avid spectator, I rank it as an unfortunate rather than as an accomplishment that I have witnessed two motor races that were marred by fatal accidents: the Grand Prix of Belgium in 1960 and this year's Charlotte World 600.

I can truthfully say I have never known of any spectator with a genuine interest in racing (and this includes the vast majority of people at any major race) who has gone to a race actually wanting to see a bad accident. Moreover, I have never noticed any mood of lust or satisfaction in the general

spectator public at the announcement of a driver's death.

As a matter of fact, crowds were noticeably more quiet and sober than usual in the above two accidents, and the wins for, respectively, Jack Brabham and Jim Paschal, seemed a bit hollow at the time.

As to the question asked repeatedly by the author of the Sept. 29 article, "Who killed Jim Pardue?" I can offer no answer, because I feel there was no murder involved, as is implied by the word "killed."

Jimmy Pardue, like Fireball Roberts, Dave MacDonald, Carel de Beaufort, and others, was a sportsman dedicated to his sport; a man who had worked years to earn the seat in the stock car he was driving. Jim Pardue was not living under an illusion of security, a condition which any racing driver will tell you is a dangerous one.

He had weighed the consequences of injury or possible death against the fame and satisfaction of competitive spirit accrued by a winner, and his choice was, to his way of thinking, the right one. It sounds rather trite in the wake of such a tragic accident, but who is to say that he did not die as he would have wanted to?

It appears to me, then, that the question to be asked concerning Jimmy Pardue is only whether or not he died in vain, a question which could be debated either way, particularly by proponents of the opinion expressed by the author of the Sept. 29 article.

But the majority of those close to the sport, while greatly saddened by Pardue's death and the

loss of others in this unusually tragic year, would agree that death cannot be entirely in vain when the person in question dies accidentally while voluntarily doing the thing he enjoys most.

Proven statistics show that an average of 14 racing drivers will die per year in motor racing accidents, which, when you consider the number of miles covered at competitive speed each year and the number of people involved, makes this sport considerably "safer" than highway driving or even crossing the street.

There is no comparison between the number of nonfatal injuries in racing and in a sport like high school football; even more deplorably, the football players are often pressured into participating, unlike motor racing, where the driver risks injury totally of his own volition.

No one can say, however, that

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letter-to-the-editor written by a member of the University community, so long as it is free of slanderous and libelous remarks.

No letters will be edited in any way, unless they are unreasonably long. No more than three signatures will be printed for one letter. All letters should be typed and triple-spaced.

DTH offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Edit page material should be turned in two or three days before publication is desired.

## Will Goldwater Push The Button?

By CHUCK NEELY

"Would he push the button?" This is the question which is paramount in the minds of many Americans and which lurks in the hidden recesses of the minds of even the staunchest backers of Barry Goldwater.

The question is a vital one and one which must be answered. For if the Republican nominee is trigger-happy then indeed he must be defeated. The office of the presidency requires a rational and mature man, equal to the great responsibilities of war and peace which have developed on that position.

I believe that there is much misunderstanding about Sen. Goldwater's stand on the use of nuclear weapons, and it is to this point that I will direct my attention. Sen. Goldwater has advocated the release of control of tactical nuclear weapons to the supreme commander of NATO, a step he believes would ensure a battlefield flexibility which does not now exist with the present presidential control of the use of these weapons.

Before a great hue and cry over war mongering goes up,

let us first define "tactical nuclear weapon."

A tactical nuclear weapon is a battlefield device, used on a tactical, short-range basis. An example is the Davy Crockett, an "atomic bazooka" which has the power of 40 tons of TNT and whose refinements have effectively eliminated most of the nuclear radiation which emanates from any atomic blast.

A strategic nuclear weapon is something along the lines of the bomb which leveled Hiroshima, a weapon with a firepower of 20,000 tons of TNT and which is much more radioactive than any tactical weapon.

The junior senator from Arizona has not advocated the releasing of Polaris submarines, Minuteman missiles or strategic bombers with their immensely powerful, wide-range nuclear warheads.

His position, one which bears the force of logic, is that if we do have a limited war we have a weapon expressly tailored to the situation such as a hand grenade, a rifle or an "atomic bazooka," we should use it.

This does not mean that he says that we should go to war, nor does it mean that he wants to give our allies the power to

By ARMISTEAD MAUPIN, JR.

Two weeks ago in New York City it happened for the first time.

Hundreds of white and Negro children were "cross-bussed" out of their own neighborhoods in a massive effort to establish "racial balance" in the city schools.

Under the Cambridge Plan, four largely white elementary schools were paired with four largely Negro schools. Within each pair, the lower grades were sent to one school, while the upper grades were sent to the other.

The following fable appeared in this column exactly a year ago today. Somehow, we can't resist printing it once more. With feeling.

No one questioned the record of Mary Agnes Faircloth.

For 27 years her diligence and integrity had served as a beacon for younger teachers at Herbert T. Mortmain Junior High School. She was a woman of remarkable intelligence, driven by an iron will and a compulsion for perfection.

Things, however, were far from perfect on the morning of September 29, 1966. A pall of uneasiness overhung the teachers' lounge as Mary Agnes Faircloth conversed with young Miss Applebaum of the Mathematics Department.

"I'm in a rather awkward situation, Stella. As you know, the man from the Commission visits the classroom today, and I have a serious racial imbalance in Elementary Sociology."

"That can't be, Miss Faircloth! Your class was reapportioned months ago."

"I know, dear, but the Monroe

boys are out with the mumps, and Rotunda Davis got married last week. I should never have let things slip. My ethnic ratio is dreadfully off kilter. And, today of all days, it just doesn't look right."

The words came slowly, with painful certainty. Miss Applebaum made a serious face. Mary Agnes Faircloth patted her bun nervously and continued.

"Stella, I'm going to ask a favor that I've never asked of another soul on this earth. If it isn't all right, just tell me so. We're friends, and I wouldn't impose for the world."

Miss Applebaum's assenting smile and nod passed unseen by Mary Agnes Faircloth. She was staring out the window at nothing. Her hands clamped onto a chair back as her lips forced out the difficult words.

"Stella, could I possibly borrow three of your Negroes?"

Miss Applebaum's face was at once sympathetic and resolute.

"Oh, Miss Faircloth, I'm so sorry . . . I'm barely up to my own quota . . . Why don't you check with Doris? I understand her Marriage and Family Living class has an underbalance of white children. Perhaps you could trade or something."

"Do you really think so?" said Mary Agnes Faircloth, turning to face her colleague. "I should never have let things slip. I should have seen the Dean of Racial Balance days ago. They'll never . . ."

Miss Applebaum gripped the older woman's hand gently. "You're making too much of this, Miss Faircloth. The Commission can be very generous sometimes."

racing is a "safe" sport. It is not, and any racing driver will be the first to tell you that.

But, like any other sport, its participants and people closely connected with it will defend it, danger notwithstanding, and will oppose any outsider who scans the facts and advocates its abolition or its "gradual phasing out." Racing serves as a proving ground, in its own way, for improving the reliability of the road car, the roadholding of tires and suspension, and the strengthening of safety components in the family automobile.

For the racing driver, it provides a tremendous challenge to his skill to lap a course faster than another man, and a chance for him to publicly demonstrate his skill.

Greg Cagle  
102 Graham

ceeded the number of situations which were not the best organized. Mr. Charles Barwick, whose letter appeared in the Sept. 22 issue of the DTH, implied that the Orientation Program was poorly planned.

I am inclined to disagree with Mr. Barwick on that point. I think the Orientation Committee, and all other personnel involved deserve a hearty congratulation and thank you from the Class of 1968 for the fine job they did during Orientation Week.

In closing, I would like to re-state the credo which Mr. Barwick quoted in his letter and to think of this credo as coming from the Orientation Committee: "Though we are not perfect, at UNC, we strive to be."

Richard L. Yarborough  
311 Manly

### Freshman Lauds Orientation Week

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Regardless of what some people may think, I feel the Orientation Program was excellently executed. If you stop to think how many freshmen entered UNC this fall (about 2,700, I believe) you can realize that there should have been a few mistakes made, because everyone is not perfect.

However, the number of meetings, programs, etc., which were put on right greatly ex-

### Wriggly Protein In Lenoir Diet

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Upon my return to Chapel Hill I once again had the pleasure of dining in Lenoir Hall. Halfway through my meal I found a worm in my food. I received the apologies of the dietitian: "They (i.e. worms) are sometimes found in cabbage." A rather poor excuse, particularly considering that I didn't have any cabbage on my plate.

Roberta Barkoff  
219 E. Cobb

be done in Viet Nam, Goldwater had listed a number of suggestions which others had made and that one of these was defoliation. Never, however, did the Senator himself espouse the plan.

Here are two specific issues concerning the use of nuclear weapons where the Republican presidential nominee has been misquoted and his ideas distorted. One wonders how often this process of muddling the truth has taken place . . .

The issue of war and peace is a truly vital one for this nation. War could well mean the destruction of much of our world and the complete changing of life as we know it.

Neither candidate favors a nuclear holocaust. Each is opposed to an armed confrontation of East and West. Each has a strategy to offer which may hold the answers to our international problems today.

Let us discuss their strategies rationally and then make our decision, but let us not emotionally throw out the charge of war monger or of being trigger-happy at either candidate, without a clear understanding of the issues which confront us.