

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.

DTH Editor Ernie McCrary is in the infirmary. During his absence the associate editor will serve as acting editor. Expressions of opinion appearing in this column do not necessarily reflect the views of the editor.

Monday's Space Flight

Greensboro Daily News

It is a measure of how blasé we have become about manned space flight that the preparations for the mission on Monday of Gemini 6 have gone almost unattended by publicity.

More than anything, this is a tribute to the success of the entire space program. Through six missions in Project Mercury and three in project Gemini, no lives have been lost — or, for that matter, seriously endangered.

The dangers are there, however, and during the flight of Gemini 6 they may be greater than in any previous mission. They will be posed not by the length of the flight — it is expected to end after a day or two — but by its complexity: for the first time, man will attempt to rendezvous and dock one space vehicle with another.

At least an hour and 41 minutes before Gemini VI is launched, an unmanned Atlas-Agena rocket will be put into orbit. When Astronauts Walter Schirra and Thomas P. Stafford follow it skyward in Gemini 6, their task will be to link up with it.

Yet whatever the dangers, the astronauts are well trained and the control centers remarkably resourceful; the mission would not be undertaken if space authorities were not confident of its success.

A Pretty Protest

Durham Morning Herald

Of all the petty, misdirected protests against this country's role in Viet Nam, burning one's draft card is the pettiest, most misdirected.

It is on a par with the shows put on a decade ago by fundamentalist preachers who burned revised editions of the Bible before carefully invited audiences of newsmen and photographers.

Perhaps Congress inadvertently encouraged this nonsense by making destruction of draft cards a federal offense and thus offering an easy way to indulge the martyr complex that seems so much a part of the Viet Nam protest movement.

Those with an honest religious aversion to military service can far better demonstrate their belief and move others by the hard process of becoming a conscientious objector.

If there were enough young men willing to make such painful demonstrations of protest, we have no doubt they would indeed make an impact on this country. But when a few seize on the flashy, contrived idea of flouting a dubious regulation, their power to move anyone is small and fleeting.

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom. The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Ernie McCrary, editor; John Jenrich, associate editor; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thomas, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobol, ad. mgr.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514.

'Let's Go Sunshine — It's Tennis Time!'



Chip Barnard THE DAILY TAR HEEL

UNC And SPU Are Now Bound Together In Carolinian Minds

By FRED R. HARWELL

The time has come for student government to take action in the face of a grave danger to the University — a danger that already has attacked and weakened Carolina and a danger the student government can best and most effectively quell.

"We're from the University of North Carolina" read one of the signs carried last weekend by a picketing member of the Student Peace Union when that group paraded around the John F. Kennedy Special Forces Center at Ft. Bragg.

Why the sign reading "We're from the University of North Carolina"? This is an excellent question. It has not been answered, but the obvious reason is that it was an attempt to link in some way the name of this University with the activities of the Student Peace Union.

Considering the circumstances, it was a crude but well-timed move. It is just such campus radicals as these that lend justification all over the state to the speaker ban law. Twist motives and talk of legalities all you will, a majority of North Carolinians who support the law will say they do because of "those beatniks" at Carolina.

It would, of course, be impossible to convince any intelligent person who is aware of the proportions of the facts that UNC has been taken over by the SPU and its radical approach to reality, or that the SPU is but an extension — or a voice — of secret views held by a University that is seeking to put an ultra-liberal or even communist hex on the young minds of this state.

There is no question whatsoever that the sign carrying pickets at Ft. Bragg last

weekend damaged this University. There is little question these same pickets will go on damaging this University in the future, unless they are stopped. Whether their views inadvertently correspond or conflict with the dominant strain of thought on campus, 20 do not represent 12 thousand. This misrepresentation will continue until something is done about it. It is for student government to take action.

Why student government? Obviously, for students to take action themselves would be the most effective means of eliminating the blight. Aside from the fact that students would be censoring students, they would at the same time be demonstrating the true feelings of at least a majority of the student body and expressing those feelings through an organ that could rightfully say: "We're from the University of North Carolina." Secondly, action by student leaders would absolve the University administration of the chance that it might have to take action sometime in the future to restrict student freedoms. The tolerance of the administration has a limit. It must not be exceeded.

What action? That is up to student government leaders. Those leaders should bear in mind, however, that the pickets last weekend broke federal laws and endangered the security of a United States military reservation. Although a precedent was set during the racial demonstrations here that participants would not be tried by the student courts for activities that resulted in civil or criminal actions, that precedent does not apply in the case of the SPU pickets last weekend, for two reasons. First, and of least consequence, their actions at Ft. Bragg last weekend carried far greater ramifications than did any civil rights demonstration in Chapel Hill.

The picketers at the special forces center did not merely lie down in front of the traffic in a small town of 13,000, they attempted to interfere in operations of global significance. Secondly, the picketers defeated any hope of using the precedent as a defense by the very sign they carried. "We're from the University of North Carolina" clearly takes the demonstration at Ft. Bragg out of the realm of personal or moral convictions. It drags in every student who attend this University, and makes it impossible for any single individual who took part in the demonstration to defend his actions on the grounds he meant to express his opinion and his alone.

In its mildest interpretation, the demonstration at Ft. Bragg was "ungentlemanly." Student Government takes action when somebody makes a scene in front of thirty-five thousand fans at a football game and drinks too much. It is time Student Government did something about those who made a scene in front of four and one-half million North Carolinians — and the rest of the world, too.

Letters To The Editor

LETTERS

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters must be typed, double spaced and must include the name and address of the author or authors. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel.

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

On October 25, 1965 Dr. Erik von Kuehnelt - Leddihn will speak in 08 Peabody Hall, at 8 p.m. Dr. Kuehnelt - Leddihn informs us (the Carolina Conservative Club) that he prefers an openly hostile audience to a passive one, that he welcomes debate with the left.

Dr. Kuehnelt - Leddihn follows in the Middle European "Neo-Liberal" tradition, classifying 'liberals' into four basic schools: (1) "Pre-Liberalism: This was best represented by Adam Smith who was strongly deistic and advocated an economic philosophy which emphasized Freedom." (2) "Early Liberalism: This philosophy of the early 19th century placed less emphasis on economics. The most able writers of the group were Alexis de Tocqueville, Lord Acton, and Jacob Burckhardt."

Tocqueville once said 'I love with passion freedom, legality, and respect for rights — but not democracy. . . Liberty is the foremost of my passions.' Burckhardt, 'foreseeing the drive toward identity,' wrote 'tyranny will raise its head in the next (the 20th) century.'

(3) "Late Liberalism: This school, best exemplified by the Manchesterians and Herbert Spencer, was strongly economic. Unlike the Pre-Liberals, their intellectual forebears, they were often agnostic, leading to their condemnation by Pius IX." (4) "Neo-Liberalism: This school derives its intellectual inspiration from the Early Liberals. They are strongly Manchesterian, oppose government intervention, seek to preserve competition, but unlike the Late Liberals, have a theological foundation for their philosophy of freedom."

Dr. Kuehnelt - Leddihn challenges the very intellectual identity of those on the American left, terming it "pure instinct," while stating that intellectual diversity is much stronger on the right: "it has a purely intellectual basis, wanting others to be not like themselves."

This gentleman's reputation as a scholar and a critic is most impressive. Having taught at Georgetown University, Fordham University and Chestnut Hill College in the United States, and Beaumont College in England, Dr. Kuehnelt - Leddihn's experience in the academic community is substantial. In addition, he has contributed to Commonweal, America, Modern Age, and is currently European correspondent for National Review magazine.

This distinguished scholar challenges the latter-day liberal, and is prepared to engage all comers.

Wilson A. Clark, Jr. President Carolina Conservative Club

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Wednesday's DTH brought to light a real atrocity. I had no idea campus coeds had to make their beds by ten o'clock. "This policy (of bed making and/or dual standards) is an anachronism," intone three Cobb girls. From this statement it logically follows that the policy in question was fitting for the coed of yesteryear. Hence, taken at their word, the coeds of today must be of better stuff than their ancestors.

Sadly, most males will admit they aren't the men their fathers were. This being true, and men and women being equal up to now in the eyes of God and nature, women have obviously become better than men. In this case, the dual standard should not be abolished but reversed!

Might I suggest that dorm girls take a page from the sorority book and employ white jacketed male wretches to perform the bothersome household tasks no modern woman should know. Perhaps a Boys Bed-making Corps, the BBC, would be in order. They could make girls' beds (bringing to mind an old proverb) at that impossible hour of ten. The BBC would help boys dislocated in this sexual revolution. Also, the paltry wages (one shouldn't overpay a boy, he'll get uppity) would help finance the expensive weekend entertainments necessary for us drones to amuse today's intellectually jaded coed.

In my petty male way I've always harbored a grudge against dorm rule 15, which prevents me from taking my bicycle, or parts thereof, to bed with me during scary thunderstorms.

Dave Fox 128 Parker

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Are the "Craigie Dormitory boys" really inept? Only to those other dormitories who merely boast of their greatness, especially Morrison Dormitory, may the men of Maverick House appear to be inept.

Inept at what? At the underhand tactics of stealing and humiliation, we may be inept, but at carrying on worthwhile and outstanding activities, we are not. Who was the leading dormitory while Morrison was still an architect's problem struggling to raise its head above the mud and muck of Schroeder's Swamp? Maverick House, that's who.

Among the activities beneficial to both residents of Maverick House and the University carried on at Maverick House are the first successful inter-dormitory govern-

ing body, the Speaker Forum, the Outstanding Professor Award, the Motorcycle Scramble and the Gymkhana, and its own newspaper, the Tarpit. What has Morrison done?

Morrison said we couldn't get our gong back. We knew where it was, and we had formulated a plan on how to get it back, but we were asked by Dean Long and Chief Beaumont to refrain from disturbing Morrison's tranquility in order to return our gong to its noble institution.

Morrison had our gong, but the thieves were not men enough to return it in person. Instead they put it in an elevator and arranged the return in such a manner so as to humiliate Maverick House. Their attempts were unsuccessful. They only proved that there are some residents at Morrison who are childish and immature. Morrison's motto must be: If you can't beat them, play Mickey Mouse games and try to humiliate them.

Maverick House is number one and will continue to be number one. The only thing we have to worry about, as far as Morrison is concerned, is getting something stolen or getting hit by paper airplanes.

Louis J. Sipka, Jr. 219 Maverick House

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

"Inept?" Not the men, the boys of "Big Morri." Stealthily, with prowess and audacity the Moes infiltrated the hallowed halls of the "old Mave" and proceeded with the utmost of skill and polish to capture their prize. Their quest for the Golden Gong successful, the Moes had made a name for themselves. No longer need the marauding Moes be overshadowed by the daring deeds of the Mavericks, for they had profaned the unguarded, sanctified chambers of the Golden Gong and had taken it for their own.

Back into the dreary swamps went the "Moorisins." Their quest was won, their cause lost. "All that glitters is not gold." In uncouth hands the Golden Gong was not a symbol of prestige and spirit, but a disdainful piece of booty. Tired of that unwieldy toy, of gloating in their fleeting moment of stolen glory, beset upon by Chief Beaumont and other Mavericks, the Moes returned their ill-gotten prize with typical backwoods protocol and aptitude. Perhaps if accomplishment came as easy as stealing a gong, Morrison could, in fact, become number one.

Ralph C. Kirby 527 Maverick House

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I was quiet impressed by Alden E. Lind's recent essay on Maupinism versus SPU'ism (Oct. 21, DTH). Seldom does one find such prose agility and command of the English language; and he argued his point with an engrossing clarity.

However, this dexterity does not make his reasoning correct.

For instance, I fail to recall a single case before now in which a group that, after turning its back on its country, was labeled as "patriotic." Nor have I ever known of a group which, having publicly 'demeaned its country in the eyes of the world was called "responsible citizens." I always thought that those people who actively supported an enemy to his nation were called traitors.

Lind, however, has taken just such a group, the Student Peace Union, and cuddled them in the arms of moral satire like a whipped puppy. Even in the face of the SPU's recent actions martyring the Viet Cong and decrying U. S. "intervention," he fails to see that this puppy is rabid to American democracy. Their aims are not, as Lind implies, to strengthen our democracy by exercising "the critical responsibilities of American citizenship," but to undermine it in every way possible. They hide behind a cloak of respect for the blood of young Americans in South Viet Nam to spit on human nobility. They spray mud on the robe of national integrity by openly supporting Communist aggression. To these creatures of vile reasoning, I offer nothing but animosity.

Proudly, then, I place myself, along with Armistead Maupin and the majority of Carolina students, in the rank of those Lind has chosen to call "impenetrably stupid." If I must be "impenetrably stupid" to support the righteous cause of my country, then I say so be it.

Russell A. Marlon 434 Cameron Ave.

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

As I was standing in the YMCA building this morning (Oct. 20), the campus SPU chairman, Charles Schunior, came in. I think that the reason my attention was focused on him was due to his unusual manner of dress — a clean shirt and tie. He proceeded to the other side of the bulletin board, where the "For Rent" notices are displayed. As most people probably know, each notice is on a 3 x 5 card and is separately attached to the board by a single thumb tack. Or, at least they were.

What Schunior was doing was removing thumb tacks from some of the notices and then attaching two notices together with one thumb tack. He then took the thumb tacks which he had "obtained" and went outside, whereupon he tacked up a sign which asked people to contribute money to the SPU so that the SPU could contribute it to CARE. I would suggest that the SPU take the first fifteen cents from their contributions (assuming they collected at least that much) and go just a few steps further into the Y and purchase a small box of thumb tacks.

Leon W. Barber 170 Bagley Drive