

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR

Of Black And White Ghettos

"Within the white ghetto of North Carolina, the best people — 'best' in terms of common sense, integrity, sanity — the best people in this white ghetto are Klansmen."

This statement by Pete Young, WRAL-TV newscaster, was perhaps the only new concept of the Klan offered at Monday night's panel discussion in Memorial Hall.

More than 1,600 students, and a number of quiet Klansmen, heard Congressman Charles L. Weltner, CORE Chairman Floyd McKissick, Major L. P. McLendon and Young discuss the Klan, why it exists and what can be done about it.

Weltner, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, said he attacks the Klan because of its terrorist activities, not its beliefs. McLendon, a Greensboro lawyer, said the South is not wholly to blame for the Klan because it all really began up North. McKissick, a Durham lawyer and civil rights leader, said the Klan is here because we allow a climate to exist where it can and will grow.

We have heard all this before.

But Young referred to President Johnson's personal attack on the Klan and his plea for a "return to decent society." Young denied that we have a decent society, "and until we do, the suffering people of the Carolina Klan will stay right where they are," he said.

Our society is indecent, he said, and it is looking for a scapegoat — which happens to be the Klan. "That's the easy road, and the fatal one," he said. He issued a "desperate message for help" from the "white ghetto of the Carolina Klan."

His point is one which is seldom made, and although his broad assumptions about the "best" people in white ghettos and the decency of society are at best questionable, we cannot go so far as Major McLendon and deny that white ghettos exist.

All Rise For 'Dixie'

Greensboro Daily News

The editors of the North Carolina State Technician who stuffily call upon performing groups to ban "Dixie" from public rendition utterly miss the point. So, for that matter, do their somber critics who angrily urge its preservation, along with grins and battle flags, as regional museum pieces.

Their ambitions are unduly modest. Far from being banned because "Dixie" stirs a response "that might be termed Pavlovian" of shouts and stomps and song, it really should be pushed to replace "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem.

If a moment of irreverence may be pardoned, "The Star-Spangled Banner" has no equal as a wet blanket of an anthem. This musicalogical monstrosity, refurbished from an old English drinking song, always leaves the question whether its composer, writing for the grog trade, had not rather heavily partaken before setting quill to paper.

The world has its fine patriotic anthems — some somber and stirring like "God Save The Queen" or Haydn's "Deutschland Uber Alles"; some vigorous and bracing, like "Dixie" and "La Marseillaise." But it was a bad day on Capitol Hill those three-odd decades ago when Congress capitulated to whatever tone-deaf lobby inspired the adoption of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem. To sing one verse of it is to risk hospitalization for laryngitis or ennuui or both, and all four verses shouldn't have happened to George III himself.

What a musical marvel, by contrast, is "Dixie"! Written as a Yankee spoof on the eve of Fort Sumter, its stirring melody and agreeable lyrics caught on and quickly gave it quasi-official status as an anthem of the Lost Cause.

Now we think the era of Lost Cause parochialism for "Dixie," which is unworthy of it, is outdated.

The Technician editors were commendably concerned lest it comfort "unreconstructed Southerners" and discomfort their enemies. But the history of a rousing anthem can't be held against it. In France the royalist today sings "La Marseillaise" with all the fervor of the sansculott; and in America, there is as much to be said for "frosty mornings" in Dixieland as for a symbolic triumph over the British in Baltimore harbor.

If "Dixie's" friends — as stirred by its strains as they are bored by those of "The Star-Spangled Banner" — should push it seriously as a competitor for national song there would really be no contest. On musical merits, it would topple "The Star-Spangled Banner" tomorrow.

And why not?

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; Barry Jacobs, associate editor; Pat Stith, managing editor; Andy Myers, news editor; Gene Rector, sports editor; Jim Coghill, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; Ed Freakley, John Greenbacker, Lynne Harvel, David Rothman, Wayne Hurder, staff writers; Bill Hass, Bill Rollings, Ron Shinn, Sandy Treadwell, sports writers.

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. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all ap news dispatches.

"Hell With It; Get Me A Box of Cards Too!"



The Student Speaks

Capitalism Belongs In World Today

Editor's Note: Ludwig von Mises speaks tonight in Gerrard Hall at 8, sponsored by the Carolina Conservative Club.

By WILSON CLARK, JR.

Perhaps the most common, and certainly most persistent complaint, that the advocates of capitalism must contend with is the argument that "capitalism was fine for a simple, agrarian society, but surely one must recognize the necessity for strong governmental planning in today's complex world."

This argument appears reasonable on the surface, but looking underneath this clever rubric, one discovers that it is only a paper argument, that in actuality, this example overlooks the long-range significance and consequences of capitalism.

Again I turn to the most distinguished advocate of the capitalist system, Dr. Ludwig von Mises, and particularly his small but powerful volume, *Bureaucracy* (Yale, New Edition, 1962). In this book, first published in 1944, Dr. von Mises examines the fundamental aspects of the free economy versus the planned economy.

His interesting analysis concerns the perennial problem of the socialists and interventionists, the actual mechanism of state planning. Professor Mises contrasts this form of planning, which he terms "bureaucratic management," with the structure of planning evidenced by the capitalist system, or "profit management."

Mises observes that in the capitalist system, the entrepreneur depends on the mech-

anism of the free market, as it is affected by his economic decisions, whereas under the socialist system, in which there is no free market, the entrepreneur depends on the state. Herein lies the fracture. How does the state know how to set prices, for example?

Before answering this, let us return to the capitalist system, and examine the nature of its economic decisions and calculations.

The capitalist entrepreneur must produce according to the wishes of the people, the consumers, or he loses his job. As Mises observes, "The capitalists, the entrepreneurs, and the farmers are the people's mandarins. If they do not obey, if they fail to produce, at the lowest possible cost, what the consumers are asking for, they lose their office."

On the other hand, in the socialist system, no such automatic check and balance regulator is present. Instead of one's success depending on profit and loss, the system shifts to the bureaucrat's whim. Mises states: "A government is not a profit-seeking enterprise. The conduct of its affairs cannot be checked by profit-and-loss statements. Its achievement cannot be valued in terms of money."

Carrying the argument to its predestined conclusion, Mises reveals the true weakness of planning, the stigma of socialism, with his analysis of "the unavoidable weakness of any administration of public affairs."

"The lack of standards which could, in

Court Ruling Is Right

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Before everyone begins ranting and raving about the Supreme Court's "one man vote" ruling as being, in Barry Jacobs' words (DTH, Dec 10), "illogical", "unfair", "a bad decision", and "not making sense," let us remember that the United States Congress was set up with one house apportioned according to population and the other by state as a compromise between federal authority and state sovereignty.

Towns, cities, counties and districts, however, have never been vested with any sovereignty rights under the state. Therefore, on this basis the Supreme Court can logically and understandably order any state which has apportioned its legislature on the basis of any other model than "one man - one vote" to make the necessary changes.

Pete Campbell
413 Patterson Place

Ehringhaus Here, Too

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

We in Ehringhaus do things in a slower more deliberate manner. We have never and never will stoop to compete with other dormitories or residence colleges. We sit back, struggle forward, and learn. In the Dec. 12 article written by Allen Warren, we were ignored, and the campus was given a thrilling report on the activities of our near neighbors.

We have never considered ourselves to be in a death race with any other living

unit. We do not spread over campus every minute detail of what we do, we don't feel that it is necessary to advertise.

We do hold several unique positions! We feel that in the case of Morrison as a mother feels when her children grow up and leave home. Byron McCoy, the present Governor over there, had his dynamic beginning as a leader in Ehringhaus, and gained many of his talents while serving here last year as President, as well as stylist of a small unique "in crowd" leadership group.

Architecturally, we are not the same as Craige and Morrison, in that we lack numerous areas for study and social functions on the numerous floors of our unit. We gave up our recreation room so that South Campus might have a dining facility, which is now the athletic dining hall, with the completion of Chateau Chase.

We are allowed to use our small study room for dances, but this eliminates any place to study. There is a small room on our ground floor which should be used as a Go Go Club or a Cowboy lounge, but it is presently being used as an occasional study area for various athletic groups, although the sole use of this facility has been begrudgingly promised us over and over again.

We have suffered from apathy, but this is due to many reasons. This year, however, we have many active people, especially among our 400 freshmen. As for rank we may not be on top, but let's just set the record straight. We are number one in the production of campus leaders, we are first to have a legal residence hall Constitution (which has been copied at times almost verbatim by Craige, Morrison, and Scott Colleges), and we are number one as far as dormitory newspapers are concerned.

Furthermore we were the first to have a Residence College Senate, and we presently hold more dorm offices, class offices and student government committee positions than any other campus group.

And finally we will be the first to enter the Residence College system Constitutionally and on our own without the help or pushing from any other campus group.

E. Allen Shepard
Speaker of the
Ehringhaus Senate
535 Ehringhaus
Robert Cherry
5th floor Senator
536 Ehringhaus
Boyd Garber
Trouble Shooter
536 Ehringhaus

Hints For Jennings

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I would like to comment on Mike Jennings' Sunday column, "Quarterly Has Bad Fiction". It is encouraging to see that the Tar Heel had found a place for literary criticism. Now it needs only to find a literary (or even literate) critic.

Certainly Mr. Jennings is entitled to his opinions, because the final critic of any story (or newspaper column) is the reader. But his criticism, rather than being incisive or constructive, merely consists of a series of wildly thrown barbs and sophomoric statements on "what good fiction should be."

He refers to the Quarterly's short stories as incoherent, pop art, and "totally incomprehensible." In reading the stories in question, I found these remarks to reflect more on Mr. Jennings than on the work he attacks. He concludes by calling the authors "beatniks," which I suppose these days is "The unkindest cut of them all."

I have a few suggestions for Mr. Jennings. He asks, "What's the good of mirroring our culture?" I suggest that he reconsider his role of journalist if he cannot answer that question himself.

He states, "Good writers—and great writers—don't preach the doctrine of despair." I suggest he read a little thing called "Hamlet."

He decides, "Our great American writers are gone." I suggest he read some Bellow, some Nabokov, or some Malamud. I suggest that he talk less about great writing and art and that he sit down at his typewriter and try to turn some out.

I suggest that he, rather than labeling people whom he doesn't know as "beatniks," go out and find what makes an individual tick, what motivates an individual who could write a story he doesn't like. He may find the material for a fine short story.

Ben L. Jones
40 Rogerson Dr.

Mike Jennings

Quarterly Can Speak For Us

You know what I'd like to see in the Carolina Quarterly? I'd like to see a story about a couple who falls in love playing sex bowl football.

You know what else I'd like to see in the Carolina Quarterly? I'd like to see a story about what happens when a fire breaks out in a girls' dormitory. I'd like to read a story about a student politician who breaks down, or about Silent Sam, or sex in the Arboretum, or about love and hate and passion and jealousy in general at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

I probably won't get to read those stories. I think that's because the kind of people that could write them don't. The people that like to sit alone and spin out stories from their own minds do write. The people who get out and see, feel, touch, hear, smell and give don't write.

At least they don't write for the Carolina Quarterly. They may write for their English classes or for their dorm newspaper, but not for the Quarterly.

Well, some of them ought to write for the Quarterly, because the Quarterly can do something that themes and newspapers can't. It can capture and crystallize the spirit of this generation of Carolina student.

But people that feel that spirit never think of writing stories about it. There are plenty of people who could write them. Let's take a hypothetical, semi-literate business administration major named Bill who thinks a plot is something a homesteader gets from the government.

Bill can't spell a lick. But if his heart goes out to the fellow down the hall who washed out of school, to the economics professor who skips his dinner to drive the marginal propensity to consume through Bill's thick skull, to the boys in Conner sighting in on the girls in Winston—if he loves this old campus with all he's got,

then Bill's a born writer. I wish he'd write for the Carolina Quarterly.

The Quarterly isn't exactly a topic of burning interest around here, but it could be. It could be if old Bill would write a story in five to ten-letter words about the time his car wouldn't start at W. C. and he had to ask to sleep in a girls' dorm lobby because he was broke and it was cold and all the girls mothered him in the morning.

If people like Bill would get together and put out a Carolina Quarterly, we'd have a publication that spoke for us, that told how we feel. It could tell our parents, the Legislature, posterity—and ourselves—just what we are.

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 limited to about 250-300 words. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel. Longer letters will be considered for "The Student Speaks" if they are of sufficient interest. However, the DTH reserves the right to use contributed materials as it sees fit.

