

The Daily Tar Heel

70 Years of Editorial Freedom

Published daily except Mondays, examinations 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.

Entered as 2nd class matter at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.

Shifting The Onus Of 'Gradualism'

Since we stopped publishing two weeks ago during final exams, the civil rights situation in Chapel Hill has deteriorated considerably. Resentment is bubbling in all directions and there have been several incidents of violence.

Thanks to the cool-headed efforts of Police Chief William D. Blake and his firm police force, however, there appears to be little likelihood that things will get seriously out of hand. Chief Blake has made it clear he and his men will countenance no incidents from anyone, and for this he deserves the sincere gratitude of everyone.

Students, as well as townspeople and others, who think it might be cute to heckle or harass demonstrators, should remember this. If it has nothing else, Chapel Hill has an integrated jail.

Now what about the situation? Where is all of this protest and resentment leading?

That's the million-dollar question. From here, things look rather bleak, and chances for any sort of honorable solution to our situation appear slim indeed. The civil rights demonstrators are not about to cease dramatizing their desire for an end to segregation in Chapel Hill; the Board of Aldermen is no more likely to pass a public accommodations ordinance now than it was before demonstrations began.

One fact needs to be reported, however. It is that the civil rights movement here is gaining grass-roots

strength among local, older Negroes. This appears to be related to the fact that demonstration leaders are beginning to move into the areas of employment and housing discrimination, which are infinitely more important to Negro parents than being able to eat where they wish to.

Our own position remains the same as it has been. We subscribe to the ends of the demonstrators and we appreciate the fact that there has been little progress towards racial equality without prodding from demonstrators. We challenge the basic premise of many whites who sincerely believe in the cause of equality but think "gradualism" is the only way to achieve it. For their basic premise is that the Negro must bear the onus of "gradualism," not the recalcitrant white. We think it is about time that the owners of Chapel Hill's few remaining segregated businesses bear this onus—that they get used to the idea of serving all on an equal basis, rather than requiring the Negro to wait until they are ready to serve him. This goes for the areas of employment, education and housing as well.

We think it is a position deserving of neither praise nor condemnation. It is the only honorable course open to us all as Americans and as human beings. The sooner we recognize this and act accordingly, the sooner will demonstrations here and elsewhere be unnecessary.

A Significant New Mood Of Desperation

The Rev. Mr. B. Elton Cox, a militant integration leader from High Point, N. C., has raised the ghastly spectre of the possibility of self-immolation in Chapel Hill. Speaking at the First Baptist Church Sunday afternoon, Cox told about 250 whites and Negroes that he is considering burning himself, and suggested other Negroes do the same. "If these Negroes can don uniforms to fight for the United States in foreign countries, then they certainly ought to be able to give their lives for the basic right of human dignity in their homeland," he said.

Cox has brought to light a prospect too hideous to imagine, but one that

would surely generate reactions on both sides that would be unparalleled by the demonstrations to date. But what would be the effect of this threat if it were carried out? We have serious doubts that the phoenix of understanding and racial equality would arise from these flames, but rather the opposite might well occur. We might find the Barnetts and Wallaces warning their hands over the fire as the United States is unfairly embarrassed over a problem that most people are conscientiously trying to solve.

Cox says he is advocating others to do the same thing. This is grossly irresponsible and unfair on his part. If the Rev. Mr. Cox decides against self-immolation, but reaches others sufficiently dedicated and sufficiently unbalanced to burn themselves, their death would be on his hands. We doubt Cox really wants that burden to carry.

But the fact that we must, at least emotionally, feel the prospect of a self-immolation to be remote should not hide from us what we must learn from what Cox said. It provides a shocking insight into the Negroes' deep-seated frustration and the means to which he could go in venting this frustration. It also provides stark insight into the growing bitterness of many Negroes over the white man's never-ending counsels of "patience."

It is obvious we had best take note of this new note of desperation, and take note quickly.

Gary Blanchard, Dave Ethridge
Co-Editors

Business Manager Art Pearce
Managing Editor Fred Seely
Advertising Manager Fred McConnell
Associate Editor Hugh Stevens
News Editor Bob Samsot
Photo Editor Jim Wallace
Sports Editor Curry Kirkpatrick
Asst. Sports Editor John Montague

Reporters:
Mickey Blackwell, Administration
Peter Wales, Campus Affairs

Editorial Assistants:
Linda Riggs
Dale Keyser
Shirley Travis

Contributing Writers:
Jim Neal
John Greenbacker
Suzy Sterling

Jesse And The DTH: The WCHL Interview

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Since several references have been made to WCHL's October interview with Jesse Helms and the tape recording of it in our files, it seems appropriate to clear the air concerning just what we have recorded.

Because of an engineer's nightmare, a once-in-a-thousand-interviews technical problem caused a vital portion of Mr. Helms' comments to be lost. They were missed when an overheated tape recorder just decided to stop working. However, enough of what he said is still on tape to generally conclude that (1) indeed, as he has said since, he did not offer to debate the Daily Tar Heel editors on his station but, (2) neither did he specify that his "prime time" for a "confrontation" would be given only to Messrs. Friday and/or Aycock.

Following is a transcript of the portion of the interview with WCHL's Flip Latham relating to the proposed debate. It be-

gins with a discussion of the Tar Heel's invitation to Mr. Helms to come to Chapel Hill to debate the Communist speaker bar law:

HELMS: "...I would question your statement that the students are more affected than anyone else (referring to a statement earlier in the conversation by Latham) that is at least not res ipso loquitur... it's debatable. They (the DTH editors) say they cannot get anybody (to debate). They have invited Clarence Stone, I believe. They have invited Mr. Orange County Representative Phipps, but isn't it curious to you that they haven't invited even one of the legislators who signed the bill?"

LATHAM: Well, I think it is, yes. But...

HELMS: Would you want to explain that for me?

LATHAM: No, sir, I was just trying to get your opinions. I don't know too much about it.

I got back in the States just about the time that this thing went through the legislature.

HELMS: Well, I would think that it would, of course I'm not a college editor and I don't think like one obviously, but if I were going to get someone to defend a bill that had been passed by the legislative body, I would first think of the person who wrote the bill, who happens to be Secretary of State Thad Eure and the Attorney General of North Carolina. I would certainly invite the Attorney General who has defended it. I would consider inviting the Assistant Attorney General who wrote a very comprehensive brief on the subject. I don't know that I would first go to a legislator. I don't know whether Mr. Phipps signed the bill or not. I think he did not. I would not necessarily go to the presiding officer of the Senate. I would get somebody... and I certainly wouldn't go to an editor of a newspaper or of a tele-

vision station, regardless of how emphatic anyone of these men had been. Now, secondly, are you aware of the nature of the invitation?

LATHAM: What do you mean exactly, sir?

HELMS: Have you read the letter which extended the invitation?

LATHAM: No, I understand from the editor that first of all an excerpt from the editorial was sent out to each of you, and then after that a formal request was made. Now, that's what the editor of the Daily Tar Heel says.

HELMS: Well, the first I knew of it I received a tear sheet from the editor with a terse note asking me to come to the campus. The letter in no way described the nature or the size of the suggested meeting, where or how it would be conducted, or under whose sponsorship it would be held. I'll tell you the truth. Even if I had been invited to defend mother-

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Since my graduation from the University in February of 1961, I have done my best to keep abreast of the University, its problems and accomplishments. Certainly, those of you who are students now have been witness and/or participant to many events. Since 1961, UNC has been frequented by crisis, conflict and excitement of several kinds.

My subscription to The Daily Tar Heel has enabled me to keep up with these events. The Gag Law (and along with it the charge by some North Carolinians that Chapel Hill is infested with Communism), the racial demonstrations that have just recently encountered such baseless, the apartment rule last spring and the accompanying implication that the faculty and administration are removing some of the student autonomy, the "anti-fraternity movement," Otelia Conner, and the great UNC victory in the 1963 Gator Bowl, to name a few.

The Gag Law, to be sure, handcuffs us all—the state, the nation, and, of course, the University and its inherent right to impart the truth. Chancellor William B. Aycock has been infinitely bold and courageous on our behalf. He has fought and is fighting like a champion to rid the school of such a handicap. This handicap is now spelled out in capitals with the realization that it is delaying if not preventing the American Physical Society from meeting here in 1965.

That Chapel Hill is infested with Communism is also a misdirected charge. Most any town that houses and is dependent upon a genuine university must reflect the somewhat liberal attitudes of that university. Whenever there is real freedom there will be extremism, both right and left, to some degree. More rigid controls over such liberties usually serve as a catalyst, increasing such extremism.

Since the late '50's there have been civil rights demonstrations

in Chapel Hill. When I was a student most attempts were directed to the desegregation of the local theatres. These demonstrations were orderly and peaceful.

Today they seem to be of a different personality, perhaps because the places that are not desegregated have held out so adamantly since this all began. Thus, they are the most determined not to desegregate. On the other hand, CORE and NAACP seem to be strongly organized in Chapel Hill now, and they are just as adamant in wanting to achieve equal rights for all. Certainly this is a worthy objective and we should all strive for it. But, let us not be intolerant and let us not be caught in the emotional frenzy which sometimes accompanies self-righteousness. Our adversaries have given us the example of how not to behave.

I wish to congratulate those of you who have fought for student autonomy. Certainly, it is one of UNC's virtues and bulwarks of strength as a University. For years the University administration has prided itself on the very fact that it has encouraged student autonomy and that it has complemented the well-being of the academic atmosphere. To allow the administration to remove these student powers would result in a genuine loss to the students as well as an atmosphere of hypocrisy.

During the past few years the UNC fraternities have faced severe criticism—from the DTH staff, students, and occasionally, the faculty. Obviously, any worth-

Which?

Editors, The Tar Heel:

You can hit a man on the head with the butt of a gun and injure his brain. There are laws against this. You can hit a man's self-respect with a "WHITE ONLY" sign and injure both his personality and his spirit. Which is the greater crime?

Closs Peace Wardlaw

while system or organization can stand criticism and constructive criticism can be helpful.

I feel that I can speak with some authority on fraternities as I was initiated at Miami University of Ohio (generally considered the "Mother of Fraternities" as Beta Theta Pi, Phi Delta and Sigma Chi were all founded there) and transferred my membership to a UNC fraternity. During my experiences as Secretary of the IFC at Chapel Hill, I came face to face with many of the current problems.

Sure, there is discrimination within the fraternities. I personally fought this issue in my own house as we had unknowingly pledged a Jewish boy. Most of us wanted to initiate him, despite threats from our national chapter that they would withdraw our chapter. In the end,

Face The Facts

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I have been impressed by the position of THE TAR HEEL on the racial situation in Chapel Hill. We cannot solve this problem by burying our heads in the sand. It seems to me that too many whites are prone to take refuge in every possible legality, while all around us swirls the overwhelming, real issue—the question of morality. And then they wonder what is going on, and why there can't be peace for a while longer.

It should be obvious by now that there will never be any peace until we stop trying to take refuge in legalities—whatever merit they may in themselves possess—and face the real issue. Certainly, the businessman may at present refuse to serve a Negro because it is his legal right to do so—but over and above the legal aspects of the situation there remains a moral issue that simply will not go away.

What must the Negro do to convince us of this?

Robert G. Coffeen

Compromise: The Solution

Editors, The Tar Heel:

"Come now, and let us reason saith the Lord..." (Isiah 1:18). "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace..." (1 Corinthians 14:33).

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." (Matthew 5:9).

The racial question in America today is one of such magnitude and complexity, especially with regard to its psychological nature and social aspects, that I have refrained from even mentioning the words "integration" and "segregation" in print, or orally, as often as possible. It is a controversy fraught with emotion on both sides—and there are even those on both sides who would deny that the problem even HAS two sides!

My reluctance to discuss integration vs. segregation is not (I think) based upon fear or cowardice. It is based, rather, upon my ignorance, and lack of wisdom. I have no glib answers; nor can I suggest a long list of workable solutions. Yet, I am not disinterested, or unconcerned.

My interest is in ALL people of the ENTIRE nation, and I am concerned, like uncounted millions, over the fact that this nation is torn asunder by internal strife. I am neither white nor Negro; my birth certificate bears the word "INDIAN." But I AM wise enough to know that no great problem was ever solved solely with emotion. If there was ever a time when Americans needed to be cool-headed and

reasonable, it is now.

Nor will threats and denunciations solve anything. It should go without saying that anything which cannot be accomplished legally, morally and within the bounds of good taste, probably should not be accomplished at all.

No matter what the cause is, either worthy or unworthy, its proponents should, first of all, determine who are its friends and who are its foes. Since a cause must have supporters in order to succeed, it is the height of folly for its proponents to attack its friends.

Speaking as one member of a minority group which is even smaller than that of the Negro, and basing my observation on two years actually spent in Chapel Hill, I can tell you in all sincerity that Chapel Hill is not the enemy of Negro progress. At least seventy-five per cent of its businesses are not segregated. Much of this desegregation was brought about not by legislation or agitation, but by voluntary endeavor. Is this the thanks CORE hands out to those who, in good conscience and often at great personal sacrifice, have furthered the same cause CORE professes to be furthering? Do threats reflect good will? They do not; they reflect, rather, a lack of gratitude and appreciation. And senseless threats may set the Negro cause father back in a day than it has gained in a century.

Fortunately, Chapel Hill is a tolerant town; but that is not to say that it is a soft one. I seriously doubt that CORE will be able to threaten it into doing anything which, in the judgment of its duly installed Aldermen, is not in the interest of ALL the people of the town.

Governor Sanford has spoken out against CORE threats. He speaks for the official State of North Carolina, and opposing him would be utterly foolhardy. He has been a true friend to ALL North Carolinians in the past, and minority groups should not even WISH to oppose him.

It seems to me that the element of face-saving has entered the picture, now that both CORE and the State have spoken. Well, all is not lost. CORE, or some other group furthering the Negro cause, can simply make a public statement saying that out of appreciation for Chapel Hill's tolerance and good will in the past, no further demonstrations will be carried out. That would assure those who have been friendly to the Negro cause in the past, or at least tolerant of the movement, that their friendship was really appreciated.

Both Federal and State laws have been abused in the past; and whether they were abused by one side or another—or both sides—a continued disregard for the law can lead only to grief for ALL Americans. One simply does not enforce the law by breaking the law.

Patience is a godly virtue, and here it will pay off in huge dividends.

Lew Barton

say that it is a soft one. I seriously doubt that CORE will be able to threaten it into doing anything which, in the judgment of its duly installed Aldermen, is not in the interest of ALL the people of the town.

Governor Sanford has spoken out against CORE threats. He speaks for the official State of North Carolina, and opposing him would be utterly foolhardy. He has been a true friend to ALL North Carolinians in the past, and minority groups should not even WISH to oppose him.

It seems to me that the element of face-saving has entered the picture, now that both CORE and the State have spoken. Well, all is not lost. CORE, or some other group furthering the Negro cause, can simply make a public statement saying that out of appreciation for Chapel Hill's tolerance and good will in the past, no further demonstrations will be carried out. That would assure those who have been friendly to the Negro cause in the past, or at least tolerant of the movement, that their friendship was really appreciated.

Both Federal and State laws have been abused in the past; and whether they were abused by one side or another—or both sides—a continued disregard for the law can lead only to grief for ALL Americans. One simply does not enforce the law by breaking the law.

Patience is a godly virtue, and here it will pay off in huge dividends.

Lew Barton

he was "balled" by two members of the house, all other members being in favor of his initiation. Ideally, there must not be discrimination because of race, color, creed, etc. But realistically, it is different. Keeping in mind that the fraternity is a social institution, think of yourself planning a party. Wouldn't you invite the people most akin to your likes, dislikes, and thus those who would be most likely to get along with each other. This is, essentially, what the fraternity tries to do in the selection of its members. Most fraternity men do not relish the thought of turning any man away. They would like to pledge as many as are interested.

Some students have advocated through the DTH that the University should prohibit those fraternities who discriminate from being on the campus. Before the University can consider such a move, it should tear down some of its own barriers. Granted, the school should be praised for allowing integration as early as 1954. This is commendable. But, why is it that there are no Negroes on UNC athletic teams? Certainly, there have been capable ones who could have made it, both athletically and scholastically. Bobby Bell (who became an All-American football player at Minnesota) and Walt Bellamy (who was an All-American basketball star at Indiana) are two Negroes I know of who probably would have been available to UNC if this apparent discrimination did not exist.

I would like to say that being a fraternity member contributed more than any other single factor to my happiness in college. It was a wonderful refuge from the perplexities of academic life in that it gave me opportunity to relax and enjoy myself among friends, when the time could be spared. It gave me a place to bring my dates and entertain them through its various social programs. More important, it taught me to live with other men, respect their opinions and ideas, and work with them in building a better fraternity, University and community.

Perhaps, UNC, like some schools, can allow new fraternities on campus and thus absorb as many students who wish to join. Miami of Ohio has Negro fraternities and everyone seems happy with this arrangement.

Finally, those of you who are students now need not feel isolated, for Chapel Hill and the University are very much alive, indeed. Both are facing the current problems, local and foreign, with the courage, foresight, and dedication that have characterized the University for years.

Jim Noyes, Jr., '61
Quantico, Va.

Ouch!

Editors, The Tar Heel,

I am writing in regard to your recent letter implying the narrow mindedness of the Chapel Hill merchants as a whole.

As the daughter of a merchant of this town, I resent the tone of the editorial criticizing this town's principles in the matter of integration.

Over the past year I can remember many times sitting down to dinner without my father, who had an integration meeting to attend or a board meeting that he couldn't miss. I am not saying that we did not expect this, he was president of the Merchants Association, and we knew that his job carried with it a lot of responsibility. But who can force difficulty in a year like the last one? When an Editor of the Daily Tar Heel can say that Chapel Hill merchants do not strive for a peaceful settlement to this problem, then, I am also entitled to voice the opinions of the opposite side, if, indeed, sides must be taken.

I know for a fact that many of the merchants of this town have actually pleaded with the hold-outs to integrate peacefully. Meeting after meeting has been held after store hours, when father should be home with their families, not conducting business. Many cups of coffee have been drunk around tables at eleven o'clock at night, while merchants discussed integration.

No, we are not fully integrated in this town, but we're 95 per cent so, and much of that has been done over the past year, with the help of 95 percent of the merchants of this town.

It is narrow mindedness like yours that sets the cause of the Negro people back. If editorials are to be printed, they should be printed factually, working and striving for a goal through public knowledge of a problem, not by blaming a group of people who are working overtime to preserve the peace of the town they live and work in.

Sincerely yours,
Karen Kemp

E. B. Caldwell
Asheville

J. L. Bulla
Morehead City

Illusion

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Many dictionaries define alcohol as a stimulant. Many advertisers would have us believe alcohol is uplifting. Many people drink alcohol to get that good-feeling illusion.

However, medical science has proven alcohol is not a stimulant. It is a deterrent that makes a person dizzy first, then drowsy. Some become the life of the party, in their effort to overcome the drowsiness. Pretending they feel good, giving a false impression that has come down thru generations.

This false impressions has induced men to drink the stuff, often with tragic results.

If people were told the truth about alcohol, there would be less alcoholics today.

J. L. Bulla
Morehead City

gives on UNC athletic teams? Certainly, there have been capable ones who could have made it, both athletically and scholastically. Bobby Bell (who became an All-American football player at Minnesota) and Walt Bellamy (who was an All-American basketball star at Indiana) are two Negroes I know of who probably would have been available to UNC if this apparent discrimination did not exist.

I would like to say that being a fraternity member contributed more than any other single factor to my happiness in college. It was a wonderful refuge from the perplexities of academic life in that it gave me opportunity to relax and enjoy myself among friends, when the time could be spared. It gave me a place to bring my dates and entertain them through its various social programs. More important, it taught me to live with other men, respect their opinions and ideas, and work with them in building a better fraternity, University and community.

Perhaps, UNC, like some schools, can allow new fraternities on campus and thus absorb as many students who wish to join. Miami of Ohio has Negro fraternities and everyone seems happy with this arrangement.

Finally, those of you who are students now need not feel isolated, for Chapel Hill and the University are very much alive, indeed. Both are facing the current problems, local and foreign, with the courage, foresight, and dedication that have characterized the University for years.

Perhaps, UNC, like some schools, can allow new fraternities on campus and thus absorb as many students who wish to join. Miami of Ohio has Negro fraternities and everyone seems happy with this arrangement.

Finally, those of you who are students now need not feel isolated, for Chapel Hill and the University are very much alive, indeed. Both are facing the current problems, local and foreign, with the courage, foresight, and dedication that have characterized the University for years.

Jim Noyes, Jr., '61
Quantico, Va.

Ouch!

Editors, The Tar Heel,

I am writing in regard to your recent letter implying the narrow mindedness of the Chapel Hill merchants as a whole.

As the daughter of a merchant of this town, I resent the tone of the editorial criticizing this town's principles in the matter of integration.

Over the past year I can remember many times sitting down to dinner without my father, who had an integration meeting to attend or a board meeting that he couldn't miss. I am not saying that we did not expect this, he was president of the Merchants Association, and we knew that his job carried with it a lot of responsibility. But who can force difficulty in a year like the last one? When an Editor of the Daily Tar Heel can say that Chapel Hill merchants do not strive for a peaceful settlement to this problem, then, I am also entitled to voice the opinions of the opposite side, if, indeed, sides must be taken.

I know for a fact that many of the merchants of this town have actually pleaded with the hold-outs to integrate peacefully. Meeting after meeting has been held after store hours, when father should be home with their families, not conducting business. Many cups of coffee have been drunk around tables at eleven o'clock at night, while merchants discussed integration.

No, we are not fully integrated in this town, but we're 95 per cent so, and much of that has been done over the past year, with the help of 95 percent of the merchants of this town.

It is narrow mindedness like yours that sets the cause of the Negro people back. If editorials are to be printed, they should be printed factually, working and striving for a goal through public knowledge of a problem, not by blaming a group of people who are working overtime to preserve the peace of the town they live and work in.

Sincerely yours,
Karen Kemp

E. B. Caldwell
Asheville

J. L. Bulla
Morehead City

Illusion

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Many dictionaries define alcohol as a stimulant. Many advertisers would have us believe alcohol is uplifting. Many people drink alcohol to get that good-feeling illusion.

However, medical science has proven alcohol is not a stimulant. It is a deterrent that makes a person dizzy first, then drowsy. Some become the life of the party, in their effort to overcome the drowsiness. Pretending they feel good, giving a false impression that has come down thru generations.

This false impressions has induced men to drink the stuff, often with tragic results.

If people were told the truth about alcohol, there would be less alcoholics today.

J. L. Bulla
Morehead City

Sincerely,
Jim Heavner
WCHL RADIO