

Kerrying On

By Kerry Sipe

The Daily Tar Heel

71 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, 1870. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.

The Atchison, Topeka And The 'GDI'

The "GDI" Paradise" gets underway tonight, and a lot hinges on its success.

The "GDI Paradise" is a combination transportation-recreation-dining effort aimed at widening the recreational possibilities of the dormitory man without a car, and/or his date.

There are absolutely no strings attached to the deal. For \$2.75 per person, or \$5.00 per couple, you get a pizza or spaghetti supper at La Pizza, four games of bowling at All Star Lanes in the Eastgate Shopping Center and free transportation all the way.

A bus will stop at Ehringhaus Parking Lot on the hour between 5 and 11 p.m., at 10 past the hour in front of Lewis Residence Hall in the Lower Quad, at 20 past the hour in front of Aldermen, and at half past the hour in front of Kemp's downtown.

The "GDI Paradise" will roll only on Friday nights until the success of the

project can be determined.

Jimmy Weeks, the UNC Law School student who dreamed up the idea and worked it out with the merchants concerned, says success means the program will be extended to Saturdays and perhaps to additional merchants as well. In fact, success could lead to a whole range of such programs, including trips to Women's College in Greensboro and other places.

The purpose, again, is simply to provide the man without a car a place to go and take a date to which is well out of walking distance.

This project deserves the inspection of every auto-less student. There will probably be a few bugs to get worked out in the beginning, but every initial indicator points to its success.

See you on the "GDI Paradise"?

Tonight, from 5 to 11.

The Sam And Henry Letters: More Please

Greensboro Daily News

Debate by correspondence may have reached its zenith in the 18th century, but we are pleased to see that two distinguished North Carolinians think enough of the tradition to sustain it.

To debate by letter requires two indispensable requisites: There must be differences of opinion but mutual respect between adversaries. These requisites are met beyond question in the case of Dean Henry Brandis of the University of North Carolina Law School and Senator Sam J. Ervin of the U. S. Senate. They admire each other; they have differences—on civil rights and otherwise—and one lives in Chapel Hill and the other Washington, thus making debate-by-letter appropriate.

Recently these two have engaged in a colloquy—we might call it the Sam and Henry Letters—about the pending civil rights bill; and their latest correspondence as published in The Chapel Hill Weekly displays great erudition.

Senator Ervin is reiterating his conviction that a considerable distinction exists between a filibuster and an educational debate in the U. S. Senate. The latter is his objective. "In participating in the forthcoming debate in the Senate," the senator writes, "I will be keeping faith with that reactionary American, George Washington, who declared in his farewell address to the American people that it was just as important to preserve constitutional principles against destruction as it was to establish them."

Then the senior senator wades directly into the issues raised by various segments of the civil rights bill, which he calls a "drastic assault" upon the "indestructible union composed of indestructible states":

(1) The bill attempts to transfer from the states to the federal government the power vested in the states by Article I, to prescribe the qualifications for voters in federal elections;

(2) It confers upon all departments and agencies administering any program involving the use of federal funds the power to use untold billions of dollars of federal appropriations to bribe or browbeat states, political subdivisions of states, charitable institutions, industry and individuals into acceptance of their views in matters relating to race;

(3) Title III would allow a federal government to "tell a barber operating in a hotel anywhere in the United States whom he must shave, a beautician operating in a hotel anywhere in the United States what woman she must attempt to beautify, and a shoeshine boy operating in a hotel anywhere in the United States whose shoes he must shine."

(4) Title II would allow the government to tell every lawful business or industry whom he shall hire, discharge, promote or lay off.

Senator Ervin contends that he cannot "be silent upon these matters as long as the rules of the Senate permit me to speak."

In answer to these assertions Dean Brandis replies:

(1) Nothing he has written suggests curtailment of "full debate" upon the

merits of the civil rights bill; he has never anticipated that Senator Ervin would engage in any such filibustering tactics as reading stock market quotations or other irrelevant material. But "even in an educational debate the critical point is reached when the end sought by the speakers ceases to be the presentation of argument as a desirable preliminary to a vote on the merits and comes to be the prevention of such a vote. At that point a filibuster is in full cry; and I reiterate my belief that this is highly prejudicial to the future of democratic government in the United States."

(2) While he (Dean Brandis) is not attempting to argue the merits of the civil rights bill, he thinks it could be "greatly improved by amendments substantially modifying some of its provisions" however;

(a) The ultimate authority on the constitutionality of legislation remains the U. S. Supreme Court and while one may be critical of its decisions, he still should accept them as law;

(b) The Senator is greatly perturbed by the effect of legislation restricting an individual's freedom, yet he has never been similarly exercised "over numerous state statutes, enforced for so many years not only restricting freedom of choice but also denying equality of privileges and rights by requiring segregation";

(c) The Senator believes that civil rights should remain the responsibility of the states, yet the same argument was made about slavery 100 years ago and led to civil war; today civil rights is a national problem and not one to "be inconsistently dealt with or neglected by the states."

(d) Finally the Dean shares the Senator's "reverence for individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution but believes in "making them, including the provision regarding equal protection, true and meaningful for all our citizens."

Thus the Sam and Henry Letters maintain throughout and consistently the eloquent tone of two learned scholars counseling each other.

And one must conclude that their differences, while substantial, are those of emphasis. Senator Ervin would focus his concern on the centralization of authority and the long arm of federal force reaching down into the local community to work its will; while the Dean emphasizes existing inequities and the need to do justice in areas of "equal protection of the laws" which too many states have long neglected and still, in many cases, refuse to heed.

In truth both emphases are important. And it seems plain to us that individual freedom for all citizens assured by the Constitution will remain in danger and be further whittled away (as Senator Ervin fears) unless individual states and local communities voluntarily correct the inequities noted by Dean Brandis.

Would the Senator and the Dean care to continue the Sam and Henry Letters and address themselves more directly to these points?

Reader Sends Two Gripes

More Pregnant Guinea Pigs?

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I would like to say two things. First, in the past few weeks Dick Akers has been cut to the quick by people who didn't hold with his beliefs and policies. Well, I want to know where this boy is? Is he going to stand by and be ridiculed by the unfeeling dastards of UNC who haven't the intelligence to lay off the poor guy? Obviously the guy is overworked and we, the student body, should realize this and let the poor guy alone. Chin up, Dick.

Second, how can you, the editorial board of The Daily Tar Heel (sic), go so low as to waste one whole column on a lousy review. Specifically the one by Mr. McInnis in the Saturday (sic) paper. I say hell, you would have done better to tell us more about pregnant guinea pigs.

Keep up the good work, fellas.

Sincerely,
Terry Hannon
313 Grimes

Nothing New In 505 Ehringhaus

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I am quite willing to relinquish the title of "Diatribic King" given me in the March 8th edition of the Daily Tar Heel by William Garnett of the Law School. The publication of his letter should make it clear to all of us that there is a new master of the illogical insult, and I felicitate Mr. Garnett. I would like to point out a few inaccuracies in Mr. Garnett's letter in the hope that I may relieve Mr. Garnett of a part of the great burden under which he is labouring.

It would be very nice if all of us had Mr. Garnett's papal infallibility. Unfortunately I am not allowed to make any statements without incurring Mr. Garnett's wrath for my assuming "that standards of value and postulates of propriety are . . . (my) . . . own brittle, unchangeable child," whereas he can with perfect freedom condemn my statements as crude and shallow.

The relationship between good taste and shrewd integrationist editorial policy is a little abstruse. If the editors' fatigue from their work with the civil rights movement is responsible for their declining powers of journalistic discrimination, then they ought to make other arrangements for choosing the material which composes the editorial page. No matter how Mr. Garnett states it, exploiting the sympathy of the American public for financial gain is in no way defensible. There is no justification for apathy. If making statements without giving reasons, as Mr. Garnett claims I have done, is so execrable, then he should tell the unenlightened what apathy's reason for being is.

There is nothing subtle about Mr. Wainwright's article; it oozes lower-class emotion well-calculated to appeal to Mr. Garnett. Mr. Wainwright no doubt had in mind that readers of his article would accept President Kennedy's greatness as based on the funeral pageant and the graveside services; thus the actual greatness of President Kennedy is conveniently obscured, and no one needs question whether a president elected by such a tiny margin is as great as those who were laid on the same bier and drawn on the same caisson before him. Mr. Garnett has lionized John F. Kennedy to such a degree that there is not the least hint of objective evaluation of the accomplishments of President Kennedy, the greatest of which were not being shot in Dallas, eulogized in Washington, and buried in Arlington.

The purpose of the press is not exclusively to provide informative or pleasant reading, nor its purpose to be as offensive as possible. There is no reason for any article's being poorly written. To Wainwright "it was a very simple grave . . . but still, simple as it looked, one could not take it all in. The long, slow walk having been achieved, there was suddenly too much to see and too little time to see it." If this is not obsession with "graveside glories," what is? John F. Kennedy was in no way responsible for that hillside in Arlington. It is only a monument to his death and to Mrs. Kennedy's ability to obtain inappropriate markers. There is another Eternal Flame in Arlington, and apparently a great many people have forgotten the one whose grave it marks. Would John Kennedy have gotten such a memorial had he died a more prosaic death? Is assassination sufficient reason for such a memorial? If so, why aren't the graves of Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley so marked? They died just as dead as John F. Kennedy.

The policy of the Daily Tar Heel in this matter is inexcusably despicable. Where apathy and poor taste abound, only the courage to take a stand, to violate "accepted" journalistic standards, will assure their continued existence. Surely Mr. Garnett's statement that I failed to be objective and fair was an oversight, in view of the lack of objectivity and fairness so overt in Mr. Garnett's petty tour-de-force.

Richard Bynum-Parsons III
505 Ehringhaus

ods of boycott, picketing and other lawful demonstrations or the attainment of social justice, and

Whereas we commend and are thankful for the witness borne to the above principles by other individuals and groups, both local and national,

Therefore, we, the duly appointed executive committee of the Episcopal Student Congregation, hereby

(1) urge all proprietors and patrons of segregated establishments to open their hearts and doors to all persons regardless of their race, and

(2) ask the cooperation of all students and citizens in helping to save our society from the pernicious system of segregation, and

(3) recommend such methods to attain this end as conferring with owners who segregate racially; as picketing and other lawful means of demonstrations; and as refusing to patronize businesses which irrationally discriminate against our fellow citizens and brothers in Christ.

(The above resolution was passed by an 11-0 vote of the entire membership of the Episcopal Student Planning and Action Committee.)

The Episcopal Student Planning and Action Committee

More Names For The Boycott

Though all the methods currently employed by those who actively seek equal rights for all citizens may not be completely desirable or productive, the undersigned are convinced of the rightness of this cause. We feel that the best and most effective expression of our strong belief in the cause of civil rights is through patronage of only those businesses which we know to have demonstrated their belief in the basic equality of all men by accommodating all equally, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

- Larry L. Poe
- Bill Horne
- P. Douglas Fann
- Lawrence M. Kaye
- Luchman Al-Abady
- Dick Smith
- Edwin Alan Taylor
- Thomas Marbury
- John Pugh
- Fred W. Roush
- Charles Pettis
- Lewis M. Burton
- Ralph C. Hendren
- J. Judson Jones
- Travis Venters
- Charles W. Dunham
- Scott Morganstern
- Paul Eugene Brown

Episcopal Group Joins Boycott

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Whereas we believe in the equal and infinite preciousness of every human person to God, as shown by his Son Jesus Christ, who died for all men, and

Whereas we affirm the right of all men to equal protection under the law, and
Whereas we support the meth-

"Sure — I'm For Equalizing Things"



'The Shallow UP'

Editors, The Tar Heel:

The recent letter by UP chairman, Jeff Adams, shows exactly how shallow the philosophy of the University Party actually is. He has said that President Lawler has "failed to meet the challenges of a mass institution." This is ridiculous. No UP president has ever met the important challenges like Mike Lawler. Far too many of them have been smooth "nice-guy" types, largely lacking in courage.

In his letter Adams refers to "unnecessary arguments with the administration." Apparently this refers to the apartment rule and student-faculty review board disputes. These are hardly ranked as minor. They are issues that threatened the very existence of student government. But then perhaps such "little things" as fair trials, due process, and student autonomy are meaningless to the UP. The SP has faced these problems, even when it was out of office, and attempted to solve them. These are admittedly areas where few students are directly affected, but nonetheless, they are as important as roaches in the Lower Quad (few people need a special UP committee to tell them about this problem).

Also, Lawler is not the person to blame for any inaction by the Campus Affairs committee. Just ask anyone on it about its activity (or lack of activity!). The blame is on the shoulders of Don Curtis, former UP chairman. Curtis did try to resign shortly after he was appointed, but Lawler would not accept his resignation until he had submitted a report of the committee's work in order that the new chairman would know the status of the committee. This is not an unreasonable thing to ask from a chairman. But Curtis persisted in not giving a report to the President and Lawler finally fired him.

The most ridiculous charge of all concerns the Tar Heel Print

Shop Bill. Adams says that there was \$5,000, appropriated for this bill's administration. This is in total error. No money was appropriated on the passage of the bill. Also, no special committee was appointed because, by the time when Lawler came into office, the Publications Board had investigated the establishment of a print shop and found the cost so high it as to be ludicrous. If our student body were the size of the University of Michigan or California, then we might be able to justify the expenditure.

President Lawler's stand on civil rights has been discussed enough. However, one thing has been overlooked in the melee. There are Negro students in the student body. Student Government has a responsibility to them also. I think that it is a necessary part of the executive's job to look out for their welfare too. This is all that President Lawler was trying to do. I hope that I have made my point clear. Adam's letter was so full of misrepresentations and wrong facts that it is deserving of a rebuttal. I hope that in the future the UP rise from petty name-calling and face the significant issues which confront Student Government.

Neal Jackson, Chairman
Ways and Means Committee

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel invites comments on current topics from its readers regardless of viewpoint. All letters to the editors should be typewritten, double-spaced and of reasonable length. All letters must be signed, with the address of the author. No letter considered libelous or in poor taste will be printed.

Heelprints

Primarily, the New Hampshire voters lodged a few complaints against Goldwater and Rocky.

Then there's the Diane Hile doll—you wind it up and it snarls.

Well, Queen Elizabeth had a real prince of a baby.

Simile: as ugly as the Tin Can.

The mountain of statistics from Washington does prove

something—that there are a lot of statisticians in Washington.

Definition: Coiffure—a French word meaning "You'll keep coming back because you'll never be able to do it this way yourself."

Looks like some Eastern rivers are getting too big for their bridges.

More and more people seem to be moving over to the Preyer side.