

DTH Editorial Page

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.

Maverick House Pushes Off

In the midst of an era in which "apathy" has come to be a too-frequent attachment to "student," any effort which promises to widen the gap between those two words is both refreshing and inspiring.

An example of such an effort is the Heart Fund "push" promised for the coming weekend by the residents of Maverick House, nee Craige Residence Hall. If the mavericks successfully execute their plan (and having viewed their past projects we have no doubt that they will), they will provide an enormous boost not only for the Heart Fund, but also for the public image of Carolina students.

This is not to say that the UNC public image should be given precedence over a worthy organization such as the Heart Fund, for if there is a war worth waging anywhere, it is the war against America's number one health hazard.

Nevertheless, the opportunities for gains by students this weekend cannot be overlooked. What better way exists to combat charges of disinterest than to

exhibit interest that extends to hard work and the unselfish donation of time and money?

Too many college students, we have found, are content to curse the public which calls them lazy or apathetic without endeavoring to rise above the unfavorable image. Too often, talk is a substitute for genuine concern or action. Too often, we protest against the world's scorn for us when that scorn is most deserved.

Thus, the efforts on behalf of the Heart Fund by the residents of Maverick House may be considered a joyous exception, to an apathetic norm. However trivial this "push" may seem to those contemplative souls who are content to turn their bitter discontent in upon themselves or outward against society, it will at least obtain some immediate results — concrete and otherwise. This is more than can be said for all the ragings and whinings of the dull, selfish beings whose only tool is disgust.

The Time Is Up For Rep. Powell

From The New York Times

Cloaked in Congressional immunity, Representative Adam Clayton Powell has spewed forth in the House of Representatives a new welter of unsupported accusations akin to those that had already resulted in his conviction for defamation of character when he repeated them outside that privileged sanctuary. Mr. Powell now has judgments totaling \$210,000 outstanding against him; he is in both civil and criminal contempt of court; he dares not venture into his own Congressional district for fear of arrest. How long will the House tolerate such flagrant contempt for law?

While the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee was regaling the House with his sophistries, some little-known facts about his disruptive influence within Haryou-Act, the Government-financed \$118 million program for combating poverty in Harlem,

were coming to light. Livingston Wingate, who was installed as executive director of Haryou-Act at Mr. Powell's insistence, has dismissed a highly qualified social worker, formerly a member of the faculty of the New York School of Social Work, for having resisted Mr. Powell's efforts to turn the project into a personal political instrument.

The ousted official has charged that a lawyer and a public relations man, both closely associated with Mr. Powell in the past, have been named consultants to the agency at fees of \$10,000 each. Without denying these allegations, Mr. Wingate has sought to justify the dismissal as necessary to "the security of the program." The real question is what useful accomplishment is coming out of this important anti-poverty project. Congress should inquire closely into how Federal funds are being spent before permitting a venture, noble in aim, to be ruined by a self-aggrandizing politician.

We Long For Judicial Freedom

Dean of Men William G. Long apparently tried again Monday to slip something past Student Government, but he was caught with his hand in the cookie jar.

The arresting officer was Bob Spearman, President of the Student Body.

The controversy arose when Dean Long, disturbed by numerous incidents of misconduct (water fights, firecrackers, etc.) on the third floor of Winston Hall, asked eleven residents to move elsewhere. His office had somehow determined that the eleven were largely responsible for the mischief, which had become sufficiently frequent and blatant as to destroy any undisturbed atmosphere conducive to sleep or study.

Now, there can be no quarrel with proper disciplinary action for those who repeatedly break residence hall rules.

Such cases, however, are the jurisdiction of the Men's Residence Council court—not the Dean of Men. By stepping in without consulting anyone, Dean Long assumed the responsibility of administering official sanction on eleven residents with due process.

Fortunately, the students knew their rights, and complained to the DTH. We referred the matter to Spearman, who called Dean Long and took issue with the proposed abrogation of the student judiciary's responsibilities.

After a short argument, Dean Long relented, and the case has been turned over to the Attorney-General's office, exactly where it should have gone the minute Dean Long heard of the matter.

Long, in a statement yesterday afternoon, explained his actions as seeking "to rectify the problem and to prevent certain students who appeared to be headed toward obtaining official disciplinary records from reaching such a situation."

If they were indeed engaging in actions detrimental to the residence hall, then they should be tried before the MRC Court. That body has been noted for its fairness and comprehensive study of cases, and we are certain the 11 will receive a fair trial.

If they are found guilty, they should be disciplined. These are the rules which student government has set up with University approval, and these rules should be followed.

It is not the administration's place to meddle with the student judiciary any more than it is the student's place to disturb his hallmates during study hours.

At the Free Speech Movement rally last week, Dean Long, representing the administration, told the crowd that student problems should be taken to the elected student leaders. We hope that in the future they will be—without hesitation or roadblocks.

Definition Of Fraternities Not Taken Very Seriously

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Mr. David Owen defends "discrimination" in his Feb. 18 letter in the Tar Heel. According to Mr. Owen, since all fraternities are based on a certain form of personal discrimination, it is silly to object to discrimination based on racial or religious bigotry, or any other "quirk" of the present fraternity members. For Mr. Owen, all forms of discrimination are equal.

But this argument is nonsense. It is like saying that since government is based on coercion, it can use any kind of coercion it pleases. Yet one of the crucial ideas of democracy is that all coercion is not equal and that governments must be sharply regulated in their use of it.

Or, to use a different analogy, Mr. Owen's argument is similar to the idea that since all business is based on profit-making, no one has a right to interfere with whatever a businessman may do to make a profit. But this argument hasn't had a serious advocate in 100 years. Everyone acknowledges that

businesses must be regulated in the public interest—that businessmen should not be allowed to mislabel their products, to make false claims, etc.

All discrimination is not equal. Discrimination on the bases of talents, abilities, character and so on is legitimate. Discrimination on arbitrary and irrational bases is not.

Fraternities are not private clubs. They are campus organizations which are already regulated by many university rules. Regulations about having women in rooms, for example, are made by the administration.

Few people believe that fraternities should be exempted from having to meet the standards of civilized behavior. Few would argue, for example, that fraternities could use any hazing procedures they like—including ones that threaten the well-being of pledges.

Likewise, fraternities have no right to use procedures in determining who can pledge which are based on racial and religious bigotry. Now, 20 years after World War II, it seems to me we should have learned something about preju-

dice. It is not an innocent, private matter. Rather, the existence of organizations based on bigotry is a continuing insult to a portion of the community, and an encouragement to vicious sentiments of group superiority.

Mr. Owen declares that doing away with restrictive clauses would "in essence destroy the entire fraternity system." It is strange to hear this said when on other campuses such clauses have been done away with without wiping out all fraternities.

But more important, it illustrates Mr. Owen's narrow-minded notion of what a fraternity is. Apparently he has never taken the word "fraternity" seriously. For him, it means discrimination, not brotherhood.

To the extent that fraternities on this campus cannot approximate the standards of common brotherhood, they are a discredit to themselves, to the University and to those who condone them.

Lewis Lipsitz
Dept. of Political Science



On Religion Blast

Byrum: One Pro One Con

Faith Different From Religion

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Since most of his readers seem to have mistaken Mr. Byrum, or to have taken him lightly in his critique of "religion," I feel called upon to second his comments.

His comments do not take issue with faith, but with religion. Note this distinction. Faith is what Paul Tillich defines as ultimate concern—what one in the end takes most seriously. Religion, on the other hand, is the sum total of ritual, formulas of belief, and the like, which constitute the varieties of human response to encounter with what is ultimate, or divine.

It is dangerous when we humans, whose understanding is finite, begin making unqualified judgments about the divine truth which is infinite. This is to confuse revelation, which is God's, with the reception of revelation, which is human.

If we take our own formulations of belief about God and pronounce them universally and forever valid, we commit the sin of pride, or self-righteousness. That is, we set ourselves up as the equals of God, who alone possesses truth in any final form. The religious tradition itself teaches that God's incarnation (becoming flesh, not word) in Christ is alone the "way, truth and the life."

What Mr. Byrum rightly attacks is a way of believing which refuses to admit its own essential human ignorance and sinfulness. He attacks the special interests who claim that God is on their side, and all others are wrong. He attacks

human institutions which claim to possess truth in its final form, when this is the property of the ultimate alone.

The divine does reveal itself. Some men do find that to be themselves authentically they must do certain things. But theirs is not the right to claim that what is valid for them is valid for all.

Rick Edwards
YMCA President

Adept Acrobat Flips For Atheism

Editors, The Tar Heel:

To say that my viewpoint differs from that of Mr. Jeff Byrum with regard to Christian theology and social concepts would certainly be an understatement. To attempt to elaborate on my personal concepts of Christianity would certainly be out of place in the columns of this paper, equally as out of place as I felt Mr. Byrum's tirade to be. Religious viewpoints are rarely changed by journalistic debate.

Certainly Mr. Byrum has put forth no ideas that I have not heard before. His quotes smack loudly of "Bartlett's Familiar Quotations" while his vernacular is very obviously that of the dormitory bull session. Its intellectual quality is hardly equalled by its emotional pitch.

I presume that as far as Mr. Byrum is concerned, I am one of the "misguided humanist," or perhaps some of the "leaven in the loaf"; this is not the point. I do not wish to argue over what I consider to be the virtues of Christianity as opposed to what Mr. Byrum reputedly to be the freedoms of atheism. I do find however Mr. Byrum's

concepts to be somewhat fuzzy if not misguided, and it is particularly to this that I direct my criticisms I have.

I do not consider religion to be a "hangover from the Dark Ages," nor do I feel "we sacrifice our humanity at the altar of the false god, Religion." That which we use as the basis for our relationships with other human beings and for understanding our relationship with the universe, if not our religion, has at least religious overtones for us, be it a belief or a disbelief.

While there are those of us who may "juggle for Jesus," Mr. Byrum himself seems quite adept in his acrobatics for Atheism. He seems at least as eager to make his disbelief in Christianity seem "relevant," as he implies Christians find it necessary to do with the teachings of Christ. He appears to disbelieve as strongly as he implies the most ardent Christians believe. Who is to say who is the more fundamental?

To my point of view Mr. Byrum's approach is at least as fanatic as he seems to feel that to whether or not he is also "standing naked in absurdity." He seems at least as interested in imposing his concepts and views on Christians, as he feels that they have imposed their views upon non-Christians.

In short, Mr. Byrum appears to be at least as religious as those Christians he criticizes. If an alka-seltzer is really needed for our religious hangover, Mr. Byrum will need one too; and, if we are sacrificing our humanity at the altar of religion, I hope Mr. Byrum will join me on the pyre.

John Craig
109 Aycock Hall

Issues Raised By Gardner Valid

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Following Friday's rally at Y-Court, there must have been no more confused group than the N. C. General Assembly.

These conscientious gentlemen had hoped to protect us from political extremism of the left. If all they saw Friday were hands raised in obscenity and fireworks thrown wantonly, if all they heard were explosions, vain choruses of "Dixie," and crude vituperation from the audience, while the speakers showed mature calmness, they must have realized who the real extremists were.

They must have thought that they were observing adolescent morons whose only emotion besides lust was cynical hostility, whose naive rebellion did not comprehend the agony symbolized by their Confederate flag.

Why would so many act so immaturely, trifling with important issues? What were they imitating in their crude way? That scurrilous personal attack against James Gardner in last Tuesday's DTH which so unfortunately set the tone of campus reaction?

How ironic was Pete Wales' lament Friday morning that "The issue is no longer the issues, but the way they have been handled"! Perhaps some blame is Mr. Gardner's some the whole community's. Some blame also lies, though, with the DTH for not keeping salient issues in the foreground.

No one should deny the concern of Messrs. Stevens and Seely for this University. With other leaders they have worked hard and long to woo legislators from the Speaker Ban Law. Their alarm that such work might be pointlessly destroyed is understandable. Perhaps their fear for UNC diminished the clarity with which they understood James Gardner's intentions or his basic message, with which they might well agree.

The issues raised must be dealt with thoroughly. The integrity of the University is at stake. We cannot condone institutionalized racial segregation. We must not sacrifice, for appropriations, a free forum in which serious ideas are seriously debated and their implications acted upon.

We will utilize the right of free speech to discuss important matters and to praise mature attempts to deal with them—such attempts as the Administration is now making, such attempts as are still needed in areas like wages, promotions, and recruitment.

Bill Griffith
426 Whitehead Circle

Rednecks At Rally Like Mississippi

Editors, The Tar Heel:

After attending the "rally" at Y-Court today I happened to come across Friday's edition of the Daily Tar Heel. In the issue was a sensible editorial calling for responsibility on the part of Mr. Gardner and company in presentation of their ill-conceived grievances.

I went to the rally out of curiosity, not sympathy, and I think the protesters were responsible; but, I cannot be sure, for I was prevented from hearing by all the "responsible" booing, hissing, and exploding fireworks. Oh yes, it was all very funny at first, but soon it took on a distasteful flavor of rudeness and abuse.

Certainly the "rally" was a poorly inspired result of an insignificant incident; however, those "cool" hecklers showed that perhaps Mr. Gardner is not really nuts. Something is wrong at Carolina when a redneck element can gag a speaker, no matter how ridiculous his views may be.

The heckling did not shock me—it just reminded me of my home, Mississippi.

Michael Crowell
206 Manly

Ban Unnecessary When Mob Rules

Editors, The Tar Heel:

If there was ever any question of what sort of mind conceived the Speaker Ban Law, it was answered loudly and publicly this past Friday in Y-Court. There, several hundred future leaders of America proved they were just as adept at quieting a "subversive" idea (or any idea, for that matter) as any of their more seasoned solons.

The idea is simple: don't let the man speak. If a person disagrees with and or can't comprehend what the speaker is saying (or wishes to say), such person may take one of two channels.

First, there is the tried and true method of passing a law to

keep his kind away from our impressionable youth.

Secondly, there is the quicker way reserved particularly for the electorate. This takes for a certain amount of practice for it involves the chanting of fight songs, the singing of "Dixie" off-key, and the ability to calmly throw explosives into a crowd of your friends and neighbors.

For those of you who missed this little segment of "Life in these United States," you need only envision a man speaking of the evil of rattlesnakes from the bottom of a rattlesnake pit.

When the classic methods of mob censorship are used in the middle of a supposedly "enlightened" University, and are accepted as being mere schoolboy pranks, the oft-heard claims of "academic freedom" sound as hollow as the minds of our rattlesnakes.

"I may not agree with what you say..."

Ben L. Jones
40 Rogerson Dr.

Crux Of Religion Is Brotherhood

Editors, The Tar Heel:

From all appearances, seems that the DTH has only seen proper to publish negative replies to Mr. Byrum's article. These people who have answered seem to have the attitude that only God, Mother and Country, are sacred.

But worse, they also seem to feel that it is natural for religion to be "commercialized." It should be remembered that if Christianity were in its natural state, as Christ taught, there would be no Christian propaganda, or even churches. All Christ taught was the Brotherhood of Man and a belief in God—a very simple religion.

I say, "Good for you, Mr. Byrum! More people should realize the Fallacy of Christianity."

Jane Marcotte
Town House Apts

TEP Violated Strict Silence

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I would like to address this letter to Mr. Goodwin with regard to his article in the Tar Heel Saturday.

Mr. Goodwin apparently assumed that because the Hockfield family are close friends of Mr. Evans, and because Ralph Grosswald is a close friend of the Hockfield's sons, that therefore Ralph Grosswald is a close relative of Mr. Evans. Since Ralph is in no way related to Mr. Evans, and since Mr. Goodwin's major criticism of the IFC's strict silence rule is the restrictions it allegedly places on relatives of freshman males, I fail to see how Mr. Goodwin arrives at his conclusions that the dirty rush charge on the TEPs is unfair and unfounded. His conclusions are not only illogical but entirely irrelevant to the issue in the TEP case.

Mr. Goodwin: the TEPs through Mr. Evans (their International President), attempted to and succeeded in what amounts to buying a pledge. Actually, this is not the issue at hand, because as morally and ethically wrong as this practice may be, it is not illegal according to IFC rules. The issue at hand is that Mr. Evans offered the boy financial assistance prior to the end of strict silence.

It has been stated in defense that Mr. Evans: 1) was not aware of strict silence when he spoke to Grosswald; and 2) he spoke to Ralph not of a TEP offer of financial assistance, but of fraternity scholarships in general.

Being not only an extremely active alumnus of TEP, but an officer in their national to boot (not to mention that he lives only 12 miles from Chapel Hill), it is absurd to assume that Mr. Evans knew nothing of the strict silence regulations. What he doesn't know about fraternities and IFC rules on this campus isn't worth knowing.

Concerning the statement that Mr. Evans spoke to Grosswald not about a TEP offer, but of fraternity offers in general, this too lacks credibility. That would be comparable to the New York Jets having told Joe Namath about the bonus he could get if he joined another football team!

In short, the TEPs have clearly violated both the spirit and the word of the strict silence rule, and must now pay the consequences if the IFC's rules and regulations are to continue commanding the respect they have presently. Admittedly, strict silence does pose problems, but a fraternity's blatant disregard of this rule to suit its convenience will not solve, but merely add to the problem.

Ken Mann
107 Fraternity Court

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.

Fred Seely, Hugh Stevens, co-editors; Mike Yopp, Ernie McCrary, managing editors; Pete Wales, associate editor; Larry Tarleton, sports editor; Fred Thomas, night editor; Mary Ellison Strother, wire editor; John Greenbacker, Kerry Sipe, Alan Banov, staff writers; Pete Cammons, asst. sports editor; Perry McCarty, Pete Cross, Bill Lee, Tom Haney, sports writers; Jack Lauterer, photographer; Chip Barnard, cartoonist; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Betsy Gray, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobel, ad. mgr.; Jim Peddicord, asst. ad. mgr.; Tom Clark, subscription mgr.; John Evans, circulation mgr.; Dick Baddour, Stuart Picklen, Jim Potter, salesmen.

Second Class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. 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.