

UNC Lacks Leadership On Rights

By TIMOTHY RAY

Fourth in a Series

In Part III of this series it was urged that the the belief expressed by the DTH and by some administrators that the appropriate method of seeking removal of the Speaker Ban was through behind the scenes negotiations was mistaken, since that method included assuring legislators that the University's faculty was, and would continue to be free of Communist taint and that the Ban was not 'necessary' This approach treats as relative a freedom which ought not to be considered itself either negotiable or a privilege that is contingent upon the maintenance of self - policing activities by the University.

Mr. James Gardner, who first, in recent times, voiced here the need for an open forum for the discussion of ideas, has pointed out the contradiction implicit in such an approach. By making the freedom of speech contingent upon its not being exercised, the removal of the Ban under these conditions would not result in the achievement of academic freedom.

If the freedom were ever exercised by, for example, the hiring of a person, even a brilliant scholar, to teach mathematics or chemistry, and if this person were known to be far left in his political views, a Ban which had been removed under such circumstances and by such methods as those I have referred to could very logically be reimposed by the State on the ground that it was, after all, really 'necessary.'

I hope that it is not necessary to argue that a scholar should not be discriminated against on grounds that have nothing to do with either his scholarship or his teaching ability.

Today I want to discuss other issues which the UNC Free Speech Movement, or Forum, sought to bring to the attention of the Student Body: racial discrimination and its implications

for University life.

In an interview Thursday, Dean of Men William Long said that the recent decision against discriminatory clauses in fraternity and sorority constitutions was the removal of a "double standard" which had been in existence since 1959, when a regulation was issued prohibiting the establishment on the UNC campus of new organizations with discriminatory clauses, but which did not forbid existing organizations from retaining their clauses.

Dean Long said that he favors the recent ruling on the ground that "it is right," and that, in reality, it brings greater, rather than less, freedom to our organizations, since it prevents external control by national fraternity officials.

Pointing out that the committee which recently took action has been in existence since Oct. 1 of last year, he said that the timing of the announcement was due to a prescheduled report to the Faculty Council and occurred coincidentally right after Gardner's raising of the issue.

But why, I have wondered (and I address this question to every person with authority here), wasn't such action taken earlier, since it was long overdue? Why the maintenance of a "double standard" since 1959?

This leads to the larger question of whether the University has provided the leadership in the area of civil rights, in recent years, that is appropriate to an old and widely respected institution with a reputation for greatness.

The saddest fact along this line is that Carolina students who participated in the civil rights struggle had to do so at the cost, in some cases of great personal sacrifice and a possibly permanent damaging injury to their reputations. Where, we wonder were the leaders of this mighty academy?

Three bright, personable and promising young men, Pat Cu-

sick, Quinton Baker, and John Dunne were sentenced to jail last year on charges that were dropped by those who had initially made them. A very conservative court official insisted on the prosecution, an official whose adamant stand might have been mitigated had a single high-level University officer spoken to him in these students' behalf.

What did happen was that a Dean congratulated the judge of the court in which the sentences were given, as rendering a valuable service to the University.

It is interesting that this Dean later listed "participating in the movement to end segregation on all levels and in all places" along with such undebatably commendable and humanitarian activities as "Collecting books to replenish the burned-out library of Algiers, providing social and recreational activities for the patients of Dix Hill Hospital, and working with the retarded children of Murdock School," as providing the experience of an interesting, busy, and exciting year ("A Report to President Friday and the Board of Trustees of the University by Chancellor William B. Aycock, for the Academic Year, July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964", p.3.).

This is very odd, since it becomes difficult for younger members of the University to know where this official stands, or perhaps, why he didn't stand up for that interesting movement which he has so listed.

In a forthcoming bok, "The Free Men," to be published by Harpers, a member of the Ford Foundation and a faithful citizen of Chapel Hill, John Ehle, addresses the topic of students in search of their own values, and the "movements" that have spontaneously resulted.

Ehle is interested in the fact that, to use Gardner's words, "There is throughout our country an incipient, still very loosely organized, student movement, groping for identity and for the proper tactics, but with-

out exception, not to institute the dramatic sit-ins which became necessary at Berkeley, but to work toward the redefinition of the university."

Professors Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, in a recent issue of the *New York Review of books* (March 11, 1965, p. 18), have expressed this situation with classic clarity:

"Beyond the immediate attractions of a lively campus, many students today, especially those in the humanities and social sciences, are aware of the shortcomings of their society and are passionately looking for authentic values to replace what they perceive as the phony slogans and spiritual tawdriness of so much of the public rhetoric and action of our time.

"Few of them come to college with an ideology, nor do they seek one while there.

"Rather, theirs is an ethic of sincerity and personal encounter. They take ideals seriously,

and are quick to detect evasion, posturing and double-think.

"If their conception of the educational process is somewhat romantic and wooly — tending to equate the exchange of impressions and sentiments with learning, impatient with discipline, and inclined to rush off after a dozen exciting novelties at once — it is still more attractive than the emphasis on utility and training in the multiversity establishment.

"The latter is a bleakness of spirit, closed and immobile; while the former is a plenitude of spirit, open and vital.

"Such students constitute a university's most valuable resource, and it is a delight and a privilege to teach them. There were a great many such students, graduate as well as undergraduate, involved in the happenings at Berkeley. Given all the loose talk about student riots and radical, it is necessary to emphasize this point."

If Goldwater Were President Now—

By ART BUCHWALD
The New York Herald
Tribune

Every once in a while, when I have nothing better to do, I wonder what the country would be like if Barry Goldwater had been elected president of the United States. Based on his campaign and his speeches, it is a frightening thing to imagine.

The mind boggles when you think of it. For one thing, we would probably be bombing North Viet Nam now if Goldwater were in office.

As I see it, this is what would have happened.

The Viet Cong would have blown up an American barracks. Using this as an excuse, Goldwater would immediately call for a strike on military bases in North Viet Nam and announce a "new tit-for-tat policy."

Democrats would be horrified and they would make speeches that Goldwater was "trigger happy" and was trying to get us into a war with Red Cina.

Ignore Criticism

But Goldwater would ignore the criticism, and to show he meant business, he would continue the raids, using not only Air Force bombers, but jets from the U. S. fleet. As time went on the country would be shaken at the recklessness of Goldwater's

plan, but he would explain through his secretary of state that, instead of a "tit-for-tat" policy, we now intended to bomb North Viet Nam in order to let Hanoi know that they could not support the Viet Cong without expecting retaliation.

Senators would get up in Congress and call for some sort of negotiations. But Goldwater with his lack of restraint would report that there is nothing to negotiate and we would only be sat down at a table with the North Vietnamese and Red China.

Russia and France would call for a Geneva Conference, But Goldwater would reject it.

Instead, he would recklessly announce that he was sending in a battalion of Marines with Hawk missiles to protect our airfields. His critics would claim he was escalating the war, but Goldwater would deny it. Instead he would bomb supply routes in Laos and Cambodia.

To explain these desperate actions, Goldwater would have the Defense and State Departments produce a "White Paper" justifying the attacks and proving that Hanoi was responsible for the revolution in South Viet Nam. He would insist we had to support the Saigon generals, no matter how shaky they were.

The paper would be followed by more air strikes using South Vietnamese planes as well as American B-57's.

No Choice

The people who voted for Johnson would scream at their Republican friends, "I told you if Goldwater became president he'd get us into a war."

But the Republicans would claim that Goldwater had no choice, that he, in fact, inherited the Viet Nam problem from the Democrats and, if he didn't take a strong stand now, America would be considered a paper tiger.

It all seems far-fetched when you read it and I may have let my imagination run away with itself, because even Barry Goldwater, had he become president, wouldn't have gone so far.

But fortunately, with President Johnson at the helm, we don't even have to think about it.

Cops And Robbers



Library Attack Not Specific

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I was baffled and much intrigued by a letter from an unidentified "Faculty Member" published in the March 9 number, in which said Faculty Member blasts some of the library staff for neglect of duties, attributing said neglect to the time they devote to athletic prowess, or something like that.

Would the academic "Mister X" clarify his criticism? Has someone kicked sand in his face, or perhaps, "stack dust?" What's up? Shall we confiscate their athletic supporters?

David Littlejohn
Dept. of Romance Languages