

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

Tovarich And The Tobacco

By JAY JENKINS
In The Charlotte Observer

RALEIGH — One little rag-tag Communist, who scarcely knows where his next theoretical meal is coming from, certainly can stand the State of North Carolina on its ear.

So it's in order to conjure a tableau of the future in the Tar Heel State, one that is purely imaginary. . .

The first hint that Tovarich had been invited to speak on the university campus at Chapel Hill came when a number of legislators suddenly filled the lobby of the Capitol.

"Another one's been invited," a legislator said darkly. "A festering Red sore," said another. "A Red nest," said another.

There was much milling around. At long last, the chairman of the trustee executive committee emerged from the governor's office and said quietly, "The speech has been cancelled."

Great was the rejoicing. But over to one side, a stranger looked glum and shook his head sadly.

"Don't believe I've had the pleasure," said a legislator. "Smith, from the U. S. Department of Agriculture," said the stranger.

Then the stranger added, almost under his breath, "Tovarich was gonna talk about Russia's plans to buy surplus tobacco."

"You mean flue-cured tobacco."
"North Carolina flue-cured tobacco," said the stranger. "Moscow isn't interested in the Virginia or the Georgia leaf."

"Tovarich says they want only the Tar Heel variety. He says it's something in the soil or atmosphere, a sort of rancid flavor."

It seemed all at once that a rump session of the General Assembly had been called. All the legislators were talking simultaneously. Then the governor appeared, smiling at his office door.

"You can go home, fellows," said the governor. "We took care of that little matter." His smile changed into an expression of alarm, as the legislators rushed toward him.

Only snatches of their torrent of words were decipherable. Phrases like "free speech" and "academic freedom" were spliced into shouts about "90-cent tobacco" and "disappearing surplus."

"Wait a minute now" said the governor, examining the faces in the crowd. "Every one of you told me personally you didn't want Tovarich to speak in Chapel Hill."

"That's right," said a perspiring legislator whose car carried a dactal reading, "Largest Tobacco Market in the World." The legislator added, "we want him to speak at East Carolina College."

There was a lot of confusion. The governor said the trustees would "lose face" if they rescinded the ban, and a legislator shouted his county would lose a lot more if the ban stood.

The governor and the legislators finally went to the Hall of the House to talk some more. Smith, the Agriculture Department man, was quizzed at length. "Yes, Tovarich is a hard-core Communist—" he began.

"Get on the tobacco angle," shouted a legislator. Smith said that yes, Tovarich was ready to pay cash, for present and future orders.

"Governor, this talk clearly would serve an 'educational purpose,'" said a tobacco-county lawmaker. "This state is committed to education. Our boys and girls deserve the best. They can separate the wheat from the chaff when these Commies talk. . ."

"But, gentlemen, you passed the law giving the authority to the trustees, and they have decided that Tovarich has been invited only for the sake of controversy," said the governor.

In the end, the governor capitulated. When the special session convened, the badge of the Easterner was his fur headpiece and the "Volga Boatman," lapel pin. A section of U.S. 74 in Pitt County already had been named "Tovarich Drive." Chowan County commissioners decreed that henceforth shad roe was "Leningrad caviar."

Tovarich's speech was sparsely attended, and picketed by non-smokers protesting the section of the "open-end speaker law" that prohibited them from asking him questions. But he bought the surplus tobacco.

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; Grady Hubbard, wire editor; Bill Fesperman, religious editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; David Rothman, columnist; Carol Gallant, secretary; Ed Freakley, Bob Harris, Glenn Mays, Steve Lackey, Steve Bennett, staff writers; Wayne Hurder, Ron Shinn, Mike O'Leary, copy editors; Gene Whisman, Bill Rollins, Bill Hass, Sandy Treadwell, Drummond Bell, 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.



The Student Speaks

Trustee Action Justified

By WILLIAM OTIS

A lot of us thought that we had won the last laugh on the General Assembly with the amendment of the speaker ban last year. Once more we could pursue Truth and Wisdom unshackled by the petty and vindictive little minds in Raleigh. The threat of accreditation loss had been too much for even their provincial obstinance, and reluctantly they acceded to the requirements of "academic freedom."

"Hallelujah!" we rejoiced. "The witch is dead!"
Not quite.
In our intoxicated exultation we overlooked a few relevant details. For one thing, the amendment did not, thank God, make the campus a streetcorner soapbox onto which any variety of cranks could trot to preach their particular Word. Instead it shifted responsibility for the regulation of speaking privileges from a fixed policy (i.e., no Communists, Fifth Amendment pleaders, etc.) to a flexible one, and from the General Assembly to the University board of trustees.

So now that latter body has chosen to exercise the responsibility and flexibility we demanded so loudly and so petulantly only a few months ago that it be given And what is our reaction? We resume our weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth because we think that the foot of academic freedom has had its delicate toes stomped on.

But I, for one, have heard enough pompous bombast about academic freedom from students here. Let's get some things straight.

First, this University has no academic freedom and never has had any. The freedom of inquiry we do enjoy, which we commonly confuse with academic freedom, (and which, incidentally, is a great deal more substantial than that enjoyed by university students in the nations Herbert Aptheker most admires) is simply one of the privileges we are granted by the General Assembly.

This is a state-owned and state-supported institution, and as such enjoys only those prerogatives the state sees fit to grant it. No more.

Second, we knew that this was the case when we came here. We were not compelled to come, and we are not compelled to stay. We have chosen, consciously I assume, to exercise the privilege of attendance at a state supported university and yet continue to act as if academic freedom were our God-given right.

Third, just how much do we make of "academic freedom" when we are not squawking that we don't have any? The truth is that all the "academic freedom" 95 per cent of us ever use is just enough to look at our text books (once in a while, at least), read Monarch outlines, and scurry on occasion to the local quiz file.

We use our freedom of inquiry not to examine what are the tenets of Marxism (or utilitarianism or Zen Buddhism, etc), but toward another sort of question, i.e. how are we getting to Greensboro this weekend, can we get to the ABC store before it closes, what is on the tube tonight?

The remaining five per cent who actually do take an active interest in intellectual questions beyond the immediate scope of their courses are, I feel sure, sufficiently resourceful to provide for nourishing their minds by means other than personal attendance at lectures given by persons barred from the use of campus facilities.

They could, for example, arrange for these persons to speak off campus, or could tape and re-play their speeches, or could avail themselves of texts, journals, circulars, and reprints, available in voluminous quantity both on campus and off, in which persons prohibited from appearing have expressed themselves.

Moreover, our beligerence increases: We'll show them, we will, with mass rallies, marches to Raleigh, petitions, and if need be, law suits to shake them from their provincial obstructionism.

It might be a good idea to avoid antagonizing the petty little men in Raleigh too much, though. They might decide one day that they'd had enough lip from post-teenage know-it-alls, and close this place down.

Then we would have something legitimate to complain about.

Another point: disregarding all other considerations, it is argued that prohibiting Aptheker's appearance would violate his freedom of speech. So we must stand up for Constitutional Rights, Democratic Principles, and the American Way (also, presumably, Justice, Mother, and the Flag), and demand that this Communist be permitted to belch his dogma at us from on campus.

This is utter nonsense. To forbid the enlistment and use of the grounds, buildings, and other facilities which are owned and maintained by the state to Communist speakers is not to deny them freedom of speech. Thus the trustees are in no way impinging upon Aptheker's constitutional guarantees; they are withholding the privilege of the use of state property. This is entirely within their authority.

One final point should be added. The student body has seemed all too willing to make obvious its general contempt for the legislature, the trustees, and the Governor. We see them as men of little vision, intelligence, or perspective. (Naturally, these qualities abound in ourselves.)

Exactly why this obnoxiously smug attitude prevails is not important here. That we exhibit it with ever increasing frequency is. Campus leaders added to the exhibition when they joined the SDS in inviting Aptheker. Hardly a prudent move, for it served not to clarify the unity of the student body behind what it incorrectly views as free speech, but instead to blur even further the hazy distinction in many people's minds between the generally moderate and responsible course of student government and the rather different course of the SDS.

Mike Jennings

UNC Lacks Trust Of State

"What's wrong with those people in Chapel Hill?"

"Who do they think they are down there, anyway? Maybe we'll just show them who they are."

They did. They showed us who we are. Just like they've done so many times before, the people of this state put us in our place. They showed us we don't deserve to be trusted.



The Trustees were only reflecting this state's ancient, almost morbid distrust of its state university when they pulled the rug out from under the invitations to Wilkinson and Aptheker.

It's this distrust — this unfounded, superstitious suspicion of Chapel Hill and the University—that is the real burden of shame our school bears. The rebuttals the Legislature and the Trustee have handed us in the past have been something worse than mere injustices. Unjust statutes could at least be respected if they were accompanied by a feeling of concern throughout the state for the welfare of the University.

But the feeling has always been, "I guess that'll show those—and radicals and communists in Chapel Hill they aren't going to run this state." That's what hurts. That's what makes the statutes mockeries.

This writer will try to disprove, in a feature article in the Sunday Tar Heel, many of the charges commonly made against the University and Chapel Hill. The article will use statistics and statements

gathered from law enforcement agencies and from the Institute of Government to show that Chapel Hill has as clean a record as any major city in the state on all counts—including violence, narcotics usage and communist activity.

It's too much to hope, though, that contrary evidence can kill a phantom born of an old tradition. For a long time to come, people across the state will mistrust us. They'll "know" all about the blood on the Old Well, the communist behind every bush, the perverts behind every bush, the marijuana in the attic and the brothel on the ground floor.

And they'll want to know, to our endless frustration, what's wrong with those idiots in Chapel Hill.

Thanks To Students

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I would like to express my appreciation to the students who so quickly and efficiently gave me first aid and other assistance on Thursday, Jan. 27. Slipping on the ice near Hill Hall about 4:45 p.m. that day really made a mess of my ankle. My stay in the hospital is not over. Due to the quick thinking and kindness of those who stopped to help, I suffered no shock and probably was spared more serious injury.

Today many people consider the college student to be thoughtless and self-centered. I feel otherwise, and I have proof!

My thanks again to all who helped.
Sincerely,
Jane Wright,
Visiting Assistant Professor,
School of Library Science

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.

David Rothman

He Dreamed Of Dissension

Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey said recently that Students for a Democratic Society is plagued with dissension, and judging from a discussion I dreamed I had with several SDS members, I'd find his observations entirely correct.

"Is it true your group is dissension-ridden?" I asked one member.

"We have trouble agreeing on everything," the member replied.

"In fact," he said, "We have more dissension within our ranks than any other organization on campus."
"Huh?"

"We're against the consensus."

Then I talked with another SDS man. "Nonsense," he said. "Everyone agreed on nearly all the points brought up at our last meeting. Our six motions were almost unanimously approved. Nobody disagrees with anybody."

At this point still another SDS member interrupted the conversation to ask: "Who said that was the number of motions we passed?"

"I did."

"Oh come on now. You've probably made it up."

"I did not."

"The heck you didn't."

"Want to fight about it?"

"Please," the second SDS member I talked to pleaded. "Stop your argument."

