

# Intermarriage Measure Misconstrued & Untimely, But Very Admirable...

The "intermarriage" resolution passed last week by the State Student Legislature has ignited a controversial conflagration throughout the state—partially due to a misconstruing of the measure's content state newspapers.

The News And Observer and other state papers termed the measure an open advocacy of racial intermarriage, which is diametrically in opposition to the measure's actual meaning.

The resolution actually advocates the repeal of all state laws prohibiting racial intermarriage, which in effect, merely extends more civil liberty to the people of the state.

As an extension of civil liberties, the resolution is admirable. But the tone of the measure, especially at this particular time when racial flare-ups and proposed educational integration has the South on the tip of its touchy toes, was definitely in poor taste and left the student solons open for a great deal of criticism by trustees, administration officials and alumni throughout the state.

The resolution was introduced by the Duke University Woman's College and was passed by both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

We very definitely and very vehemently oppose intermarriage between Negroes and whites. We can think of nothing more despicable than amalgamation and miscegenation.

But we do not condone nor endorse governmental prohibition of racial intermarriage. To each his own. If individuals want whole-sale miscegenation, then the matter should rest with these individuals.

Governmental intervention and prohibition merely stifles liberty and solves nothing. To wit: The Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and on a realistic and more recent level, intervention of federal troops in Little Rock—an action justified only because of the bull-headedness and political-mindedness of Gov. Orval Faubus.

The University delegation, according to one unofficial source, accorded the resolution more negative votes than any other school represented. Thus trustees and others so up-in-arms may partially vindicate local student lawmakers, if vindication is the proper word to use.

In short, the resolution came at a most inopportune and racially-upset time.

But the promulgation of more civil liberties to individual Americans is always an admirable action. More and more, American individualism and justifiable states' rights are falling prey to a creeping brand of socialism generated by the federal government.

And state newspapers who completely misconstrued the State Student Legislature's action definitely owe representatives a large economy-sized apology. Some papers even reported that the State College-introduced bill to legalize prostitution was passed. It was incontrovertibly defeated.

State Student legislators had guts. But their fortitude was displayed at a rather inopportune time.

The bill restoring individual-civil liberties was admirable, but inopportune.

Perhaps the most politically important argument against integration comes from those who believe that the authority over education, voting, and opportunity emanates from the states. Those holding this view feel it is the state's responsibility, not the federal government's, to handle the problem of the colored people with regard to education, enfranchisement, and opportunity. This is the States' Rights doctrine.

Article Ten of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States gives the basis for those who claim the doctrine of State's Rights, for this article reserves the powers, not specifically delegated by the Constitution to other agencies of the federal government, to the states.

However, there is a clause in Article Ten that says that powers prohibited to states by the Constitution shall not be reserved to the states.

Prior to 1868, only Congress was specifically prohibited the power to infringe on the rights guaranteed individuals in the Bill of Rights, articles one through nine. However, in 1868 with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, the states were denied power to infringe on individual rights. The colored people by virtue of the Thirteenth Amendment were, in the large majority, citizens. Hence the states had and now have no legal claim to infringement of the rights of any individual regardless of race, creed, religion, or color.

There seems to be no doubt in the minds of the segregationists as to the validity of the Thirteenth Amendment. There seems to be indeed some question as to the legality of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the question has been raised often and most notably by Columnist David Lawrence. Yet, the fact is that it is a part of the U. S. Constitution and has had more far reaching effect than perhaps any other single amendment.

Moreover, there is no question that the amendment was ratified legally, and is in the Constitution of the United States justifiably. There are, however, two ways of looking at the ratification of this amendment.

From a Constitutional angle, there is reason to believe that the Southern states were not states after the civil war, but were territories of the United States.

In Article One section ten of the Constitution there is a clause which states that no state may enter a confederation. Hence, the Civil War was the southern independence, and the result was territorial status for the southern states.

If this is true, then the legislatures of the Northern States, with only Kentucky and Delaware dissenting were enough to carry the amendment. Moreover, Congress, which is, by virtue of Article Four, empowered to set the requirements for statehood, was able to call ratification of the Constitution with the addition of amendment fourteen as a prerequisite for readmission as states of the Union. Without ratification, the southern states still would be territories.

There is another view held by many including the Supreme Court in Texas vs. White, that the southern states had never left the Union. If this is the case, then

## VIEW FROM THE HILL: Segregation & States Rts. Doctrinaires

Curtis Gans

Perhaps the most politically important argument against integration comes from those who believe that the authority over education, voting, and opportunity emanates from the states. Those holding this view feel it is the state's responsibility, not the federal government's, to handle the problem of the colored people with regard to education, enfranchisement, and opportunity. This is the States' Rights doctrine.

Article Ten of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States gives the basis for those who claim the doctrine of State's Rights, for this article reserves the powers, not specifically delegated by the Constitution to other agencies of the federal government, to the states.

However, there is a clause in Article Ten that says that powers prohibited to states by the Constitution shall not be reserved to the states.

Prior to 1868, only Congress was specifically prohibited the power to infringe on the rights guaranteed individuals in the Bill of Rights, articles one through nine. However, in 1868 with the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, the states were denied power to infringe on individual rights. The colored people by virtue of the Thirteenth Amendment were, in the large majority, citizens. Hence the states had and now have no legal claim to infringement of the rights of any individual regardless of race, creed, religion, or color.

There seems to be no doubt in the minds of the segregationists as to the validity of the Thirteenth Amendment. There seems to be indeed some question as to the legality of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the question has been raised often and most notably by Columnist David Lawrence. Yet, the fact is that it is a part of the U. S. Constitution and has had more far reaching effect than perhaps any other single amendment.

Moreover, there is no question that the amendment was ratified legally, and is in the Constitution of the United States justifiably. There are, however, two ways of looking at the ratification of this amendment.

From a Constitutional angle, there is reason to believe that the Southern states were not states after the civil war, but were territories of the United States.

In Article One section ten of the Constitution there is a clause which states that no state may enter a confederation. Hence, the Civil War was the southern independence, and the result was territorial status for the southern states.

If this is true, then the legislatures of the Northern States, with only Kentucky and Delaware dissenting were enough to carry the amendment. Moreover, Congress, which is, by virtue of Article Four, empowered to set the requirements for statehood, was able to call ratification of the Constitution with the addition of amendment fourteen as a prerequisite for readmission as states of the Union. Without ratification, the southern states still would be territories.

There is another view held by many including the Supreme Court in Texas vs. White, that the southern states had never left the Union. If this is the case, then



there is also no question of the legality of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although the Fourteenth Amendment was rejected the first time around, with thirteen states dissenting, there is no bar in the Constitution to trying to pass an amendment a second time. The second time, it was passed by the "Reconstructed" southern legislatures.

There may be some who say that the "reconstructed" governments were not representative governments, but Congress is empowered, by Article Four, to guarantee to the states a republican form of government. Hence, the "Reconstructed" southern governments under the 1867 Reconstruction Act, were the governments thought of as representative and republican at the time by Congress.

Whatever the ills of Reconstruction, the great good of the protection of the democratic rights of all citizens in law was a product.

Equal educational facilities through integrated schools was judged to be one of the rights or a corollary of the rights guaranteed to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or religion. Any attempt by Gov. Orval Faubus, Sen. Harry Byrd, or even the more moderate Rep. Thomas Pearsall of North Carolina to prevent the progress of integration in the southern states is a deliberate circumvention of the law of the land.

It is indeed unfortunate that President Eisenhower waited until force was necessary in Little Rock, but it is a fact that the President as executor of the laws of the U. S. has the power to employ force to see that the law of the land is followed. Equality of rights is the law, and must be followed.

It is only when the colored people have equal rights in all fields,

## WISE AND OTHERWISE:

# Herringbone Spacers Reject Housing Offer

Whit Whitfield

We don't imagine that anyone else saw it. Most of the coeds were in, and it was after 3 a.m. It was about 268 feet, 3 inches long, weighed 26 tons, and was shaped like a lampshade with a cigar-like nose.

The Herringbone tweed design of the body was clearly discernible in the streetlight near Y-court. The yellowish, orange-like glow which surrounded the ship as it descended was eerie enough, but the passengers were enough to scare even such a brave man as President Eisenhower.

There were 67 of them in all, each dressed in olive-drab space suits of Harris Tweed (yes, with no pleats). They were all six feet tall and weighed 187 pounds. They appeared friendly enough, so we walked over to chat with them. Which was difficult, for they only spoke Greek.

We asked them if they were responsible for the stalled cars in Texas and New Mexico, the kidnapped dog, the potato patch scare in Dunn and the fish pond incident in McColl, S. C. They affirmed that they were and apologized for the trouble they had caused. Incidentally, their leader,

Kris Kolombo, mentioned a visit with a gentleman named R. O. Schmidt on a Nebraska prairie a few nights back that proved most interesting. He was the first insane human that they had met.

We were invited in for a breakfast of dogs, and eggs. (They met with Sputnik II on the way.) Afterwards Kris told me that they were married students at the University of Nocoop, a state-owned school on the planet Mars. They too were looking for accommodations.

Most of them were veterans of the Chumpev Revolution, and deeply concerned over the lack of consideration given them by the state. Their living quarters were in a state of semi-dilapidation, but this was all they could afford. For the apartments near the university were so high that it was absurd to think that they would afford to pay for them.

After we had told them the situation here, they were quite upset, and rightly so, for they had wanted to commute from earth if possible. They didn't relish the idea of going on to Jupiter.

Optimistic Republican: One who thinks that after resounding defeats in New York City, Virginia, and New Jersey that things look bright for Rickie Nixon in '60. "Nix" Nixon has already lost Goodie Knight's vote.

To a VVV and M: "Methinks the lady doth protest too much."

## Life-Blood & Lethargy: Vote And Insure Liberty

The life-blood of American democracy, of democracy anywhere, is at stake today.

This lifeblood, of course, is the ballot box procedure—the right to vote for the candidate of your choice.

ice. It replenishes government and reinvigorates governmental system through the tenure of office which it insinuates or terminates.

Systematic tenure of office is the heart-beat of government, and the balloting procedure is the life-blood upon which the heart-beat depends.

Student autonomy is only as strong as the percentage of voters which appears at the ballot box today. In past fall elections—since the major student government officers, the campus-wide officers, are elected in the spring—the voting percentage of the student electorate has been discouragingly small.

Cynics and opponents of student government and its encompassing self-discipline often argue that students are too little interested in government to govern themselves. Their most convincing argument is the lack of student participation at the polls.

Government and autonomy's heart-beat becomes lethargic and slow only if student participation becomes slow and lethargic.

Officials in student government's judiciary and legislative branches are being elected today—the law-enforcers and law-makers of the campus. And class executives, whose merit—with exception being the senior class—is somewhat more dubious, will be chosen.

The student electorate must realize that failure to vote could result in a serious jeopardy, as far as student self-government is concerned.

Vote and guarantee student liberty.

Failure to do so is dangerous.

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Sunday, Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year; \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

- Editor: NEIL BASS
- Coed Editor: ALYS VOORHEES
- Managing Editor: DOUG EISELE
- News Editor: BILL CHESHIRE
- Asst. News Editor: PATSY MILLER
- Sports Editor: BILL KING
- Asst. Sports Editor: DAVE WIBLE
- Business Manager: JOHN WHITAKER
- Advertising Manager: FRED KATZIN
- Librarian: GLENDA FOWLER
- Business Staff: WALKER BLANTON, LEWIS RUSH
- EDIT STAFF: Whit Whitfield, Nancy Hill, Gary Nichols, Curtis Gans, Al Walker, Gail Godwin, Harry Kirschner.
- Circulation Manager: SYD SHUFORD
- Wire Editor: PAUL RULE
- Subscription Mgr.: AVERY THOMAS
- Feature Editor: BEN TAYLOR

- NEWS STAFF: Davis Young, Ann Frye, Dale Whitfield, Mary Moore Mason, Stanford Fisher, Edith MacKinnon, Pringle Pipkin, Mary Leggett Browning, Ruth Whitley, Sarah Armstrong.
- SPORTS STAFF: Erwin Fuller, Mac Mahaffy, Al Walters, Ed Rowland, Ken Friendman, Donnie Moore, Neil Lehman, Elliott Cooper, Carl Keller, Jim Purks, Rusty Hammond.
- PHOTOGRAPHERS: Norman Kantor, Buddy Spoon.
- Proof Reader: ALTON CLAYTOR
- Night Editor: ALTON CLAYTOR

## Letter Policy

Letters to the editor are not only welcomed, they are heartily encouraged. All letters signed and in good taste will be printed with the greatest possible expediency. Typewritten letters, set at 66 spaces, are preferred.

## L'IL ABNER



## POGO



## by Al Capp



## by Walt Kelly



## READERS' REPOSITORY: Reiterated Plea For Lighter Load

EDITOR: Last week's article "A Plea for lighter curriculum" reiterated the well-known need for scientists in this country — scientists of all ranks, not just Einsteins, but technicians and everything between the two extremes. The major point was something familiar to most students, and that is the unfair workload that is placed on science students. When we say unfair, we mean the actual amount of work required for science students as compared to the amount of work required for non-science students.

Just imagine the difference in the amount of work outside of class necessary for a non-science student to keep up with his sociology, anthropology, or English classes, and the amount of work necessary for the science student to keep up with his chemistry, physics, or calculus classes. The number of hours credit for both is approximately the same, fifteen or sixteen hours, but the difference in actual work performed is practically doubled!

And don't be misled into believing that the science courses are just as easy for the science major as the non-science courses are for other majors. It just ain't so! Why is there not a proportional representation of science students participating in extra-curricula activities? Why aren't more science students in fraternities and sororities? Is it because they are not interested in these activities? No—a better reason is that they don't have the time to participate. Most of them have to double up the amount of work in a given time just to be able to go to one football game in two or three months!

Also every semester several science students are forced to quit school or change to another field because they cannot maintain an average scholastic standing due to the present workload requirement. This is a loss of capable students; it is a loss that is detrimental to our country and our way of life. Can we afford this loss?

But what can we as students and faculty do about this? Well our need for scientists is a reality. Why not use a realistic method to help meet this need? Why not reduce the workload for science students? That is, instead of requiring fifteen hours per semester, why not reduce this requirement to perhaps twelve hours of work per semester in cases that need this reduction? What this really amounts to is an equaling-out of the workload for science majors. This would give them a chance to compete and participate on an equal basis with other students. This reduction in workload does not imply a decrease in the quantity of courses required for science majors, nor does it imply a decrease in the quality of work required for any particular science course. But it does offer the student of science an opportunity for a "normal" workload each semester.

One possible outcome for an equaling-out program of this type would be the inducement necessary for students who are interested in science to go into it. Some of these students are afraid to tackle it now. We can't afford to lose these interested people, not with the world situation that exists today.

Some students obviously just aren't interested in how much work a science major has to do, but there is one thing you can bet those "uninterested" students are interested in, and that is protection for themselves and freedom. And after all, those are the problems at hand in the world today! There seems to be one country that knows where its safety lies, and that country is Russia!

Are we going to be able to use our tradition and resistance to change as defense against their knowledge and their missiles?

## THE FIRE FIGHTERS' FORM OREGON DAILY EMERALD:

# Cruelty To Dogs Or Achievement

The peculiar nature of humans is nicely pointed up by the storm of indignant protest that has arisen over the Russians' launching of a small dog in Sputnik II. The repercussions of this act may well catch them with their propaganda down.

This is really — much as we hate to admit it — another scientific "first" for the Russians. They beat us with Sputnik I and now have launched a larger satellite with a warm-blooded animal in it.

Many observers are saying, and perhaps correctly, that sending Curly up with the new satellite will do the Russians much more harm — propaganda-wise — than good. This follows the old journalistic axiom that a picture of a starving pup on a back page will arouse more interest and discussion than a dozen stormy editorials.

But from a detached scientific viewpoint, the storm of indignant protest over Curly is nonsense, and made even more ridiculous by some animal-lovers' suggestions that human volunteers should have been sent up instead. Much of scientific value can be learned by sending a mammal orbiting in space.

Most of the modern advances in medical science have been over the dead bodies of thousands of laboratory rabbits and guinea pigs. Many of the techniques of treating heart disease have been perfected through experiments on dogs.

The Emerald certainly does not condone needless inhumanity toward dumb animals. But we hold no brief with those emotional people who are saying the animals should not be used in legitimate scientific experiments. And just because the Russians are using Curly in a scientific experiment does not change the facts of the matter. We're just sorry that she's not up in an American Vanguard.