

The Daily Tar Heel

In its seventieth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the University administration or the student body.

All editorials appearing in the DAILY TAR HEEL are the individual opinions of the Editors, unless otherwise credited; they do not necessarily represent the opinions of the staff. The editors are responsible for all material printed in the DAILY TAR HEEL.

October 18, 1962 Tel. 943-2356 Vol. XLX, No. 24

South's Troubled Search: Reconcile Beliefs, Reality

Many observers of the Mississippi crisis have claimed that the defiance of Federal authority and ensuing enrollment of Meredith mark a "turning point" in the progress of desegregation in the South—this, it seems, misses the point.

The "turning point" in Southern race relations which is being looked for, has come—is coming—and will come.

What happened in Mississippi has affected Southern defiance physically, but not morally. The riots make such future actions less probable, but do nothing to the basic reasons for these actions.

The turning point came for Oxford's citizens that Bloody Sunday on the Ole Miss campus. A month before the turning point probably came for an old man in Atlanta . . . three months before that, for a couple in Charleston . . . a year before that, for a college student in Raleigh . . . before that, for countless others, came moments of doubt, the questioning, and finally the acceptance that American ideals mean the same thing for all citizens, that "all men are created equal" means all men are created equal, and that the Southland can no longer deny basic human liberties to any portion of its population. Thus the turning point has come for many Southerners.

For the last hundred years, more desperately in the last ten years, the South has been searching for a solution to its racial problems. More accurately the search has been for THE solution, the panacea which will end forever the agonizing conflict within the white Southerner—between his racial attitudes on one hand, and on the other, his essential belief in American principles and the honest, generous spirit of the South.

The Southerner is caught between what he believes he SHOULD think about the Negro, and what he actually feels.

He is shipwrecked, lost in a sea of confusion and doubt.

But, as Ortega Gasquet's "shipwrecked" man did, the Southerner "looked around for something to which to cling, and that tragic, ruthless glance, absolutely sincere, because it is a question of his salvation, will cause him to bring order into the chaos of his life.

"These are the only genuine ideas: the ideas of the shipwrecked."

The Southerner cannot end the conflict within himself by reading about the Federal troops in Mississippi, or by hearing an argument

supporting the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments, or by seeing that the South's resistance is futile—and this is the point.

Most of the words directed at Southerners on the race question have said, "You will lose—Don't fight—You will lose." For a region with a deep-seated love for lost causes, this argument carries no weight—the South accepts it with spirit of Earl Long, when he said, "You can't fight the Federal government; they've got the H-Bomb."

That this resignation in face of the power of government solves no basic feelings does not mean it should be stopped or slowed. It does mean that parallel though must be directed—thought primarily by concerned Southerners, because it is their conflict and their shame—to ward reconciling the Southerner spiritually and emotionally to the Negro as a human being and as an economic, political and social fact.

This though, and the actions stemming from thought, should come primarily from Southerners because they know the internal conflict—the Southerner understands why his best friend or his next-door neighbor or roommate is a segregationist. He understands the maze of religious and emotional reasons behind the prejudice and stubbornness.

The Southern college student has an even greater obligation to help remove the stigma of racial prejudice from his region and his people. The student is given four years of comparative freedom, with prime responsibility to his own education—in and out of the classroom—and he is given these four years in a time of history, when his region is embroiled in a painful upheaval of the old order. The student is offered the knowledge to deal with this situation—offered by a campus which specializes in tolerance and understanding.

On the racial problem—as on no others—the student is faced with a situation which is next door—really, it is within his house, within his dormitory, shadowing him wherever he goes. This is the only issue of moral and political consequence which the student cannot escape—as long as he is in a school or a church or a theater or a restaurant or in a voting booth.

The racial situation is one which must not be dragged out for centuries—it must be dispensed with, ended, so that no longer is it even a "question" or a "problem". Only when there is no longer a race problem, will America be able to confidently and completely center its attention upon the issues of war and peace, economic development, the world community of nations . . .

As long as there is an Oxford and a Little Rock there will be little understanding abroad of the American system of democracy. Close to home, as long as there is an Oxford, business will be troubled . . . state and local and Federal government will be in constant friction . . . There will be no peace until the ever-present sword of racial agitation is taken from over our heads.

And the Southern student must assume a leading responsibility in this.

Each student must conduct his personal "search", must resolve his personal conflict, and then aid the region in resolving its broader conflict.

The decisions and actions of these shipwrecked Southerners are "the only genuine ideas", in Ortega's words. These will be the decisions and actions by which the South advances and eventually, finds its peace. (JC)

Preoccupation Force



Letters To The Editors

Open Trials, YAF, And (Yes) Ross Barnett

'Troika' Proposal And Open Trials

In the current debate raging on campus concerning increased openness of Honor Council trials, proponents of this amendment stress the educational value to be derived from such procedures. The need for and the merit of increased knowledge by the student body of the work of the Councils cannot be disputed. To accomplish this, legislation soon to be proposed would provide that all trials would be open except in those cases which a selected 'troika' deemed openness and publication unwise, even within the limits of the amendment. Carefully thought-out limitations and restrictions present in the bill are designed to provide adequate information to the student body while completely protecting the identity of the defendant. My concern here is primarily with the mechanism devised to accomplish this, namely the 'troika' concept.

With this in mind, let us ask, "Why are closed trials currently provided for?" Of the many reasons that could be given, one of the most important is that certain offenses inherently are best handled in this manner, experience validating in this. Examples here include certain cases handled by the Women's Council plus those involving well-known student body personalities. Yet in concern for fairness, ready access has been provided all defendants to closed trials. Secondly, many feel that the bad connotation associated with any appearance before the Councils, whether as witness or defendant, is greatly reduced or eliminated in closed trials. In the case of the guilty defendant, it is often felt that the council is better able to achieve its twin objectives of providing a sentence balanced by both corrective and punitive elements. Finally, the present right which allows each defendant to decide the question of the openness of his trial is one which should not be dismissed lightly, as the proposed amendment would do. For here, the defendant is forced to decide between the validity of his reasons for a closed trial and the validity of the student body's interest in the proceedings of the Councils. This privilege he should always have! In response to those who disagree, of what value then is student government if it removes the opportunity for responsible decision-making from the defendant's rights? Is not the defendant the one who may most need to grow in responsible living?

Brief mention has been made of some of the reasons behind the current tradition of closed trials and

why ready access to them should always be available. Admittedly, the number of open trials in the past has been small. WHY? The wording of the constitution "favoring" closed trials and the attitude thus conveyed its partially responsible. But also involved, whether justifiably or not, is a lack of confidence in the Daily Tar Heel to responsibly handle open trials. In view of this tendency, the farmers of the "open" amendment included the 'troika' device to insure increased access to Council trials. Thus, one is forced to wonder what kind of proposal this is that needs such a crutch! Is the proposed amendment strong enough to protect the individual's identity or not? And if so, then why do the amendment's proponents lack such confidence in its merits that they feel compelled to abolish the right of each defendant to decide for himself the openness of his trial?

If the bill would be as beneficiary as its advocates proclaim, then why is there this unwillingness to work to sell and persuade fellow students of the merits and strong points of the proposal. Why do proponents feel they must "oram" this amendment down the student's throat? If it is that good and that soundly conceived and administered, then surely the amendment can stand on its own, without any crutch! Correctly handled and communicated, it can receive voluntary endorsement from each defendant, while at the same time, providing the opportunity for free, responsible decision-making by each student as to his responsibility to his fellow students for their knowledge of Honor Council transactions.

The proposed amendment does not need such a crutch as the 'troika'. Except for that particular detail, it is quite strong, well-conceived, and thought-out. Yet, even here it cannot be assumed perfect. Thus, it is crucial to provide an effective check against that which currently seems inconceivable, namely the flagrant abuse of the amendment's purpose via some unforeseen loophole or carelessness in handling. Let us continue to provide for ready access to closed trials by any student on his own volition. Let us not ask the student body to forfeit the opportunity for responsible decision-making presently available. Rather, let us shift the present emphasis to one of "open trials unless the defendant requests a closed one." Let us work for increased conviction among the students as to the merits and guarantees of this proposal while simultaneously retaining the 'check' of the individual decision to insure protection of personal rights.

—John Mitchener

Barnett And Co. Real Enemies

To The Editors:

Is the American Legion really interested in strengthening America and fighting Communism?

If so, why doesn't it "investigate" the real treats to our security—those who have openly advocated rebellion against our government, defamed our world image as a "democracy", and furnished the Communists with valuable propaganda weapons.

With Ross Barnett and his supporters doing so much to weaken America and help its enemies, why does the Legion make such a fuss over a harmless bunch of left-wing college kids?

—Craig Smith
—Betina Smith

YAF Meeting Slated Today

To The Editors:

The first annual convention of Young Americans for Freedom, America's leading conservative youth organization, was held in New York City on September 27, 28, and 29. Robert Bauman of Washington, D. C., a law student at Georgetown University was elected to a two year term as National Chairman, and David Jones of St. Petersburg, Fla. was elected to the post of Southern Regional Chairman. Prominent speakers at the convention included William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of National Review, and Rep. William Cramer (Rep.-Fla.). Sam Jones and Mike Jaffe attended as representatives of the local YAF Chapter.

Several resolutions were passed by the convention, putting YAF on record as holding the following positions:

—Supporting in full the principle of freedom of association in fraternal organizations, and strongly condemning any actions by college administrations tending to diminish the independence of fraternities and sororities in regard to their membership policies.

—Favoring the immediate activation by the U. S. government of a total armed blockade of Communist Cuba, and the establishment of a policy which would demand the full cooperation of our allies in such endeavor.

—Supporting President Hoover's proposal for the formation of a "Council of Free Nations," the membership of which should consist on-

THE ONE AND ONLY REAL TRUTH

By BENEDICT BURR
(Eds' Note: Mr. Burr, the author of this new weekly column, comes to Carolina from St. Mary's Jr. College, where he was expelled for falsifying records, and more recently he was expelled for painting black a statue of Thomas Jefferson. For his protection, he is writing under a pseudonym.)

With the recent turbulence at the University of Mississippi, a question of great relevance comes to the minds of all professional rabble-rousers and hate-mongers. That is, "What can I do on my particular campus to bring about similar hostilities?"

Although football games are good for raising students to the level of wild animals, they lack the necessary ingredient to provide a genuine frenzy. This ingredient is, of course, a sense of Revolt, and is best manifested in recent times by Ross Barnett. (The distinguished governor will surely go down with Bacunin and Trotsky as great exponents of anarchy.)

Clearly then, students must revolt against the nearest form of government, namely Student Government. Plans must be laid immediately for the violent overthrow of Graham Memorial, and the setting up of a Student Provisional Government.

The first step in any good revolution is to gain control of the military and the proletariat. Obviously the most aggressive, militarily-oriented group on campus is the sorority pledges who will be organized into a marching force. The proletariat is, of course, the residents of Ehringhaus dorm. (What other group is more oppressed and dissatisfied?)

With the Ehringhaus boys rioting outside New East, the pledges will march in and purge the Student Legislature of all undesirables. (Which includes everyone, except Rufus Edmisten, who could never be undesirable to anyone.)

The new revolutionary-controlled

legislature will immediately supplement its power by nationalizing all campus industry and commerce; thus, placing in their control the Book Exchange, Y Court, and the greatest of the factories, Lenoir Hall.

Obviously, all other political parties will be made illegal, and the honor council will be forced to imprison the SP and UP chairmen in the bell tower.

It will not be necessary for the legislators to enact a bill of attainder since the Campus Code already provides for the legality of mass-arrests.

The final step in the assumption of complete control is the overthrow of the executive branch. President Inman Allen masses his forces around Graham Memorial, preparing for violence. Nevertheless, he makes a last-minute plea for peace over WUNC.

This is unfortunate, since no one ever listens to WUNC. At the moment he is reminding the rebellious students of their "responsibility," a correspondent from the Duke Chronicle is hit with an Early Times bottle, and war erupts.

As the violence reaches its peak, and the President's forces are firing last year's G. M. calendars on the mob, a heroic figure appears to lead the retreating revolutionaries back on the student union. It's Hank Patterson! Ex-student government officer and unsuccessful candidate for legislature in last spring's election, Hank makes a dramatic appeal, and leads the charging students back against Allen's marshals.

At the last moment, Graham Memorial is saved when seven reporters from the Ole Miss student newspaper arrive to give the President the added strength he needs.

After a brutal show of force, the rebels are quelled. As the scene closes, the campus is in shambles, and executive troops have occupied Chapel Hill.

ly of those nations which are dedicated to freedom and opposed to Communism.

—Supporting the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would have the effect of allowing state or local school boards to provide for the saying of non-sectarian prayers in public schools, thus overruling the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *Engle v. Vitale* (the "school prayer" case).

The UNC Chapter of YAF will hold its first meeting of this semester Thursday, October 18, at 7:30 p.m., in the Law School Courtroom. The program will consist of a discussion of plans for the coming year, and the playing of recordings of speeches by Senators Barry Goldwater and John Tower. The public is invited to attend all YAF meetings.

—Mike Jaffe

Why Send Best Men To Oxford

To The Editors:

Here is an excerpt from the October 15th edition of the U. S. News and World Report; draw your own conclusions.

"Some comment is heard about how the U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff rate troop requirements for the jobs they do. In Vietnam, for a real war, fewer than 10,000 American military personnel of all kinds have been involved. In West Berlin are about 6,000 U. S. Troops. Oxford, Miss., however, got 16,000, including some of America's toughest combat troops."

And our youth in such sorry physical shape!

—Norwood Taylor

Defense Of Letter On Individualism

To The Editors:

I had no idea that my article "Thank God for Barnett" published in the DTH would bring so much comment both by letters to the paper and in conversation. I am referring specifically to the letters written by Mr. John Madsen and Mr. J. Stogowski.

Thank you very much, Mr. Madsen, for your concern about my letter. I plainly stated that Meredith was an individual. Your letter was entitled "Meredith is Individual Too", a fact that you said I had overlooked. To quote my article, "In a sense Meredith is an individual." Obviously, Mr. Madsen, you

too are an individual in that you are you are perhaps the only student enrolled at Carolina that can't read.

As for you, Mr. Stogowski, and I hope I did spell that correctly, you missed the whole point of my article. Thank you for the compliment in considering me a "world-conquering" freshman, but flattery will be of no avail. I was not comparing Barnett and Luther, I was trying to illustrate my idea of an individual. I realize now that even by drawing a picture some people could never understand my point. I don't know what level of high school or college you have reached, Mr. Stogowski, but there is a word to describe your writing. The best description I could give would be sophomoric.

—Joe Exam

Meredith Protest Didn't Cost State

In reference to the editorial clipping sent to the DTH from Williamson, N. C. "Enterprise," I would like to offer a "humble" rebuttal to the severe slappings aimed at our esteemed University.

Having been accompanied by a raft of Nazi propaganda and a letter by an obvious John Birchler, the clipping had as its purpose evidently to motivate someone into curtailing our liberal "antics." May I remind the writer that the Minute For Meredith demonstration was no part of a so-called "program" laid down by the administration to enhance our intellectual capacity. But, on the other hand, it was held by a group of students — who, according to the writer, were "still wet behind the ears" for the mere value of showing INTEREST and CONCERN for what is going on in our land of bountiful, equal opportunity and prosperity.

I am very distressed that the people in the backwoods are disgusted by our lack of concern for education. I might add that we were utterly overcome by their interest and generosity last year when the Bond Issue went down to a smashing defeat! They claim they are "the people who pay the tax to support such assinine antics;" however, to my knowledge and the knowledge of those involved, the Meredith demonstration did not cost ANYONE (not even the Daily Tar Heel editors) one red cent. Since when have the right to assemble and the freedom of discussion guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States become "things foreign to education"?

—Johnsye Massenbarg

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOFFELTER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

Bill Hobbs — Associate Editor
Wayne King — Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors

Bill Waumett — News Editor
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spis. Ed.
Chris Farran — Matt Welsman
Feature Editors

Harry DeLung — Night Editor
Jim Wallace — Photography Editor
Mike Robinson — Gary Blanchard
Contributing Editors

DAVE MORGAN
Business Manager

Gary Dalton — Advertising Mgr.
John Evans — Circulation Mgr.
Dave Wysong — Subscription Mgr.

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester, \$8 per year.
The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.
Published by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.