

Speaker-Committee, Demonstrations, Etc.

Dupe?

Editors, The Tar Heel,

For several days I have been reading the letters sent in by that illustrious group, the Student Committee to Help Eliminate Invidious, Subversive Speakers. I would like to know who the members of this group are and what kind of "favorable response" they received. I seriously doubt that this "student committee" is really composed of college students. More likely, it is one of the ultra-conservative organizations such as the John Birch Society or the American Legion hiding behind a long title.

Who are they to pass judgment on what is fit for people to hear? They say that "immature youth" is not "sufficiently trained" in "the proper ideas of our American Way" to see the faults of communism. What do they mean by these terms? What are "the proper ideas" and when does a person become mature enough to safely handle the communist doctrines? It seems to me that if this organization put into prac-

tice what they preach, America would be an even worse police state, imprisoning mind and body, than the worst form of communism.

Our "friends" make reference to the idea that we should learn about communism not from "some pale pink professor who spends his time in books (but) rather . . . in the many arts of war." Since when has the "American Way" of settling issues been based on "the many arts of war"? Also, what is so "manly" about war? The death and suffering caused by war is the most horrible evil man has created and carries no glory or manliness except that which is in the warped minds of men who favor it as a method of settling disputes.

I was disgusted to read that these people consider such phrases as "Love thine enemies," "Blessed are the peacemakers," and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you," out of date and even dangerous. I have always been led to believe by my pale pink professors that these are the basic American

and Christian ideals.

I don't agree with your ideas. I feel that the fanatical right is just as dangerous as the fanatical left. So what am I, a dupe of communist infiltrators? Are you going to eliminate me and my insidious, subversive ideas?

Frank Kurth
203 Aycock

Anti-Gag Quotes

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Politically speaking, I consider myself a moderate or even a conservative. However, my opinion on House Bill 1395 swings in the opposite direction from most conservatives. I justify my damnation of the "Gag Law" on two bases—the concept of democracy and the concept of academic freedom, the two of which are inseparable. Not being a polished speaker or writer, I must depend upon the words of John Stuart Mill and Supreme Court Justice Douglas in order to present my views. They are quoted here from "The Politics of American Democracy."

Mill wrote in his essay, "On

Liberty," "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

In the following quote, Justice Douglas dissents the Supreme Court's opinion of the Feinberg Act; however, by substituting the word "speaker" for "teacher," this passage is applicable to House Bill 1395:

"Where suspicion fills the air and holds scholars in line for fear of their jobs, there can be no exercise of the free intellect. Supineness and dogmatism take the place of inquiry. . . . This, I think, is what happens when a censor looks over a teacher's shoulder. . . . It produces standardized thought, not the pursuit of truth which the First Amendment was designed to protect. . . . The Framers knew the danger of dogmatism; they also knew the strength that comes when the mind is free, when ideas may be pursued, wherever they lead. We forget these teachings of the First Amendment when we sustain this law."

Robert H. Lane
204 Purefoy Road

Boycott Asked

Editors, The Tar Heel:

The Civil Rights movement has gained tremendous momentum in Chapel Hill in the past several days. Twenty-seven people, among them several white students, have been willing to sacrifice their holidays for freedom.

Yet, it must be remembered that far too many places in Chapel Hill do not serve all men with equal dignity.

We speak as individuals, and not as members of any organization, in asking every student's support in boycotting the following segregated establishments:

In India . . .

Cooking And Eating Customs Different Than Here

(Editor's Note: This is the fourth in a series of articles sent from India by a participant in the Experiment in International Living. Our Experiment is sponsored by the International Students Board of Student Legislation.)

By MARGARET A. RHYMES
CALCUTTA—Walking into the home of an Indian family, one senses an air of timelessness and the feeling that nothing is ever rushed or hectic here. There's room to breathe and relax under the whirling barbershop fans, remnants from the British days, which hang from high, cool ceilings.

The outdoors with its palms and greenery and the tropical

sun streams in through tall, uncurtained, unglazed windows with wide casements. An occasional sparrow slips in between the shutters to flutter about the room and a small green lizard darts across the wall.

Most of the furniture is low and comfortable and small bamboo stools and plenty of long, round bolsters are scattered about to settle back on.

People move about barefoot or in simple thong sandals across richly patterned rugs or the dark enameled floors, washed daily by one of several servants.

Pictures and statues of gods and a few clay toys and brass

knickknacks are placed about on small, square tables. In the bedroom—if the family doesn't spend their nights on the roof or in the gardens—there are narrow frame beds laced with canvas and covered by a thin palat, one muslin sheet and a light coverlet. Perhaps a mosquito net is hung from an overhead frame.

One wanders into the kitchen—with shoes off in the orthodox Hindu home for most of the food preparation is done on the floor.

There may be a small black stove and a spigot protruding low on the wall from which water runs along a small gutter to the outside. If the family

the edges.

When will we again see "American Life" whole? Perhaps we never will, but then again, perhaps we may. But only when we realize that each of us has a hand in the jig-saw, only when we learn to work together to re-

place those warped and missing pieces will the puzzle become whole. And instead of merely painting the new pieces, we must add color to the whole with our love, our pride, our devotion.

Richard B. Conely,
Durham

More Fuzzy-Wuzzy McInnis

Editors, The Tar Heel,

I have a few more facts to offer for the disposal of Mr. James Robinson, hoping that he will not so much dispose of them as use them to his advantage and understanding.

Swooping down with ominous wings, befuddled in red, white and blue artificial coloring, he thinks to attack liberals, swallowing them up in one overwhelming burst of logic-power. But the vulture is weak and must choke on its own poison.

I urge Robinson to re-read with eagle eye the Ninth Amendment: "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." He should take this law to his heart and his head and apply its spirit and meaning to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Then he might get some elemental glimpse into what it's all about.

"The direct consequences of the Bay of Pigs invasion were a lowering of national prestige and a loss of several million dollars in ransom 'donated' by Americans. Mr. McInnis says that the John F. (Fuzzyminded) Kennedy administration has a knowledge of direct consequences." Several objections, I have, Mr. Robinson: I said in my letter of November 19, "The liberal mind, if responsible, knows that goals have no meaning or direction without a knowledge of direct consequences, and he plans as best he can. The Kennedy Administration is doing precisely that, all disclaimers aside."

This did not mean that I believed the Administration knew in advance everything that could happen given a certain goal or course of action. Obviously, I said that the Kennedy Administration APPRECIATED consequences, not that it could gaze into a magic crystal ball. The late President admitted that a great and tragic mistake had been made with the invasion. Where was Mr. Robinson then?

Even men of Kennedy's position are fallible. It is only the strong and the humble who admit their limitations. The selfish nature of the conservative mind reared its head when it looked on the valiant men who were captured by Castro. What could it see out of its dollar-sign eyes but national disgrace when a compassionate nation pays a monumental ransom for mere men? I am happy to be a part of a world power not so wretchedly insensitive to humanity that it can band together to reclaim its freedom heroes. When Robinson waxes sarcastic about the ransom being "donated" there is little to do but inform him that a donation from private citizens was the case, and these Americans who gave had nothing of which to be ashamed.

Robinson needs to purge himself of the cliché that Medicare is synonymous with socialism. Not so, not so. Medicare provides that medical health insurance be taken from social security. I think Robinson will have to eat crow here, but suspecting his delicate stomach, I suggest it be a Jim Crow, which would be most palatable and more to his taste.

As for his deploring the forces of federal troops to assure equal educational opportunity, at Little Rock, or Mississippi, I suggest that he remembers that he is a citizen of America, whose Supreme Court wrote into our national conscience in 1954 that the laws of the land will be enforced. The government exists to protect the rights of her citizens, and that was what was done. It had to be done. If that exercise in democracy is "totalitarian," then we all might as well go back to the cave stage, when chaos ruled, and darkness prevailed.

What I protest above all else is fiction disguised as fact, wholesale distortions, synthetic and artificial associations. Like many conservatives, Robinson finds explanations for our bewildering world difficult, and since simple, misleading answers are easier to give than complex, accurate ones, a great many naive and incorrect statements have been made.

Fuzzy Wuzzy McInnis
556 Craigie Dorm

They Say . . .

WASHINGTON (UPI) — President Johnson, urging Defense Department officials to get full value for each dollar spent on military items:

"So I look to you not only to protect your country's purse; to safeguard not only her military strength, but her financial stability."

NAIROBI, Kenya—Prime Minister Jomo Kenyatta, shortly before Kenya became independent from Britain:

"To us this is an important day because it is the last on which the colonialist sun will shine on us. Many of us did not know that this day would arrive."

LA PAZ, Bolivia—Bolivian Foreign Minister Jose Feliman Velarde, notifying the American Embassy his country did not need arms or munitions in its campaign to free 25 hostages:

"Bolivia judges the government has the means necessary to solve this conflict by itself."

LOS ANGELES—Frank Sinatra after his 10-year-old son was released by kidnappers:

"Tomorrow is my birthday and this will be the best birthday I ever had."

Do-Nothing Leaders & Demonstrations

The resumption of demonstrations in Chapel Hill is mute testimony to the failure of our town's political leaders to lead, whether through abdication or inability.

Faced with a patent evil—segregation in places of public accommodation—town leaders with the power to remedy this evil have hemmed and hawed over the false issue of property rights vs. human rights, and have ended up doing nothing, which amounts to condoning the evil.

As a result, humiliated Negroes and indignant whites have taken recourse to their only remaining weapon, the sit-in. Those who criticize the use of this weapon should bear in mind that it is only being used because all other methods—including a plea to the town's political leaders—have failed.

It is unfortunate that Chapel Hill's excellent police department is being made to bear the brunt of the situation, but by their lack of action the town's political leaders have in effect decreed that this be done. It is to be hoped that the

police officers, who are having to work overtime to handle the demonstrations, will be compensated more adequately and quickly than they were as a result of a similar situation last summer.

For the benefit of those who criticize the demonstration in favor of strict attention to Negro voter registration, it should be pointed out that the two programs are not mutually exclusive. In fact, with sound leadership in both areas the programs are highly complementary. Demonstrations are far more effective than door-knocking when it comes to impressing upon the uninitiated Negro adult the need for him to register and vote, which is the only ultimate way to remove the need to demonstrate.

In the meantime, demonstrations are an excellent way of reminding the town's leaders that just because they have swept the problem under the rug, it still exists and must eventually be coped with, if only because segregationists are bigots to whom reason and human dignity have no appeal.

An Old Fashioned Power Play

Two important elections face North Carolina voters in the coming months, and both could have long range effects for this state. The first is the January 14 referendum on the mis-named "little federal" amendment to redistrict the state legislature. Those students who wish to vote on this referendum must register while at home over the Christmas holidays, and apply to the Chairman of the County Board of Elections in their home county for an absentee ballot.

This amendment is an issue on which every eligible North Carolina voter should educate himself and vote. If this redistricting proposal should pass it would give the smaller, less populous areas complete power to tyrannize the remainder of the state, and could quite possibly bring the state's growth rate and industrial progress to a slow and grinding halt.

But not only have the amendment's proponents ignored this aspect, they have perverted and scoffed at the concept of equal representation. At present the House and Senate are districted in a manner which fairly well reflects the state's population distribution, although not nearly as closely as might be liked.

The House has 120 members, 1 per county, plus 20 on a population basis. In this, 49 central North Carolina counties, with 70% of the state's population, control 55.8% of the seats in the House. If the "little federal" amendment passed the 20 seats allotted on population would be cut and the same 49 counties would only have 49% of the seats. 30% of the population would control a majority of the seats. However, it is also possible that only 19% of the population could

control a majority in the House since that is the percentage of the population in the 51 smallest counties from all over the state.

But this shows only part of the gross unfairness of the plan. If it passed, Rep. George Wood of Camden County, for example, would represent 5,600 people while the Mecklenburg representative would speak for 272,100 people. Or the 15,883 people who live in Camden, Hyde and Tyrrell Counties would have the same representation as the 708,000 people who live in Mecklenburg, Guilford and Forsyth Counties. One Tyrrell County voter would count as much as 37 Wake County voters, 9 Wayne County voters or 14 Johnston County Voters.

But what about the Senate? The state Constitution provides for mandatory redistricting which was accomplished in the 1963 Special Session. Each Senator represents an average of 91,123 people with an average district variation of 10%. 54% of the total state population in the most populous areas has 52% of the Senate seats.

If the amendment passed, the Senate would be increased by 20 seats and the 1965 General Assembly would again have to redistrict. Each Senator would represent an average of 65,087 people, and the bill stipulates that each Senator shall represent a number not to vary more than 25% from the state average. This means that the variation between the Senator representing the most people and the Senator representing the fewest could be as large as 50%. Again a gross unfairness.

The proposed amendment is a blatant power grab by a few of the small county legislators, and must be defeated on January 14.

©1963 HERB LUBNER
THE WASHINGTON POST