

DTH Editorial Page

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.

The University's Role In Fraternity Clauses

No one, at this date, can properly pass judgement upon the relation of fraternities with discriminatory clauses to the University of North Carolina.

Of course, several things can be said for certain. One is that Chancellor Paul F. Sharp and Student Body President Bob Spearman are unalterably opposed to having fraternities with national discriminatory clauses on the UNC campus.

Another is that the Congress of Racial Equality should stay out of the internal affairs of the University of North Carolina. We are capable of solving our own problems, and it is doubtful that any help from CORE, such as a friendly demonstration or two, will be of any appreciable value.

And a third is that the fraternity system at UNC will set up a yell that can be heard to Miami, Ohio, if anyone in the administration sets an arbitrary limit on the time a fraternity has to rid itself of a clause of any nature.

The opposition displayed by Spearman and Chancellor Sharp is understandable, as both have spoken out against the clauses in eloquent, sincere fashion. They have voiced their concern that discriminatory clauses might be injurious to the University's position with the Federal Government because the fraternities are chartered by the institution. If this legal connection is strong enough to place the University in jeopardy under the 1964 Civil Rights Law, then the clauses clearly will have to go.

Throughout the school year, investigations have been conducted to determine the exact legal status of discriminatory clauses as well as the moral and social obligations of fraternities to the

University community. It is this type of calm, reasoned approach on the part of faculty administration and fraternities which can and will result in a quiet settlement of this most controversial issue.

If it becomes obvious that the fraternities which employ such clauses have no legal leg on which to stand, then the clauses will of course be ordered out, and rightly so. Of more immense and more complex proportions is the question concerning the moral and social obligations of fraternities.

Assuming that no legal restrictions interfere, there seems to be no overwhelming argument in favor of ordering all fraternities to drop discriminatory clauses. Granted, such clauses are, in essence, injudicious and silly. Granted, they have very little to do with the selection of pledges because the fraternity members themselves vote their personal convictions in making absolute choices. And, granted, fraternities are far from sacred. Still, the right of a fraternity as a private, self-contained organization to set its own standards for membership is hardly questionable.

The most important point is to approach this situation with calmness and deliberation. CORE and anyone else challenging the right of Carolina fraternities to have discriminatory clauses should pause and consider the situation carefully before blowing off steam in the courts or the headlines. Despite rumors to the contrary, something is being done, and they may rest assured that whatever the eventual outcome of the current discussions and investigations, it will be fair, responsible—and out of court.

Letters To The Editors

Two students visited the DTH offices yesterday inquiring about a letter they sent in which had not been published. Needless to say, they were quite angry.

We don't blame them for being such, as the DTH has said it will publish any and all letters which are acceptable for publication.

But, as it turned out, their letter wasn't acceptable, and after we explained the circumstances they willingly agreed and went presumably to write another which would be of acceptable standards.

So, once and for all, we take this opportunity to say exactly what constitutes an acceptable "Letter to the Editor."

The basic requirements are that the letter must be typed, double-spaced, not of excessive length (no more than 350 words) and free of libel.

It must be typed and double-spaced because the printers will not set in type

anything that is not. It must be of reasonable length for obvious reasons, and it must be free of libel because the DTH can be sued for printing such a letter, even though someone else has written it.

There are other considerations.

If we receive a letter that has been mimeographed, it goes in the trashcan. Why? Simply because we will not allow these pages to be a sounding board for any organization only seeking to propagandize its position.

When we receive such a letter (and we receive many each day), it is not difficult to conjure up the vision of every other newspaper in the nation receiving exactly the same thing.

A few of the newspapers, it is true, will print the letter intact. We will not, and we doubt there is any other newspaper which seeks to be ethical which will.

We encourage letters, and we again say every one will be published. But please observe the basis tenets of the trade.

Aaagh

Our case of shingles took a turn for the better yesterday, when Dr. James Taylor pronounced them "much improved." However, we aren't much improved, as we still aren't allowed to shave and our countenance is beginning to resemble a reject from a peace march.

Growing a beard is like catching a cold—you know it will get much worse before it will get much better. The blasted thing is now in the itchy stage, and a bushy friend of ours told us yesterday it would take at least another week before we stopped feeling like we were making love to a porcupine.

Of course, we'll be right in fashion if the great anti-everything rally comes off, and perhaps we can offer our services to the FBI when they attempt to infiltrate the movement. (FLS)

FCA BLASTED Religion Is Mass Opiate

By JEFF BYRUM

After reading your article of Thursday, February 11, entitled "FCA Rally Features Yanks Richardson," I can ignore the situation to which it refers no longer. A much more appropriate title would have been "Jocks Juggle for Jesus."

How much longer must we be plagued by that noxious phenomena called Religion? Why is there not some Alka-Seltzer for this hangover from the Dark Ages?

Religion makes dupes of far too many people. Trust in God is claimed on every coin, each of which is an offering to Melech. Almost every public meeting is opened with a prayer, regardless of its purpose or the persons who attend it. Thousands protest with righteous indignation when it is held unconstitutional to require prayers in public schools, meanwhile lauding separation of church and state.

They fail to see that the two enjoy a relation much more subtle and incestuous than any established church. Absolutely insane ditties are played on the radio advising listeners to "go to church this Sunday." And they go, in ever increasing numbers to wallow in sentimental prattling about "ideals" and "standards of Christian conduct," which is more dehumanizing than a large proportion of all "immorality."

Money continues to pour down the religious drain to publish literature which would offend the intelligence of a 6-year-old, were it not religious; to pay misguided humanists to perpetrate the silliness from pulpits and confessionals; and to build beautiful steam-heated, air-conditioned, scientifically-lighted edifices for periodical social gatherings devoted to mysticism and morality.

But worst of all, the whole unbelievable potpourri of sentimentality, hypocrisy, and downright deception is allowed to exist unchallenged; for although all but a scattered few, the leaven in the loaf, are atheists, one must not, above all, be sacrilegious.

The subtlety of this blight which pervades our whole society could explain its success, but to what do we attribute the tolerance and even the encouragement of its more obvious hyper-developed outgrowths?

I refer to the fundamentalist Protestant and reactionary Roman Catholic groups which use no subtlety but stand naked in their absurdity. They make the Bible an absolute rule book, not to be disobeyed or questioned. They censor books and films of undeniable artistic and human merit because unmarried couples are portrayed as happily sleeping together. They must juggle for Jesus in order to make the "teachings" of this "great prophet" interesting and (for goodness' sake) relevant to those who presumably would not otherwise be interested.

They broadcast on the radio on the basis of the Bible. They ironically use ancient Semitic documents to justify racial suppression. They claim to worship God with gatherings consisting entirely of emotionalism. They claim, in effect, that prayer is magical incantation. They would remove foreign languages from the public school curriculum (as suggested recently by an official of a Southern state) "because if English was good enough for Jesus, it's good enough for us."

Could we not resist at least these more obvious deceptions? "Have you not heard of that madman," Friedrich Nietzsche, who, almost a hundred years ago, reported to us that God was dead? Not that there is no God, but that we have killed him.

And "how shall we, the murderers of all murderers, comfort ourselves? . . . What festivals of atonement, what sacred games shall we have to invent?" Would Nietzsche have believed that even after a hundred years we still do not "smell anything . . . of God's decomposition"?

Those who speak for religion must have some answer for Dietrich Bonhoeffer who says that Christianity has nothing to do with religion but only with Jesus Christ.

They must listen to Soren Kierkegaard who says: "Let the speaker be offended by Christianity, he is still human; let him despair of ever himself becoming a Christian, he is yet perhaps near that he believes; let him fight to the last drop of blood for the extermination of Christianity, he is still human—but if he is able here to say: it is true to a certain degree, then he is stupid."

Why must we sacrifice our humanity at the altar of this false god, Religion? If this rally turns out to be "the most inspirational thing to happen on campus all year," then some serious questions are raised about the University of North Carolina.

"Temperers got so hot in here last night that they turned off the heat for the day."



Letters To The Editors

Speakers, Editors Confuse

Gag Law Blame Is On Democrats

Editors, The Tar Heel: In regard to your editorial entitled "Our Apologies" which appeared in the Feb. 10 issue, I accept your apologies as a Young Republican on the condition that you (1) clearly represent the prevailing mode of opinion in the Young Republican college organization, and (2) recognize the originators of the Speaker Ban Law.

As Charles Hooks, president of the U N C YRC, affirmed, the state Young Republican College Council has not taken a stand either for or against this controversial action. At the Charlotte convention last weekend, the College Council met two hours before the Young Republican meeting.

The College Council did not have access at that time to copies of the Young Republican platform, and under the conditions which existed during the roll-call vote at the Young Republican convention, the College Council delegates were not present in full voting strength.

Consequently, the vote on the entire platform was taken minutes after mimeographed copies were distributed to the small body of delegates present. During this interim period, several delegates from the Chapel Hill YRC and the UNC Greensboro YRC spotted the Speaker Ban clause and attempted to draft an amendment deleting it altogether.

When the vote was taken, the convention had run 90 minutes overtime, and the platform was passed overwhelmingly as delegates hurriedly rushed the business matters in order to beat the motel check-out time.

Speaking as an individual Young Republican, I am opposed to both the wording of the Speaker Ban Law and the philosophy behind it. However, I take issue with the Daily Tar Heel for not only "inadvertently misrepresenting their YRC position," but for grossly underestimating the intelligence of its readers.

Since it was stated in the preceding paragraph of the aforementioned editorial that "the College Council has never taken a stand on the law," why does the Daily Tar Heel repeatedly induce its readers to believe that the Young Republican College Council has indeed taken a stand one way or the other?

The reactionary thinking that produced such an abortive measure as the "Gag Law" originated within the Democratic Party, not within ours. I suggest that the Daily Tar Heel devote itself to the correction of the multitudinous mistakes made by the Democrats in their legislative fumbblings, rather than attack organizations which have consistently produced leaders of a more tolerant persuasion, i.e. Robert Gavin as opposed to Dan Moore.

Unfortunately, I do not choose to reiterate the Tar Heel's considered opinion that there is not a "spark of hope" left in

the tender mind of a college Young Republican. On the other hand, I hope that the Daily Tar Heel will use whatever sparks its brilliant editors can muster to illuminate the fulsome, stagnant depths of the political party which created this monstrous law in the first place.

Wilson A. Clark, Jr. 313 Aycock

Mock UN Pages Made A Mockery

Editors, The Tar Heel: Having taken part in the Middle South Model United Nations as a page, I was greatly distressed to see the disorganization of the preparations made by the various committees.

As a recent transfer to Carolina, and being unfamiliar with its procedures, I expected to find a professionally organized assembly, with everything in order. I was very disappointed and disillusioned when my expectations proved unfounded.

As far as I know, Carolina and the other schools participating in the conference had been preparing since before New Year's. It seemed Thursday morning, and even as late as Friday, as though we had just recently been informed that it was to be held here.

Some general examples of the disorganization are as follows: In most cases the meeting places were in no way prepared beforehand. There was no obvious or published seating plan which remained constant, therefore no way for pages to feasibly deliver messages.

In some meeting places there was insufficient room for the delegates, in others there was more than enough—obviously no one knew approximately how many people would attend each meeting. In some buildings, delegates were arranged alphabetically according to country, but this was of no help to the pages in locating them.

The people who were asked to volunteer were in no way oriented or trained beforehand. They were assigned certain buildings and often had no idea of the nature of the proceedings. When they arrived, there was no organization, no one was in charge, and then they were expected to act smoothly and efficiently. There was obviously no one in charge of pages and relaying messages—or if there was, it was not evident.

I would advocate at least one page orientation meeting as opposed to throwing them in among the wolves to fend for themselves (and the University). They acted as representatives of our school, as did our delegates.

I also noted that when it was impossible to locate the person to whom a message was addressed, and it was necessary to read the message to find the sender, some of them read, "Where should we meet for lunch?" or "Guess what! Bill got a ticket!"

We pages volunteered our time and patience to help speed the proceedings of the conference, not to play pony express for such trivial messages. Often these messages sent pages tearing from one building to another in order to find the addressee.

I suppose this just added insult to injury—but with all the other disheveled activities which preceded it, the pages certainly didn't appreciate it.

I think if we are to fairly represent our school which some of us consider to be the finest, we should show ourselves to be efficient and well organized to others.

I am willing to lend my time to other similar and worthwhile projects in the future to insure that this doesn't happen again.

Iiah Maureen Murray 304 Alderman

Waskow Speech Missed The Point

Editors, The Tar Heel: I am replying to a speech made before the model U. N. by a Dr. Waskow, Resident Fellow of the Institute of Policy Studies in Washington.

In his speech Dr. Waskow, a political scientist, stated that the U. S. retaliatory attack against North Viet Nam was the "stupidest policy ever undertaken in U. S. foreign policy." He gives as his reason that the attack "might force the USSR and Red China together."

I strongly disagree with Dr. Waskow. He states that he had intended to make his speech on another subject but was "deeply upset over the events of the past week." I submit that Dr. Waskow was so "upset" that his judgment was somewhat impaired.

Surely Dr. Waskow must realize that the forces separating Red Russia and Red China run deep. Not only are the differences in their respective approaches to domestic and foreign policy separating them but also the more fundamental differences of Red China's need for expansion and the historical enmity between the two peoples.

Red China has been actively seeking to push Russia out of Asia and Africa by arousing racial prejudice—after all Russians are "white." Russia's anxiety over Red China has been so great that she long ago pulled out technical military assistance and assistance of almost any kind.

A further argument can be drawn from recent history. During the Korean war, surely Russia and Red China were much closer and what's more Stalin was still in control in Russia, yet Russia did not at that time enter the war.

I think the risk of Russia's aiding Red China substantially now is slim with all that has happened between them. I submit that Dr. Waskow's speech is alarmist and irresponsible.

Lee Caruthers 623 Ehringhaus

THE CANDLE Battle Rages In Old Sainoi

By TIMOTHY RAY

A meteorite fell the other day. Inside the meteorite was a bottle, and inside the bottle was a piece of paper with writing on it. This is what it said:

"There was once a village called Sainoi. For forgotten reasons there were always hard feelings in Sainoi between a group that was called the Greens and a group called the Oranges. The Greens, who had many college degrees, and who rode bicycles, and drank much whisky, lived on the west side of town. The Oranges, who had very few, if any, college degrees, and who walked or rode donkeys, and drank lemonade, lived on the east side of town.

"The Greens would get very drunk while riding around and sipping whisky. They would lose their way and ride through the Orange side of town, singing their college songs very loud. The Oranges would get mad and throw rocks. Therefore, the hard feelings continued.

"In the middle of town lived several families called the Drabs. Two of them, the Smiths and the Jones, lived next to each other. Mr. Jones was a Green, by upbringing, though his wife was an Orange. And Mr. Smith was an Orange, and his wife, a Green.

"In both households there was frequent chaos, because the fathers and mothers competed to be the boss. The Smith children liked to sneak into the Jones house and teach the Jones children to play Hop Scotch.

"When Mr. Jones was being boss, he would spank these Smith children and send them home, because, being a Green, he did not approve of Hop Scotch, naturally. But when Mrs. Jones was boss, she would play Hop Scotch with the children. This encouraged the Smith children to come over in larger and larger numbers.

"One day when Mr. Jones was trying to get control of the household, he could not find all the Smith children: they were in the attic, the cellar, the garage, and the coal bin. While he was chasing one group out, more would sneak in through the windows.

"Exasperated, he called Elbie Jay, the strongest of the Greens to help him. Elbie Jay beat all the Smith children that could be found, with a big stick. This sort of thing continued for a long time, with first Mrs. Jones, then Mr. Jones and Elbie Jay, getting control of the household. "One day, while Mr. Jones and Elbie Jay were beating Smith children, the oldest Smith girl, Hoehchy, came over and whacked them both on the seat of the pants.

"Elbie Jay was filled with embarrassment and righteous indignation. He quick ran over to the Smith house and kicked Mr. Smith in the stomach very hard.

"Mr. Smith called in his Orange friends, Cosy Gin and Mayozye Dung, who frowned and said solemnly, in unison, 'Loyal brother, kind and true, we are on your side.' Then they sat down and started sharpening their pen knives.

"When Mr. Jones and Mr. Jay found out what was going on at the Smith house, they telephoned their friends, McFord, George, Bev, and Dean. All of them bicycled over, except Dean, who was sitting at home with a sore throat, his feet in hot water, frantically sipping Old Fashioneds and muttering, 'Gotta get well, for old Green U!'

"Meanwhile, the Greens had kept cycling and getting drunk and singing their college songs in Orangetown, and the Oranges had kept throwing rocks, rotten oranges, and old whiskey bottles that drunk Greens had previously left behind. Finally, since there was no police force, Youtante, a small Drab man, who had been elected Chairman of the Village Council because of his great impartiality, honesty and belief in free enterprise, started knocking on everyone's doors in town, asking everyone to get together and settle the Orange-Green differences in a nice parliamentary way.

"But no one listened. Instead, the Big Greens, a group of men with ten college degrees each, aimed a cannon at the Smith house. Then the Big Oranges, who hadn't gone to public school, but who had received certificates in guerrilla warfare, aimed a cannon at the Jones house. Soon everyone was setting up his own little cannon, aimed at somebody's house on the other side of town.

"McFord and Cosy Gin saw each other on the street, called each other dirty names, and got into a fist fight. Then the Greens fired the cannon aimed at the Smith house, and the Oranges fired the cannon aimed at the Jones house. Soon everybody started firing cannons all over town."

"That's all the writing that was on the paper; that was in the bottle that came inside the meteorite."