

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.

For A Quiet FSM Rally

Today is rally day—the day that James Gardner and several local “cause” groups will have an opportunity to voice their grievances concerning a long series of items, including discriminatory clauses in fraternities, last Friday’s incident involving a Liberian visitor, and the Speaker Ban Law.

But the rally also presents an opportunity of another kind—an opportunity for Carolina students, whatever their feelings concerning these specific issues, to demonstrate a responsible attitude to a curious public.

We have never taken issue with the right of Gardner, or anyone else, to express in public his personal feelings. Earlier in the week we did take issue with Gardner’s ill-directed fury because we felt that his unreasonable demands and defiance of calm reason placed this University in jeopardy.

Much of that feeling still abides today. We are still concerned about the possible consequences of a blatant defiance of the Speaker Ban at such a crucial time, and we doubt that an all-encompassing attack on the fraternity system can be justified by the events of the past week-end.

However, Gardner has promised an orderly, responsible demonstration and we certainly do not contest his privilege of carrying out this aim. Rather, our concern today is that the “rally” be just that and nothing more. A demonstration of the type witnessed on other University campuses in recent months can only result in chaos and the destruction of the atmosphere of mutual understanding

which has stood this University in good stead for many years.

In this context, a word is in order to those who disagree with Gardner. The opposition, too, must share the burden of responsibility surrounding today’s public meeting. An undesirable incident originated in defiance of Gardner would be no less damaging or unfortunate than an irresponsible act on the part of one of the participating groups.

Thus, our simple plea is that all who attend the noon assembly do so in a spirit of mutual toleration and understanding.

By our editorial commentary during the week, we have attempted to show forth some of the fallacies which we have observed in Gardner’s reasoning and in his approach to a complex and difficult situation. Our most constant concern is that all involved be made aware of the facts lest they enter needlessly and irresponsibly into full scale public defiance.

Now it is Gardner’s turn. Once again, we remind him that a burden of responsibility rests on his words and actions today. If he will, as promised, carry out an orderly and careful public airing of his views, this University will not be marred by a regrettable scene.

We hope that Gardner and his sympathizers will take advantage of the public forum provided by the University and speak with a voice of reason, not anger. For we firmly believe that if his cause is just, this University’s responsible administrators, students and faculty members will not allow legitimate wrongs to remain inviolate.

Gardner’s Rally Poorly Inspired

By PETE WALES
Associate Editor

A rally (not a demonstration) will take place today in Y-Court in which James “Liberian Incident” Gardner will attempt to establish a bigger and better version of the SP’s long-plugged-for Open Forum.

The idea is to get issues concerning students out into the open and stir up enough of the students to erase some of the apathy that pervades the campus.

The goal is fine and noble and one we have pushed for a long time.

But the methods are all wrong.

We are not sure at this point what will happen. We can only hope and pray that students will be mature enough to let it go and demonstrate themselves that it is an unworthy project.

Gardner is no longer so concerned directly about the Liberian incident at Big Fraternity Court. He is satisfied that all the proper apologies have been made (unfortunately, not before the incident had been blown out of all proportion).

We are ashamed of the people who insulted the foreign visitor and we roundly condemn their actions as immature and entirely unbecoming of Carolina students.

But to make a national issue out of it through CORE is and was absurd. Further, to use it to protest fraternity discriminatory clauses is equally irrelevant.

Gardner told us that he and others are primarily concerned about “the conditions under which such incidents can occur.” But it is stretching a

point to say that clauses are a direct influence on this type of behavior.

The clauses, we feel, are ridiculous. They are only last-ditch efforts of old men who think they are still in fraternities to wield power over their fraternities. This is further illustrated by the information that only five UNC fraternities now have such clauses.

It makes far better sense to allow the local chapter to pick whoever they please. The national, in this instance, is irrelevant to the local chapter.

But even without clauses, fraternity and non-fraternity men alike at Chapel Hill are going to have prejudices about race for some years to come. Far more than the clauses must be removed. And the method by which the clauses are removed is important in these greater goals.

The University certainly has begun to show good faith in this matter. After ten years of sitting on their duffs, the Faculty Committee on Fraternities and Sororities has finally got a new chairman and has begun investigation of the problem with a possibility of action this year. The IFC itself has begun to discuss the problem and to look for possible solutions.

The speaker ban also will be discussed. Here, Gardner plans to speak himself on the methods of working for repeal of the ban, taking issue with the methods espoused by the Administration and Student Government.

He feels that if we cannot risk discussing this openly for fear of offending legislators, then we have no freedom at all.

We would submit that any exercise of freedom is restricted by the context in which we operate. The idiot who insulted the Liberian was exercising freedom of speech, but it was

a poor way to do it at best. One has to be aware of how one’s words will affect others.

The same is true for this rally. With the incredibly poor promotional job Gardner has done, alienating many liberals and potential allies, nothing he or anyone else says at the rally can do anything but reinforce the position of the pro-ban legislators. The fact that this is taking place in its present context is enough to make any discussion of any issues irrelevant and immaterial.

The issue is no longer the issues, but the way they have been handled. No oratory will correct this.

The issue of whether or not the Carolina Forum retracted an invitation to James Farmer to speak here is entirely absurd and illustrates finally how poorly this rally is being handled.

The Forum says that they never invited Farmer. They considered it, but because of various scheduling difficulties, they decided against it.

To even think that the Forum might not invite Farmer because he is too controversial and/or a Negro is ludicrous. If anything, Farmer is too dull a speaker and too colorless for the Forum.

More in line with past policy would be an invitation to former Black Muslim Malcolm X, to Socialist Norman Thomas or to a John Birch.

Last spring, when Farmer was in Chapel Hill, the Forum tried desperately to get him to speak. He turned them down.

To pick such a non-issue as a part of the discussion is symbolic of the lack of sensitivity shown in the entire plan.

Equally poor is the idea of having sympathy rallies on other campuses.

Gardner has dreams of a new national organization of students, faculty and administra-

tors who will come together, partially as a result of the Berkeley situation, and discuss the problems facing growing universities.

This is indeed an admirable goal. We couldn’t agree more. But this sort of brotherly rally is not consonant with this aim. If students at the other campuses involved had any idea of the weakness of what they are

mimicking, there is no question but they would forget it immediately.

“The really positive thing to come out of Berkeley was the awakening of a sense of community between faculty, students and administration,” Gardner says.

We hope he’s right. We only hope that this rally won’t put it back to sleep again.



Gardner Blasts Cathey Statement

To The Chapel Hill Weekly:

Of the several unhappy reactions on the part of some University officials to last week-end’s racial incident was the choice of Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey to make a public statement on the matter over the 6:00 p.m. Sunday evening news on radio station WPTF in Raleigh.

Not only did Dean Cathey misidentify the insulted African student as coming from Nigeria instead of his real home in Liberia, but he attributed a portion of the guilt in the matter to Mr. Hage’s extreme sensitivity as a student from a newly-emerging African nation while suggesting that the fraternity boys were merely playfully “unsophisticated” in their assault on Mr. Hage.

Dean Cathey’s recorded remarks are probably still on tape at WPTF if anyone wants to check the accuracy of this letter.

To call a Liberian a Nigerian was undoubtedly an innocent error and has no more effect on Mr. Hage’s feelings probably than it would upset Ben Gurion to be identified as a Jordanian. What mars an otherwise gracious apology is the suggestion that our guest, Mr. Hage, is supersensitive because he comes from a newly-emergent nation. Liberia became a country in 1822 and a Republic in 1847. Dean Cathey’s definition of the fraternity boys as “unsophisticated” that afternoon suggests that their offense was not to say “black nigra” rather than “black nigger.”

This all suggests that Dean Cathey is perhaps not the best-qualified spokesman on racial incidents. It is Dean Cathey who instituted an official policy of racial segregation in the dorms that was very fortunately corrected last fall by Chancellor Sharp after it was called to his attention by Student Body President Bob Spearman.

It was also Dean Cathey who speaking as Dean publicly complimented Judge Raymond Mallard in Hillsboro last fall, thanking him for his “services” to the University in the civil rights trials of 1963-64. This expression of appreciation to Judge Mallard was printed in the Weekly and was nowhere retracted by any University official. John Ehle’s forthcoming book on the Chapel Hill troubles will rather seriously raise the question of whether the University owes Judge Mallard a debt of thanks or not.

I have the feeling that these and other matters such as the Carolina Forum’s withdrawal of support for James Farmer’s appearance on campus this spring and the University’s effective policy of not soliciting students from Negro High Schools in the same towns it visits to invite white students will come under a certain degree of discussion in the near future.

James W. Gardner
Graduate Student

I hope this solution will be satisfactory with all concerned.
Dr. Kenneth J. Rackford
Dept. of Classics

Issues Important, Not The Motives

Editors, The Tar Heel:

The main point of Tuesday’s DTH editorial seems to be the purity of Mr. Gardner’s motives.

It is unfair to pretend we know with any certainty at all the motives of a person in a political situation. Whether in a graduate instructor, a student editor, or Churchill himself, a political conscience is an impure and mysterious thing. That impurity, and its complexity is human.

The editors, myself as I write this letter, everyone, has mixed and muddled reasons for championing or avoiding causes, for organizing or disbanding rallies, signing or not signing petitions, for writing letters to the editors and for editing those letters. This is the frustration of our condition, and it is being less or more than human to write a smugly Olympian editorial publicly speculating about the impurity of one person’s motives.

The valid areas for speculation and discussion are the issues that Mr. Gardner raises. There are the explicit ones: racial discrimination in fraternities in the light of the Civil Rights law, the place of sororities and fraternities in creating the general tone of the University, the speaker ban law, etc. And there are the implicit issues that he himself seems to embody: the question of how exactly a student or a professor should voice a serious criticism of the administration, the student government, or the student body at large and the problem of how to make the atmosphere here in Chapel Hill more inclusive, more flexible and adaptable to even radically dissenting opinions and ideas.

Surely such concerns as his, and even the spectacular challenges, are not simply to be tolerated, but encouraged as a sign of health and variety in the university community. To my view, the omniscient condescension of the Tar Heel editors is a much more malign symptom than Jim Gardner’s baroque plans for inter-city sympathy demonstrations. At least he works out in the street where we spectators can see him.

The motives of the editors, however, within the elaborate shelter of the established, moderate opinion are much more difficult to evaluate and as the expressions of individuals they need not be. But their housing, the administrative structural support and the respectable weight of community approval, the sedentary, moderate position, should be periodically checked for signs of decay.

Mr. Gardner’s call for an open forum situation on campus may serve this purpose.

Coleman Barks
404 Hillsboro St.

DTH Omits Main Point Of Conflict

Editors, The Tar Heel:
Your editorial on Tuesday was disturbing to me. James Gardner is a fascinating personality, I will agree, but why should his possible flaws in character or errors in action evoke your wrath, when the ugly incident in front of the SAE house seems not to interest you at all?

J. Scott Byrd
131 North St.

LETTERS

The Daily Tar Heel solicits letters to the editors at any time and on any subject.

All letters must be typed DOUBLE SPACED and must be free of libel. The editors reserve the right to edit for length. Letters should be submitted at least two days prior to date of publication.

A Vote For A Vote

The Charlotte Observer

Even though it is the only state in the Union whose governor does not have the authority to veto legislation, North Carolina has had notably good government for many years.

Why, then, should anyone advocate that our governors be given the veto? The only sensible justification would be that a gubernatorial veto power would make good government better.

And that is precisely the case.

The governor is the most powerful officer elected by all the people of the state. Because of that, he alone bears an overriding responsibility to all the people for the conduct of the state’s affairs.

While individual legislators generally feel a strong sense of responsibility for the sound governance and progress of the entire state, they are naturally—and quite properly— beholden first of all to the people of the counties or districts who elected them to office.

If a governor works at his job, he should possess or have available to him more knowledge of state affairs than

any single legislator or executive department officer. More than any other man, he is in position to weight the information, the needs and the frequently conflicting interests that bear on any given issue, then make a judgment in the best interests of all.

A courageous governor could also use the veto to resist sudden gusts of popular or legislative opinion on which unwise bills ride to passage. In this sense it serves the same sensible, conservative function as the filibuster in the U.S. Senate and other built-in checks.

If the governor of North Carolina could exercise the “item veto,” which a number of states have, he could scotch some of the waste that occurs every two years when legislators push through appropriations for unneeded historical markers and such.

For all these and other reasons, most political scientists have long regarded the executive veto as a useful tool of state government. It is inevitably a limited tool, for legislatures have the authority to override vetoes if they can muster enough strength to do so, usually by a two-thirds vote.

The absence of the veto in North Carolina is noted in college classrooms all over the country with the interest that one regards a man with a gap in his front teeth.

That gap in the Tar Heel governor’s repertoire of political tools does not mean, of course, that his office is a “weak” one. It is, in fact, considerably stronger than its counterpart in South Carolina, which has the item veto.

Custom, tradition and progressive legislatures have contributed to the evolution of our governorship into a reasonably strong and effective office. The addition of the veto power would enhance that office.

Former governors Luther Hodges and Terry Sanford favor the addition of the veto power. Gov. Dan Moore, who has been in office only a few weeks, disagrees. But we would not be surprised if sometime in the course of this or the next General Assembly, the governor changes his mind.



In South Nonamura

Ah So Ousts Hu Cares

By ART BUCHWALD

The news from South Nonomura this week has been very encouraging. Gen. Ah So has overthrown the civilian government of Premier Hu Cares and is not in charge of the country again. Gen. Ah So has vowed to continue the fight against the guerrillas from North Nonomura.

Premier Hu Cares’ downfall took place when students leaders of the powerful Butane sect marched in the government palace and vowed to tear the place apart. Police forced the demonstrators back towards the USIA library building in the center of the town. The students and demonstrators took the hint and before sundown wrecked the library.

The United States sent a strong protest to the Minister of the interior, Hu Mi, who said he not only planned to reject the protest, but he was going on a hunger strike.

The announcement of Hu Mi’s hunger strike enraged the Butane sect leaders, who said that they were the only ones who could go on a hunger strike. Unless Hu Mi stopped his hunger strike, they

said, the Butanists would call for a mass drowning of all its members in the Won Ton River.

Dim View

In the meantime the American Ambassador in South Nonomura warned the military the U. S. would take a dim view of them overthrowing Hu Cares’ government. He said in no uncertain terms that if the military did anything to rock the civilian government the United States would have to reconsider its entire Southeast Asia policy.

The next day the military overthrew Hu Cares, and Gen. Ah So told the U. S. to stop interfering in the affairs of his government.

It is no secret that Gen. Ah So and the American Ambassador don’t see eye to eye on political and military matters in South Nonomura and this has put the United States in an embarrassing position. On the surface the U. S. has had to support the American Ambassador, but at the same time it realizes that nothing can be accomplished as long as Ah So is in power. If the State Department recalls the American

Ambassador it will be a sign of weakness on our part.

CIA Coup

Therefore, the only solution seems to be for the CIA to stage a coup d’etat against the American Ambassador so he will be forced out. This the State Department has been reluctant to do for fear of hurting morale among its other ambassadors around the world.

Another reason the State Department is hesitating to do something this drastic is that they have been assured by the leaders of the Butane sect that Gen. Ah So won’t be in power for more than a month if they have anything to say about it.

So the State Department has ordered the American Ambassador to stand fast. But if things get tougher they have told him to go out on a hunger strike.

The American Ambassador is now eating four meals a day to prepare for this eventuality. A reporter in Washington asked a State Department spokesman if he thought the hunger strike might work.

The spokesman replied, “Why not? We’ve tried everything else.”

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.

Fred Seely, Hugh Stevens, co-editors; Mike Yopp, Ernie McCrary, managing editors; Pete Wales, associate editor; Larry Tarleton, sports editor; Fred Thomas, night editor; Mary Ellison Strother, wire editor; John Greenbacker, Kerry Sipe, Alan Banov, staff writers; Pete Gammons, asst. sports editor; Perry McCarty, Pete Cross, Bill Lee, Tom Haney, sports writers; Jack Lauterer, photographer; Chip Barnard, cartoonist; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Betsy Gray, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobel, ad. mgr.; Jim Peddicord, asst. ad. mgr.; Tom Clark, subscription mgr.; John Evans, circulation mgr.; Dick Baddour, Stuart Ficklen, Jim Potter, salesmen.

Second Class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. 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.