

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.

Decision On The Greeks

At long last, the University is ready to move on fraternity and sorority discriminatory clauses.

According to Dr. Herbert Bodman, chairman of the Faculty Committee on Fraternities and Sororities, the University will make a statement on clauses today or tomorrow. We expect that the committee report recommending a ban on such clauses will be presented to the Faculty Council today, and that an administrative statement will follow.

The statement will probably give all campus chapters a time limit for obtaining a waiver of their clause from the national office.

Provision for this has already been made by the four UNC fraternities which have clauses specifically related to race or religion. Nothing definite has been done by the sororities.

'Colorful' Still Means All White

Spectators at the Atlantic Coast Conference basketball tournament this weekend will no doubt be impressed by the "color" surrounding the event. But they may also find it difficult to refrain from noticing the color of the participating players—they are all white.

This is a deplorable situation, especially since the ultimate winner of the tournament is almost certain to face opposing teams in the NCAA regionals which feature Negro players who reside in the ACC's four-state area. (An example is once-beaten Providence, which features two exciting sophomores from North Carolina—both Negroes.)

We can't speak for the institutions outside of North Carolina or for the private schools within our boundaries, but the obligation of this University is clear. The State Board of Higher Education has signed a pledge saying to the nation "we do not discriminate."

If that is indeed the case, how much longer should an agency of this institution continue to discriminate at its own expense?

It is both hypocritical and ridiculous to fail to recruit every bit of available talent, but that is exactly what happens when we allow competent Negro players to pack off to other schools while we wait for Negroes to "volunteer" and "make the team."

Use Both Hands (To Drive) Please!

If you think there's nothing quite so romantic as a Sunday spin in your jalopy with your honey's head on your shoulder, be careful. The N. C. General Assembly may make front-seat snuggling illegal, or at least the finer forms of it.

By means of an "anti-necking" bill which he has introduced in the House, Rep. Paul Roberson of Martin County hopes to make it unlawful "for any person to steer or operate a motor vehicle

Such a statement will be a major step forward in the lifting of essentially irrelevant membership requirements from our social organizations. It will also allow local chapters to choose members according to their own standards, and not according to arbitrary requirements set by distant national offices.

But the report will be only a step in really opening our social organizations. Four fraternities will remove their formal clauses, but slightly less formal gentleman's agreements will undoubtedly persist.

Besides, there are approximately six other fraternities on campus with clauses that allow any chapter to "ball" a man from any other chapter because he is not "socially acceptable." Such a clause serves the same purpose as those that are being banned.

Whether or not these clauses will be banned in the report is unknown.

It was this clause that caused the Yale chapter of St. Anthony's Hall to be besieged by "brothers" from the University of Virginia when they initiated two Negroes without giving the national a chance to ball them.

This kind of clause should also go. It is unwarranted control of local membership by people who have virtually nothing to do with that chapter.

As for the greater problem of local fraternities discriminating on the basis of race or religion, no legislation can solve it.

Fraternity and sorority members must re-evaluate for themselves whether or not they can maintain a viable "brotherhood" while categorically refusing to consider non-Caucasians or non-Christians. It is our feeling that one cannot have a social organization in the educational context that is at all meaningful if certain groups are discriminated against.

All of us have prejudices. Some of us don't like people from small towns, others hate Yankees. Yet in a fraternity or a sorority, one can come into more intimate contact with people a little different from oneself. And more often than not, we learn to like them.

The University is finally ready to make itself clear on this subject. We only regret that the students couldn't have done it themselves.

At long last the University is removing the equivocation from its policy on social discrimination by race and religion. It is up to the students to follow the cue and make this policy meaningful.

on any public road or highway while embracing a companion or while the operator's arm is resting on the seat behind or around a companion."

Now, it's pretty obvious what Rep. Roberson has in mind. He wants to cut out one-arm driving, a cause with which we heartily concur. It's pretty uncomfortable to see a two-ton automobile bearing down on you while the driver casually flicks the steering wheel back and forth with one finger.

Our feeling, however, is that Rep. Roberson has attacked only part of the problem. Admittedly, driving lovers (or loving drivers) abound on the highways, attempting to perform simultaneously two two-handed tasks.

But what about the drivers who allow their left hands to wander; you know, the thousands of folks who persist in holding up the roof of their car, or clinging to an outside mirror, or just plain arm-dangling? Maybe they aren't so preoccupied as the neckers-on-wheels, but they are more numerous.

Perhaps something can be done about this type, too.

And while we're at it, how about an anti-canine amendment? We've always felt a little uncomfortable to see some huge boxer or collie licking a driver's face, giving ad lib signals out the rear window with a paw, or thrusting a smiling countenance into the breeze.

Isn't there some way to make those things wear seat belts?

KING VIET KONG



Letters To The Editors

Gag Law Hurts University

Legal Question Is Not At Issue

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Mr. Otis' letter, headed "State Has Right to Control UNC," has this to recommend over the general run of similar pronouncements that it is sober in tone and written in intelligible English. But two points should be made in response.

One is that, while deprecating the McCarthyist habit of discounting any cause or problem, however just or pressing, if it seems to enroll suspected "leftists" among its advocates, he comes close to doing just this in suspected "leftists" among its advocates. He comes close to doing just this in the very next paragraph. The portentous admonition at the end of his letter is just such an irrelevant appeal to prejudice, and profoundly unworthy of a college student.

The other point is that, contrary to his impression, nobody really doubts that the state legislature has the legal right, at least pending judicial review or new federal legislation, to pass a Speaker Ban of the sort we are now saddled with. Similarly, the Congress could tomorrow outlaw the KKK, or the John Birch Society, or the teaching of nuclear physics without FBI clearance.

The question was, and is, whether it is either wise in itself or

They may derive greater satisfaction from having state teaching institutions which proclaim and inculcate certain values and axioms they hold dear and shield them from re-examination, and instill fear and furtive curiosity about other values and axioms which they detest, also without examination; institutions that ensure that their young people grow up to become as much as possible like themselves.

If so, the scholars who know and care what a university must be, and who essentially constitute a university, will gradually leave, and the legislators and voters will have such institutions.

Or they may prefer to maintain a place where rival viewpoints that exist, and some not yet thought of, are examined for and with students and subjected to impartial and informed judgment, as far as human prejudices permits, and with careful regard for a multiplicity of criteria, moral and intellectual implications, and socio-political consequences. If so, they may dedicate themselves to this more demanding vision and a mission.

I have no idea which of the two they will choose. But again, they can't have both.

Nobody "owns" a university, for the moment they think they do and act accordingly, it is no longer there. I agree this must be annoying.

Dr. Walter W. Arndt
Linguistics Dept.

The Candle: Mr. Otis Is Wrong

By TIMOTHY RAY

Mr. William Graham Otis has completely dispelled the illusion that everyone in the University is opposed to the Speaker Ban Law. It was a comfortable illusion and it is rather sad to see it chased away. Of course, while the illusion was present, some of us opponents of the Ban sometimes had the feeling that we were boxing at shadows, since there was no one here to try to convince. But now we know that there is at least one articulate defender of the Ban on our campus.

Mr. Otis argues that past discussion of the merits of the law have involved "futile and irrelevant discussions" of whether Communist arguments are "truthful and hence valuable, or deceitful and thus worthless." There is no question but that Mr. Otis is correct in thinking that such arguments are irrelevant to the question of the Ban. But it is certainly news to hear that past discussions of the Ban have involved this issue, for that presupposes that someone would actually defend the arguments of Communist parties, and no one has publicly or journalistically sided with or attempted to defend Communists or their arguments around here.

Mr. Otis bases his opposition to the critics of the Ban on his position that the University "has no freedoms or prerogatives except those granted to it by the State," which owns and supports

it. Thus he leaves out any explicit reference to the fact that, as American citizens, we have certain rights and freedoms guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights and other amendments to the United States Constitution over and above what this State has the power to add or detract.

He does, however, make an implicit reference to that fact in stating that the legislation by the General Assembly "would be binding until and unless ruled void in the courts," and also in stating that the Federal courts have upheld in the past, "similar, though not equally restrictive statutes."

This approach badly misconstrues the nature of the opposition to the Speaker Ban Law. The opposition has never argued that the State legislation is not legally binding in this de facto sense. What it has argued is that (1) the law is devoid of any de jure legitimacy and (2) that the law is objectionable, since it curtails the normal function of a University to hear all sides of an argument.

Now from the standpoint of structural, i. e., legal consideration, the de jure legitimacy of the Ban will be established if and when a test case occurs and Federal courts uphold this particular law. This has not happened. While it is true that the Supreme Court has upheld certain curtailments of free speech,

FSF Brings Home Meaning Of Spring

By PETE WALES

Associate Editor

The Phoenix that was James Gardner burned out spectacularly, but something much sounder is rising out of the ashes.

The FSM has changed its name to the FSF (Free Speech Forum) and has found a new sponsor, the YMCA.

What Gardner and other potential FSM recruits realized was that the principles on which the first fiasco were founded were in fact worthwhile. The failure was due almost entirely to poor publicity, most of which was well-earned.

FSF will meet today at noon in Y-Court to start off under its new image a series of weekly, open-air meetings. Speakers on the topic of the week will be presented, then any interested passersby will be allowed to debate the issue further.

The idea is indeed a healthy one, something students would be well advised to take full advantage of.

The goal professed by FSF is "the enrichment of the University community." The means is the outdoor, public forum, where the average, run-of-the-member may be enticed into discussion. The same person might never come to a scheduled auditorium meeting.

An equally important goal, and part of the goal of enrichment, is to make all segments of the University community a part of this revival.

FSF says that it wishes to get faculty talking to administrators, administrators to students and students to faculty. It asks that students be concerned about more than their grades or their Saturday night date. It asks that they participate in that great vague experience called education.

FSF asks that faculty members turn away from the research into the meaning of line 43 in Book I of Paradise Regained, and that they look into the meaning of the community around them.

It asks that administrators

slow down and talk to the rest of the world before they plan us right into Morgan's Creek and a mall over Franklin Street.

And then it asks that we all get together and start talking with the State. It asks that the University reassume its traditional role as independent and responsible critic of society.

FSF is basically a friendly movement, designed for basically friendly Chapel Hill. It plans no demonstrations, it burns no crosses. It's just a great, big, happy, but meaningful, bull session on the state of the campus and on the role of the campus in society.

What could be more a proposal to Chapel Hill? Indeed what could be more a proposal to the time of year, when students' minds naturally wander from the routine and it's time to open the shutters and do the spring cleaning?

This University has plenty of spring cleaning to do and it needs very much to open some of its shutters. Because this University, like many others, is developing another specialized blinder.

Having overcome many of the problems of one kind of segregation, it is developing another much more insidious and far more stifling. But there is no one minority group in this case. Everyone suffers from it.

All members of the University community, save a very few unusual faculty members and student government leaders, have shut themselves off from life around them and from any new ideas that might accidentally penetrate the barriers.

It's spring, and time for the University, all of it, to join nature in doing a little reawakening of her own. To quote our favorite third-rate poet and a Carolina man, Lawrence Ferlinghetti; we are "perpetually awaiting a rebirth of wonder."

Whereas the past four years may not qualify as "perpetual," it feels like it.

We heartily endorse the new FSF in its first meeting today, and hope that UNC students, faculty and administrators will give it, and themselves, a chance.

Baker Is A Smoke Screen For Pot Shots At Johnson

The Albany (N. Y.)

Knickerbocker News

Without questions President Johnson's friendship for former Senate majority secretary Bobby Baker and Ex-White House aide Walter Jenkins somewhat tarnished the Johnson image in the 1964 election campaign.

It is at the same time a mark of the President's popularity that he survived so well and a warning to men in high places to police and monitor what assistants are saying in their names.

Aside from this, however, we fail to see the connection between a private insurance deal and the President's official life.

The "charge" now under congressional investigation is that a Silver Springs, Mr., insurance agent bought \$1,208 worth of unneeded advertising on a Johnson-owned Texas radio station as the quid pro quo for selling Mr. Johnson a \$100,000 life insurance policy.

Messrs. Jenkins and Baker got in the act because they are said to have made the deal in Mr. Johnson's behalf while he

was still in the hospital recovering from a heart attack.

Even though the two were Johnson aides at one time or another, the government was not involved. No official favors were promised, granted or implied.

Nor was governmental pressure applied. The insurance broker could have withdrawn at any time, but apparently he thought he had a good deal, as well he might.

Though he patronized the radio station to the tune of \$1,208, he stood to make well over twice that amount in commissions from the policy in the first year alone. There is hardly a business firm in the world that one time or another does not, with perfect propriety, reciprocate with other firms to their mutual benefit.

If a president errs and strays in the conduct of public office, he should be brought up short. But if a congressional committee finds itself investigating a private transaction that is well within the business ethic it should forthwith move along to the next subject.

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 Lanterer, 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.