

The Daily Tar Heel

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.

Activists Or Troublemakers?

Berkeley came to UNC Sunday night. Free Speech Movement leader Steve Weissman excited wild applause from a small audience, many of them student activists, as he called for student-faculty control of universities.

Weissman, a member of Students for a Democratic Society, urged students to "organize and force the faculty to speak as a body." He used the Speaker Ban Law as an example, saying that if the faculty banded together, invited a communist speaker to campus and told the General Assembly to deal with them collectively, that the legislators would be unable to enforce the law. Students, he said, should collectively resist the law and create "controversy."

Weissman and the FSM crew at Berkeley found demonstrations and hard demands effective tactics there. This seems to have whetted their desires to continue the "we want everything or we'll keep demonstrating until we get it" attitude.

What about compromise? The word is a joke to the FSM.

Hard, uncompromising demands may have worked at Berkeley, a center for liberal action on the West Coast. But to apply the same rule to UNC or a host of other schools would be a farce.

A Free Speech Movement of sorts was attempted here earlier this year. Even organizer James Gardner had admitted the highly-publicized rally was a fiasco. The only result of "collective student action" here against, say the Speaker Ban, would be a further alienation of the General Assembly and a loud cry from many North Carolinians that UNC has fallen prey to communists.

In the unlikely event that every student in the state demonstrated against the Ban, every professor went out on strike and the General Assembly repealed the law, where would that leave the University? In the unenviable position of being looked upon with great public disdain from the citizens who support it.

Is there another way to solve our problems? Yes, and it's being done. Students and representatives of the administration are seeking a quiet repeal or amendment of the Gag. The result will be the same for either avenue of approach, and perhaps with the latter the people of North Carolina will realize that anyone who protests the Ban isn't really a spokesman for Moscow, and will come to see the law has no place in the state statutes.

But the Gag is only one example. Students here have a great deal of freedom, and they will have more and have it without need of demonstrations. Student government is a forum for students to air grievances, and an effective tool for implementing student desires. Contrary to what Weissman said Sunday, a student government is not necessarily a body which only effects the mandates of an administration.

But Weissman is a rebel. Some rebels have made a place for themselves, but only those who were willing to realize that there are others in this complex world and some concessions must be made to live in it — concessions which do not necessarily abridge one's freedom.

Much good can be gained by employing the old art of compromise and doing more talking and less demonstrating. But it's not as exciting, and you can't have Joan Baez sing at rallies.

A Satisfying Jubilee

The third Jubilee is over, and nearly everyone agrees it was the best yet.

Graham Memorial Director Howard Henry, the man most responsible for the whole show, is "well pleased."

The problems which have caused unpleasantness and trouble at previous Jubilees were kept to a minimum. Campus Police Chief Arthur Beaumont called the weekend a "success from every standpoint."

It certainly was, and credit is due in several places. First of all, to Henry and his staff. They worked hundreds of hours, making plans and putting them into effect. Congratulations to the weatherman, who couldn't have provided better conditions for the weekend activities.

Thanks to the grounds crews who put Polk Place back in order between concerts.

But most of all, congratulations to the students themselves. Conduct at the performances wasn't perfect, but no one expected it to be. But it was reasonably sane — which is all that had been asked. UNC students have done themselves a credit by showing they aren't as irresponsible as some say they are.

The change in the audience was noticeable. Even one of the Four Preps — who were here for the 1963 Jubilee — mentioned it. "I don't know what you did, but it's sure a lot better," he said Friday night.

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.

Ernie McCrary, editor; Mike Yopp, associate editor; Kerry Sipe, managing editor; John Greenbacker, news editor; Fred Thomas, copy editor; Mike Wiggins, night editor; Fred Seely, sports editor; Richard Smith, asst. sports editor; Andy Myers, John Jenarich, Mary Ellison Strother, Ernest Robl, Bob Wright, David Rothman, staff writers; Bill Lee Pete Cross, sports writers; Jack Lauter, photographer; Chip Barnard, art editor; Becky Timberlake, secretary; Jack Harrington, business mgr.; Woody Sobol, advertising mgr.; Tom Clark, subscription mgr.; John Evans, circulation mgr.

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.

Toward New Liberal Action

By JAMES GARDNER
And TIMOTHY RAY

Last of a Series

Two assumptions have clearly shown through our analysis of the local consensus establishment and the failure of liberal actions groups to move it to creative dialogue or change growing out of such debate.

The first is that radical critiques of existing modes of thought and behavior on campus are essential to the life of a free university. A radical critique questions at

the core the validity of any existing form in terms of a value judgment which has itself been subject to radical critique and found a suitable base for evaluation. It differs from protest somewhat as research differs from application. Veblen's "Theory of the Leisure Class" or Whyte's "The Organization Man" or Goodman's "The Community of Scholars" are examples of radical critique.

While such critiques have not historically been restricted to universities in origin, they have occurred there frequently enough to become at least rhetorically referred to

as one of the intrinsic functions of the university in western society. One may observe today that many universities exist whose intrinsic functions do not in fact include significant radical critique. It is an open question if the modern university any longer is the real home of creatively radical social criticism. Foundation - supported "centers," "institutes" and "study groups" along with their ancillary publications only peripherally related to universities today perform many of the critical functions once largely restricted to the campus.

All but a few campuses stress vocational training, quite pragmatically oriented research, and serve in essence as caretakers for middle - class undergraduates too young or too untrained to enter the economy and too troublesome to keep at home after high school. We believe, however that the university is still the best home for critical thought because its humane traditionalism provides the most concentrated, catholic, and tolerant counterbalance to radical critique and social re-orientation.

Our second assumption is that some — not all — radical critique leads the ethical man to the imperative of action. If, as Socrates said, "the unexamined life is not worth living," — an extremely radical claim — we hold with Camus that worthy living must involve the commitment to action if one is to avoid being the "executioner" or his "victim."

For some time now this campus has seen almost no social action rooted in locally developed critiques. The tiny, ineffectual action groups have derived their goals and tactics from centers of critical thought distant from Chapel Hill in space and time. Only, perhaps, in certain branches of medicine, communication and the social sciences here can radically creative thought said to be going on. The bulk of our university structures, goals, and methods are not self-generated but derivative.

Who can name one major attribute of our local consensus establishment nationally or internationally known as a peculiarly Chapel Hillian quality, methodology, accomplishment, feature, etc. other than the rapidly disappearing charm of our small-town community setting? Where we err, we invite correction. In the one area where we might have anticipated — even named — an national trend — the creative resolution of racial crisis in a university community, the consensus establishment failed, as John Ehle's "The Free Men" amply documents. Like most campuses we lack identity.

We now wish to claim that ineffectually challenged our local consensus establishment functions, however randomly, to vitiate critique and stifle its application. Former Gov. Terry Sanford's creative "brain trust" whose contribution to the state is a wonder of southern politics was made up to a large extent of critics and refugees from our local consensus establishment.

While there exists within our "constab" many excellent men at all levels they have not been organized into free critical debate nor have they acted effectively out of derived, much less locally developed, radical critique. Our "constab" seems committed to undefined "excellence," unexamined competition for national status, and, in general, quantitatively defined goals.

Seemingly incapable of defining our own distinctive identity, the majority of the University seems ignorant of what kind of university elsewhere we want to be like. We evidently do not wish to copy the massive campus at Berkeley, as our adoption of the hardly original idea of resident college complexes within the campus indicates. But what is our model?

We propose that we must challenge the best elements of our "constab" into life. This task is traditionally the work of radically oriented critical dialogue. Independently of, but helpfully augmenting, the "single cause" groups — CORE, NAACP, SPU, The Open Platform, we suggest the formation of a broadly based liberal research and action movement. It should be nationally affiliated, but free to address local university and community problems in an autonomous manner.

This broad new liberal movement should have, as its primary task, the research necessary to the introduction of intelligent critical dialogue on all levels of the University, but particularly within the faculty and graduate student bodies, whose leadership can draw undergraduates into its fold.

Its next task must be to challenge the "constab" to meaningful debate which it cannot, with any intellectual propriety decline. Its next task will then be the gathering of forces, sufficiently informed and respectfully enough supported, to constitute a politically effective liberal-radical bloc, capable of influencing University and state policy.

Here it can be aided by similar movements similarly evolved on the five major campuses within an hour's drive of Chapel Hill. The strength of such a well coordinated five-campus liberal bloc could be astonishing. It could significantly alter the policy of our universities, effectively support liberal candidates for public office, and initiate creative programs of liberal action within the Piedmont Crescent. Most significantly, on a long range basis, this organized liberal power bloc can have its say in the political, economic, and social re-orientation of those undergraduates who will form the future society of the state.

Let us hope that this new society would never tolerate a speaker ban law, a Raymond Mallard, or a university content to operate as a consensus establishment, rather than as a creative arena for free dialogue and the home of free men who will not be exiled from this region.

"I Can't Believe I'm Still Hung Over."



In The Mailbox

What A Confusing World

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

The Tar Heel editorial page of April 27 was perhaps its worst of the year. The two columns on Viet Nam and public accommodations by Tar Heel journalists David Rothman and Wilson Clark Jr., respectively, were disheartening to say the least.

Rothman's column was particularly disturbing. He begins by saying: "Left-wing radicals have launched a sinister campaign to associate United States actions in Viet Nam with the slaying of civil rights workers." What on earth does this mean?

Are these "radicals" saying that U. S. policy in Viet Nam actually led to the civil rights murders? Rothman shows no evidence that this is the case. It seems all that has occurred is that Robert Moses of SNCC has urged public protest of U. S. Viet Nam policy, and that SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) doesn't like either segregation or our approach in Viet Nam. But to Rothman this appears to be a "sinister campaign."

What, after all, was the protest march in Washington this Easter all about? Let me quote the New Republic's analysis of the concerns of the marchers: "They are, quite simply revolted by bombing raids in the north and by the use of napalm and other weapons on villages in the south. They ask how Lyndon Johnson can propose a billion dollar investment in Southeast Asia, while spurning all appeals to call off the bombing . . . they ask how the President can ask for 'unconditional negotiations,' while refusing to sit down with the Viet Cong; they ask how he can claim to support self-determination for the Vietnamese, when for nine years the United States has consented to, if not connived in, the postponement of elections prescribed in the Geneva Agreements of 1954."

Perhaps there are those among the "radicals" who carry identification with the underdog so far that they "embrace the Viet Cong." This seems to me an insignificant matter in comparison with the substance of the marchers' protest — the content of their criticism of U. S. policy. What was most disturbing about Rothman's approach was his attack by innuendo, by "name - calling," rather than by actually coming to grips with the substance of the protest.

It is one thing to find such attacks in newspapers written by corrupt adults like myself, but it is grim and sad to run across these practices in a student paper. Calling your opponent "sinister" hardly disposes of the issues that have been raised.

For just a moment, let me turn to Clark's article. Clark attacks the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 on the grounds that it under-

mines "the aged pillar of every freedom we cherish in a free society — property rights." This, of course, is a very old argument. One might almost say that this argument was "the aged pillar" of those that oppose equality. There is not space here to cover Clark's article in detail, but let me focus on one of his five conclusions.

He says: ". . . desegregation of businesses . . . was done, in this case, against the property owner's will." But public accommodations was nothing new in this respect. So was abolition of child labor done against the property-owner's will; so was the prohibition of fraudulent advertising, of collusion, of inadequate health standards in factories. There are also prohibitions against employers meting out punishments to workers who join unions. And there are such things as minimum wage and maximum hour laws. All these were done against the property-owner's will.

Can Clark seriously maintain that such legislation diminished the total of freedom in our society? If not, why need public accommodations necessarily do so? Unfortunately, Clark has been persuaded of a much too close correspondence between reverence for property rights and genuine freedom. The world, I'm afraid, is not so simple.

In the narrow confines of one letter I have now defended civil rights and criticized U. S. policy in Viet Nam. I can only hope that this does not make me part of the "sinister campaign" of "left-wing radicals" that Rothman spoke of.

But perhaps those who are called "radicals" are not always so out of touch with things. It was groups of "radicals" who long ago called for a test-ban treaty and lo and behold, it was approved by more than four-fifths of the Senate in 1963.

Some years ago, it was certain "agitators" who were singing "We Shall Overcome," but only two months ago the President himself was echoing their words. A confusing world!

Lewis Lipsitz
Political Science Dept.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters should be typed, double spaced and include the name and address of sender. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length.

By MIKE YOPP
DTH Associate Editor

Instead of a climax to the student peace movement, the April 17 march on Washington is being viewed as a springboard for a flurry of increased anti-war activity.

Students for a Democratic Society, which coordinated the march, has emerged as the probable leader in the planned step-up in activity. SDS officials met in Washington after the demonstration and called for nationwide protests this week of United States presence in Southeast Asia. Many northeastern colleges (where SDS strength is concentrated) are expected to answer the call along with some West Coast institutions.

An outgrowth of the same meeting was the formation of a five-man committee to draw up plans for student action in "retaliation" for continued U. S. bombing of North Viet Nam, and any attempts to further the war.

Representatives of a number of peace groups will gather Sunday at Swathmore College to discuss further action opposing the war.

UNC will be one institution taking part in an SDS - sponsored protest May 15. The program, billed as a "nationwide teach-in," will originate from Washington and be brought to campuses by leased telephone hook-up.

Peace demonstrations, especially on campuses, have increased along with the war in Viet Nam. There have been rumblings from peace groups throughout the tense nuclear chess game of the past two decades, but previous pleas were confined mostly to disarmament and an end to nuclear weapon development.

Peace groups still foster these goals, but the emphasis of their protests have shifted toward the conflict in Southeast Asia. An immediate goal has taken precedence over long range ones. And because getting the U. S. out of Viet Nam is both an immediate and a very real goal, it has served to unify anti-war organizations.

So where are students headed in their peace movement and what will be its success. To answer this, it must be realized that the movement is made up of individuals, many of whom are engaged in other activist groups. An SDS member might also belong to the Free Speech Movement, and a Student Peace Union official might be president of the local CORE chapter.

Many such groups have overlapping interests, but, and perhaps most important, all are protest organizations, and protests of one fashion or another, are much the mode of collegiate life. On many campuses, including this one, the same people might protest discrimination on Monday, march against the war in Viet Nam on Tuesday and circulate a free speech petition on Wednesday.

There is a usually small group, the activists, around which a peace protest must center on any campus. This will necessarily limit the initial membership. What about recruiting others? It is normally a difficult task for on many campuses, especially in the south, the peace marchers are associated with beatniks and "far left" elements.

Attempts have been made to associate the peace movement with the civil rights movement to provide it with a ready-made membership. These efforts have met with some success, but it is doubtful that the peace movement could ever gain the success and widespread public sympathy of civil rights work in this country.

It was not so long ago that civil rights activists were looked upon with the same disdain as the national press heaped upon the Washington marchers. But the civil rights movement has found favor with most of the nation's press, thousands of its leaders and millions of its people. And fewer and fewer "communist - backed" charges are leveled against rights groups. Responsible rights leaders would risk a great deal of public approval if they encouraged their followers and sympathizers to help such organizations as SDS which describes itself as "non-communist, but radical."

So peace groups must recruit from among the ranks of the activists and hope for college faculty support so they can produce something like a teach-in which will protest the Viet Nam war and hopefully add a few members to the ranks.

But many Americans are now looking at Viet Nam with questioning eyes, and, indeed, there are many questions to be answered. But the answers, some of them, will come soon. For President Johnson, with an eye toward 1968, will not allow any unnecessary discontent to be fostered.

But the Washington march probably didn't bother the President. He, as most Americans, must realize the organized peace movement is of small proportions if only 25,000 students could be organized to march from colleges throughout the nation.

So those who espouse peace will march and those who protest the Viet Nam war will demonstrate, and their numbers may increase some in the planned flurry of activity, but, unable to enlist widespread support, their voice will continue to be a small one indeed.