

The Tar Heel

The Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina summer school, and is published each Thursday. Offices are on second floor, Graham Memorial, telephone 933-1011 or 933-1012. Subscription rates are \$1 for both sessions.

MIKE YOPP
Editor

KERRY SIPE
Business Manager

Ernest Robl, assistant editor; Ann Streightoff, editorial assistant; Ellen Robinson, Carol Weil Galbeukiau, John Olsen, Rebecca Berger, Ronald Shinn, Allen Turner, Patty Nash, James Chesnutt, Julia Parker, Paul Schaffer, Emily Folger, staff writers; Bev Coleman, secretary.

A Wise Move For CORE

The Congress of Racial Equality, for over 20 years a leader among civil rights organizations, took a giant step toward retaining that position Monday when delegates to the national convention in Durham tabled a resolution "condemning U. S. policy of racism abroad and the priority given by our federal government to defense spending rather than solving pressing social problems at home."

This position is one held by many Negro leaders and would have gained convention approval except for the intervention of national CORE Director James Farmer. Although his personal views are in line with the resolution, Farmer said: "The matter would fragment the Negro community at a time when unity is extraordinary . . . I feel it the duty of all Americans to be concerned about foreign policy, but I don't believe the civil rights movement and the peace movement should be merged."

Farmer's line of thinking is in direct opposition to opinions of Dr. Martin Luther King, president of Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Last week King delivered a stinging attack against U. S. policy in Viet Nam. He believes that now is the time for the civil rights movement to involve itself with peace efforts.

It was wise for CORE to choose the more practical stand of confining its activity to civil rights endeavors. Farmer pointed out that the association of CORE with the peace movement would have tended to disrupt Negro unity. But he must have likewise realized that the linking of the movements would have jeopardized the advantage of widespread public approval, the Negro's most important asset in his fight for equality.

But the peace movement has not met with this success in the public eye. Such displays as the march on Washington and pickets at the State Department have left it the target of widespread scorn.

To merge the two would undoubtedly harm the civil rights effort.

Aside from practical considerations, we hope civil rights leaders realize that United States involvement in Southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic are complex issues which cannot be easily dismissed with pleas to spend the money used to support these ventures on "pressing social problems at home."

The Debate Must Continue

The heat under the speaker ban controversy has been turned down and the debate has cooled from a boil to a slow simmer.

The commission appointed to study the law has not yet met, and Gov. Dan K. Moore has said he will have no comment on the gag until the commission report is completed. It seems that fewer speakers in the state are taking the ban as a subject.

One of North Carolina's leading newspapers has cut the volume of letters concerning the ban, saying: "Practically everything constructive on both sides of the controversy has been said."

We don't agree. The issues raised by the ban are so numerous and complex that all facets could not possibly have been explored. Even if all sides had been aired, many of the arguments would bare repeating.

During the verbal conflict the ban has remained clouded by misunderstanding. The best way to clear this haze is through continued debate on the issue.

As additional dialogue is carried on, perhaps more North Carolinians will be made to see that the law is merely an affront to freedom and an insult to the people of this state.

In Gag Controversy

Educators Seen At Fault

By JAMES J. KILPATRICK
The Richmond News Leader

They have been having a terrible flop lately in North Carolina over what is known a bit clumsily, as the "communist speaker - ban law." The first conclusion to be drawn from this unhappy affair is that it is difficult to teach educators anything; they are the last to learn.

The row started two years ago, when the N. C. legislature approved Chapter 1207 of

its Acts of 1963. This provided that no college or university receiving state tax funds could permit any person to use its facilities for speaking purposes if such a person (1) were known to be a member of the Communist Party, (2) is known to advocate overthrow of the Constitution, or (3) ever had pleaded the Fifth Amendment before any legislative or judicial body in order to avoid answering questions dealing with communism or Communist party activities.

The N. C. Assembly's action

in 1963 caught the state's educators off guard. Before they knew what had hit them, the bill had passed.

They spent two years denouncing the lawmakers as a bunch of provincial numbskulls, and endeavored to get a bill introduced at the legislature's 1965 session, just concluded, to repeal the 1963 act. And presumably thinking that it would help their cause along, the educators produced a solemn threat from the Southern Association of Schools, and Colleges: If the law weren't repealed, North Carolina's institutions would face loss of accreditation. At the prospect of academic excommunication, no fewer than 150 faculty members said they would quit.

If the educators had any sense, which is a question that may be left for debate another time, they would have known that threats would get them nowhere. And nowhere was where they got.

The infuriated legislature rejected repeal attempts out of hand, and it took a good bit of quiet diplomacy by North Carolina's Gov. Moore to get agreement on a commission to study the issue. Some of the lawmakers were ready to hang the next accrediting team that showed its face in North Carolina. The idea had considerable merit.

Viewed from almost any standpoint, the "communist speaker - ban law" is a regrettable piece of legislation.

In the light of the Supreme Court's recent pronouncement in U. S. v. Brown, voiding the federal law that prohibited Communists from holding union office, the N. C. law may be of doubtful constitutionality. The states, no less than the Congress, are forbidden to pass "bills of attainder."

That point to one side, the law prevents N. C. students from hearing and appraising, in the flesh, spokesmen for the depotism that holds a billion human beings in its sway. It cuts them off, physically, from a significant group that might usefully be studied at first hand.

This, too, should be said, that the act does represent an unfortunate political intrusion upon academic policy. State legislators are not equipped, by temperament or intellect, to function as college presidents or university trustees. The converse of that proposition is equally true.

But the most regrettable aspect of the noisy row — and this the educators do not seem to understand — is the gulf that is here symbolized between the people and their institutions. North Carolina is not alone in this regard. California is experiencing the same unhappy situation. So are other states.

The educators simply will not realize that many responsible persons are sincerely concerned about what seems to them a rising spirit of collectivism on the campus. When freedom of speech is permitted to degenerate into freedom for filthy speech, decent men are entitled to be concerned. The arrogance of some professors, yapping about the sanctuary of "teature" like so many dashshunds safely behind a fence, approaches the intolerable point.

North Carolina's act of 1963 was no more than a symbol of this concern. It was a warning flag, a caution light; it was an expression by the people whose money supports the institutions that the people are not well pleased with what is going on.

"Whuzza' Name Of Your Gang, Stud?"



How Many 'Hitchhikers' Stalk The UNC Campus?

By ANN STREIGHTOFF
Tar Heel Editorial Asst.

"Stop the world, I want to get off" . . . blatant cries of a notorious "professional student" of the 20th century.

He does not stand alone, unheard. Thousands of today's youth have taken up the cross with this image finding convenient way stations for their lives at Chapel Hill, Berkeley, Cambridge, and New York City. In fact, anywhere there's a college, the hitchhikers seem to be riding free and easy.

What could be more appropriate for this type of student which is becoming so prevalent in the university community. An intellectual atmosphere relatively isolated from the cares of the world plus mirrads of students of the same "professional" status to sympathize with plus causes to shout and riot for equals blissful life under glass for our new man.

Bearded or shaven, tailored or tattered, he comes, stalking the campus, living off of what it has to offer. He thumbs his way for many reasons, but two are outstanding — disillusionment and laziness.

Jobs are hard to come by, but some men give up easier than others. Their feet are tender. The world is against them. The view from the merry-go-

round is uncertain and hazy. Why get off, when you're on a good horse?

For many, leaving the frenzied and stimulating pace of the academic - social milieu is a letdown. The cloistered society offers a unique brand of satisfaction found readily in the idealistic setting.

Looking at this new cult from another view, one cannot help but pity these people. It is unfortunate that life in a university should be so contrastingly different from life "outside" for them.

When a student wants to stay on the merry-go-round forever, one cannot help thinking that in some way education has not completely fulfilled its purpose. Education should, in part, be concerned with the integration of learned concepts and with the practical use of knowledge in the world of wage earners. If this is not possible, perhaps real education has not taken place.

Whatever the reason for the appearance in great numbers of these professional students on campuses over the country, the fact remains that they can't be ignored. They take up space. They influence people. They play their part in governing campus attitudes.

How many hitchhikers does Carolina have?