

**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.  
**ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR**  
**JACK HARRINGTON, BUSINESS MANAGER**

**D.A.G.I.C.O.R.P.O.T.S.B.**

North Carolina is the only state with a speaker ban law.

It is also the only state with a Deputy Attorney General in Charge of Rendering Pronouncements on the Speaker Ban.

It appears that Deputy Attorney General Ralph Moody is doing little else these days besides submit opinions supporting the ban.

His first contribution was a long, emotional defense of the law. Little more than a week ago he spoke up again, saying that the General Assembly could still control speakers on campuses — even if the law were repealed — by tightening the purse strings on school budgets. The Speaker Ban Study Commission had requested his views on the legal validity of a brief against the law which Duke law professor William W. Van Alstyne had presented. Instead, they got a personal attack on Van Alstyne and the "purse string" suggestion.

Now Ralph is at it again. In response to questions raised by Secretary of State Thad Eure (who wrote the speaker ban law), he has added the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to his list of targets.

The Southern Association has indicated it might take accreditation away from our schools if the law is not changed or repealed, so that apparently makes it a fair target for the attorney general's office.

"We are of the opinion that the Southern Association is 'conducting affairs' within the meaning of (state laws) and should, therefore, be required to procure a certificate of authority from the secretary of state," Moody said.

It makes no difference to him that the 11 other states served by the Southern Association have made no requests for its incorporation.

He cites as his authority the 1955 Non-Profit Corporation Act, which says, "A foreign corporation shall procure a certificate of authority from the secretary of state before it shall conduct affairs in this state."

Moody continued, "The exercise of the power to accredit or withdraw accreditation from educational institutions in this state is the result of affairs conducted in North Carolina and is set in motion by such conduct of affairs . . ."

So, he says, the Southern Association is "conducting affairs" and must get a certificate of authority. Perhaps the Association is "conducting affairs." The legal definition is somewhat obscure. We will not be very surprised, in fact, to see the Association pay the \$45 fee and get on to more important issues.

The fact that this problem ever arose at all only testifies to the smallness of some of our state officials who support the ban. They are clearly operating under the "if you make trouble for us, we'll make trouble for you" attitude, to the discredit of us all.

**Those Nasty Girls**

We've always pictured Englishwomen as very proper ladies, sweet and polite to a fault.

But now some girls from an English teachers' college have shattered that image. Although it was probably a false concept all along, it was still pretty nice to have.

These illusion-busting females have been banned from the pubs in a town near their school — because their language is so foul.

"Their language would make your hair curl," said the owner of one of the inns. "The girls are as bad, or worse, than their boy friends . . . They swear as much as the boys and they join in the dirty songs. They know all the words," said the other pub keeper.

The account gave no specifics of what the girls have been doing, but it did say that the drinking establishments are patronized primarily by miners and steelworkers. Apparently we are supposed to draw our own conclusions about the degree of grossness they have displayed to bring on this ban.

Our faith in the femininity of Britannia's females is restored somewhat, however, by the hope that these rowdy girls probably represent only a small minority of women students.

The rest, unfortunately, are probably just like Carolina Coeds.

**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; John Jennrich, associate editor; Kerry Sipe, managing editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Jack Harrington, business manager; Woody Sobol, advertising manager.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. 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.

"She's Dated Through October, Too!"



**Winston Struggled To Defend Carolina From 'Godly' Enemies**

By OTELIA CONNOR

When I first started writing the sketches of the University presidents I thought I would pass over Winston, Alderman, and Edward Kidder Graham, because each served only a short period. Later I realized to do so would be to neglect one of the most important and vital periods in the long struggle for survival in the history of the University.

President George T. Winston was particularly significant because of the masterly way in which he routed the forces which had been trying to destroy the University since its beginning.

The fight came to a climax in President Winston's administration when President Kilgore of Trinity College, President C. E. Taylor of Wake Forest and Josiah William Bailey, editor of the Biblical Recorder, bent their efforts, through the pulpit and sectarian press, to defeat the principle of state aid to higher education. They contended that it wasn't the state's business to educate the masses beyond grade school, that only a few people could benefit by an education beyond elementary school and that the church schools could best educate men for Christian leadership, that Godly people should not be taxed to support and supply Godless education.

President Winston had an excellent mind. He wasn't afraid of a fight, and he was a skilled legislative lobbyist. He lined up many prominent men and the secular press to fight for freedom of the state from clerical control. To the cry that "Godly people should not be taxed to support Godless education," he replied that Wake Forest, through its endowment fund, was a sycophant of the Standard Oil trust, and that Trinity was on its knees to the American Tobacco Company trust of the Dukes, that half of the people in the state did not belong to any church and that they should have the privilege of choosing a denominational or non-denominational school.

In 1893 the attack on the University was renewed in the legislature by the Rev. Dr. Shearer, president of Davidson College, who introduced a bill which would prohibit the University from teaching undergraduate courses and make it exclusively a graduate school. He charged that the University was in competition with other colleges. Since the University had only five post-graduates, this law would have spelled its death.

To help him win his case, President Winston had a statement distributed to members of the 1893 legislature. The main points set forth in his paper were as follows:

In obedience to the mandate of the constitution, the University is a state institution and state property, and like other state institutions, it should be guarded, supported and properly managed. Relying upon the promise of the state to maintain and guard the University, various citizens have from time to time given lands, buildings, money, and apparatus, in trust to be used forever for the purpose of a University. It can be used for no other purpose. The state has accepted the trust, and is bound in honor to fill it.

The University is the best investment the state owns, said Winston. Aid to the University in 1892 cost the state thirty thousand dollars (twenty thousand regular and ten thousand dollars special), being an expense to each regular taxpayer of less than four cents a year for the regular appropriation.

Has the University a right to be religious? And if not should it be allowed to exist?

The University has a right to be religious

and it is religious, Winston said, It is distinctly Christian, but not denominational.

If all the money now given to the University were given to the public schools, as some people advocate, Winston said, the University, which is the head of the public school system, would be destroyed and the public term lengthened by only a day and a half.

By 1897 the battle was won.

President Winston, after five strenuous years as president of UNC, was called to the presidency of Texas University at double the salary he was getting at Chapel Hill. His administration at Texas was not notably successful. The very quality — zeal to correct any situation he didn't like — that helped him win his fight for the University of North Carolina was not well received in Texas. At the end of three years he accepted the presidency of State College in Raleigh. He retired in 1908 at the age of fifty-six on a Carnegie pension. For years he divided his time between New York and London and the mountains of North Carolina. He came back to spend his last years in Chapel Hill where he died in 1932.

**State-Wide News Of Dickson Case Claimed Unfair**

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

On Tuesday morning, the same day that the DTH broke the story of the Dickson controversy, the Charlotte Observer carried a similar story using quotations from a statement given to the DTH and to the administration demanding Dickson's resignation. Those quotes could have appeared simultaneously only with the active help of the DTH, the administration, or one of Dickson's attackers. The timing of the appearance of these quotes is substantial evidence that the statement was released by someone to the state press before it was printed in *The Daily Tar Heel*.

Following the lead of the Charlotte Observer, almost every other major state newspaper has printed the story. The story has also been circulated on radio and television and in the wire reports of the Associated Press. It is abundantly clear from all of these sources that the event which is being reported is not that a student officer has committed a rule infraction, but that his removal from office is being demanded.

In addressing an audience not directly responsible in the matter by actively seeking to get the story printed in the state press, some of Dickson's attackers have now clearly revealed a purpose which goes far beyond merely securing his resignation.

I would personally like to know the names of the persons responsible for the joint blow indiscriminately administered to Paul Dickson and to this University by deliberate efforts to create state-wide publicity.

John Randall  
 2 Cobb Terrace

Terry Fowler  
 413 Patterson Place

P  
e  
a  
n  
u  
s



**Letters To The Editor**

**Dickson Attacked**

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

"To resign or not to resign: that is the question." Whether President Paul Dickson should step down is a difficult problem.

Evidently Dickson clearly violated the campus honor code or he would not have been convicted, yet some of the circumstances surrounding the trial are somewhat unclear.

It enters the minds of most students here on campus that if they had been caught instead of Dickson, what would have been the decision of the honor council? Also, it seems a little unjust that Dickson's accomplice was suspended from school while Dickson himself received only an official reprimand. Whatever office he may hold, Paul Dickson should have, and for same consideration given to any student in this university.

Supposing he did receive the same consideration that anyone else would have received, never again should a student at Carolina be suspended for taking a co-ed off-limits, whether it be dormitory or a fraternity house.

When Paul Dickson accepted the presidency of the student body, along with the duties of office he accepted the responsibility to represent the student body in his every action. He has gotten off to a very poor start.

Either through naivete or some more vain reason he has refused to resign. Even after being confronted with a letter written by a number of student leaders which asked him politely to submit his resignation, he has refused. His decision can lead only to scandal and more embarrassment. Paul Dickson owes it to the student body to resign.

William C. Rogers  
 412 Ruffin

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I believe it was Job who said, "Man that is born of woman is of few days and full of trouble."

The University, like man, seems born for trouble. In studying the history of the University, I have been struck with how often, through no fault of its own, it has been hit by tragedy, by something that set the blood-hounds throughout the state on its trail.

People ask me what I think of the Paul Dickson affair. It is hard to say. Ordinarily, I am for the individual — he learns through suffering. Give him another chance.

But more than an individual is involved, more than Paul Dickson has been hurt this time, because Paul Dickson represents an institution, he is at the pinnacle of Student Government. In the eyes of the world, he is the University.

For the good of the University, for the good of the Honor System and Student Government, I believe Paul Dickson should resign as president of Student Government. He has lost his influence, not as an individual, because this mistake could be the making of Paul Dickson's success in life, but he has ruined himself as leader of Student Government. Therefore, in the best interest of all concerned, I believe he should resign his office as president.

As for the University, it has survived raged before. It will survive this time. It has always been a beacon-light in the state, standing like a stone wall. Let's keep it that way.

Otelia Connor  
 Chapel Hill

**...And Defended**

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

The amount of righteous indignation one feels toward Paul Dickson these days seems to depend on whether one belongs to the University Party or to the Student Party. If this is the case, then the moral argument advanced in this letter will probably have no impact on events; it will, however, serve the purpose of getting it off the writer's chest.

The gravity of Paul's original misdemeanor, most of our righteous indignants feel, is due primarily to the fact that he holds a high office. Although the argument varies from man to man, it seems to be that an immoral act by the elected head of the college community undermines popular support and respect for whatever he tries to do in student government, thereby rendering him unfit for office.

Paul should leave office, people say, because others have lost confidence in him. If you say this often enough, sure enough, everyone will be going around saying how everyone else is losing confidence in the president. No one — certainly not the politically ambitious — has stopped to ask himself the right question, except perhaps Paul himself. (I should say before I continue that I have no affiliation with either of the parties on campus.)

We did not elect God to the office of student body president. We elected not only a fellow human but a fellow student, someone therefore both more inclined to look after students' interests and also more prone to students' impetuositities. Did that infamous deed last summer in itself suddenly impair Paul's ability to act as student body president?

Yes — if we, on whom he depends for support, think it did. The position taken here is that the only reason the deed might inherently cripple Paul's ability to perform his duties in government is because everyone said it did. And the crux of the issue is that Paul's action and subsequent conviction fall well within the bounds of moral susceptibility we can expect from a student, leader or non-leader. It would be difficult to maintain logically that a hitherto unknown facet of Paul's character has been revealed, justifying his expulsion from office. This argument, however, is fairly easily maintained in collectively righteous talk about consensus and a leader's immoral action.

Paul may have been a damned fool last August. Throwing garbage at him publicly in September is far more seriously immoral, since it is in effect expecting moral perfection on the part of a fellow human.

Lucian W. Pye, a political scientist at MIT and (to give him a place on the political spectrum) a supporter of President Johnson's policy in Viet Nam, has studied traditional political systems carefully; one of the characteristics he attributes to them is the inability to separate the political from the spheres of social and personal relations. Prestige, charisma and influence are far more important than policy questions in a pre-modern polity. If the shoe fits, put it on.

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

It is gratifying to know that those who are in the position to express the opinions, as well as the deep concerns of the UNC students, take advantage of their position. However, as a student at UNC I do not personally feel that the general opinion of other students concerning the Paul Dickson case has been justifiably presented by the editorial staff of the DTH.

In view of the editorial on page two of Tuesday's edition of the DTH, I fail to see where our student government has made such a "tragic plunge" into disrespect or discredit. Even if Dickson were wrong in making the decision to retain his office, he made this decision "honestly and with sincere regard for Student Government and the University." Who is to say that an entire student government with as respectable and prestigious foundation as that of UNC can be destroyed by the decision of one individual? Who is to condemn Dickson for making the decision he thought was right? The DTH did both — EVEN after stating that it wanted to avoid comment until Dickson reached his own decision (so as to avoid "conflict and confusion of a public debate involving him").

Paul Dickson was tried for his Campus Code offense just as an "average offender" yet upon his conviction and sentence he is suffering much more gravely than the so-called "average offender." Is this democratic? Does the governor lose his license for a mere parking violation? Of course, I'm not condoning his act, but has he really failed to be a "frequent practitioner of the 'right thing' "? It is true that Dickson is a public figure, but is he actually any more so than any student at UNC as far as representing our school is concerned? After all, if he is expected to represent the students, why is he any more exempt from making a violation than we are?

Before the article in Tuesday's DTH came out, I dare say, this matter was but vaguely known to the general public. Why then, if the harder decision were to resign his office, did Dickson risk his name, reputation, and honorable standing at UNC to maintain the integrity of the student government?

The students agree that the decision should be left up to them. After all, that is the purpose of our student government — to govern ourselves. No select group of students should be given the say-so over this particular matter concerning the entire student body. If further action is to be taken, let the students do it.

(Note: I challenge the editorial staff to publish this letter.)

Donald G. Hobson  
 411 Manly