

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

Black Eye On The Tube

From The Greensboro Daily News

Gov. Dan Moore's "I see no value in it" statement about the Ku Klux Klan preceded by a few hours a national television show which left the strong impression that North Carolina has the liveliest Klan revival in the nation.

Coincidence or not, the Governor's remark is a fitting commentary. With its lurid paraphernalia of hoods and flaming crosses (and its sordid history) the Klan is a subject that draws millions to their television sets.

What those millions saw, Tuesday evening, was enough negative advertising for North Carolina to offset dozens of full-page ads by the Department of Conservation and Development.

Justly or not, North Carolina emerged before the CBS cameras as a place where the brews of racial and religious bigotry are brimming over.

If — as we suspect — the program overblew the strength of the K.K.K. in North Carolina, that may be because the CBS reporter who narrated this excellent documentary, Charles Kuralt, is a North Carolinian who remains keenly interested in his home state. But such a supposition is dangerously complacent. In the course of investigating the Klan resurgence throughout the South, Mr. Kuralt has told friends that he found its "nastiest" growth right here.

Why is that? What is making North Carolina ripe for this revival? And what can be done about it?

In the 1964 gubernatorial primaries, when cross-burnings first brought the renewed K.K.K. to public attention, Gov. Terry Sanford made clear his own distaste for the Klan and his determination to keep it within the law. Governor Moore, then a candidate, equivocated. But he has had more than one occasion since then to regret not having staked himself out as firmly as his predecessor. Now he has begun to do so. We hope he will continue to speak vigorously.

But organizations like the Klan feed on more than faltering leadership. They feed on the racial, social and economic insecurities of those who feel they have no spokesman amidst the threatening tides of change.

Certainly deliberate lawbreaking by civil rights demonstrators has set an unsavory example: Extreme begets extreme.

The Klan hierarchy and the klaverns are filled with those whose thwarted ambition to cut a figure finds an outlet in mystique and rant. They must be brought to understand that there is room enough for everyone to enjoy a good job and self-respect in this state — and that those who seek to enhance their own dignity by striking at the dignity of others are on the wrong track.

Perhaps the greatest irony of Tuesday evening's unfortunate publicity is that it reduces the appeal of North Carolina among those who have jobs and hope to dispense.

The Northern or Midwestern company with a plant to build in Eastern North Carolina is hardly enticed to do so by organized tub-thumping against racial and religious minorities. Those who hood themselves and prance to hymn music around flaming crosses are really their own worst enemies. For they make the adjustment to new times and new ideas all the more difficult.

Of course the habits — the "image," if you please — of the new - model K.K.K. have changed since "Catfish" Cole, the last of the old grand dragons, had his fire snuffed out by the Lumbee Indians and the courts. The Klan now claims to be law - abiding and respectful of order. It likes publicity.

But has the reality changed, really? It is hardly conducive to law and order to preach racial and religious hatred. The nation has watched, with mounting horror, what the Klan can do to a town like Bogalusa, La.; and "it can't happen here" hardly seems a realistic thought.

There are stringent laws on the books in North Carolina, first written in 1868 and often revised, to counter those who incite others to hatred and fear of their neighbor. They should be used. The Governor can and should speak out against this pitfall of wasted energies. The state can go on striving for the economic security that will offer these disoriented people a suitably high opinion of themselves and keep them at home.

But these are steps for the long run. For the moment, let us hope that solicitors throughout North Carolina are dusting off their statute books and are vigilant for infractions of the law.

North Carolinians do not want a Bogalusa here.

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 Sobel, 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.

Administration's 'Meddling' Shows 'Personal Malice'

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

As impressed as I once was with Chancellor Paul Sharp, I must say that I feel that his administration's recently attempted intervention in student government is virtually inexcusable, inept, and showed too much personal malice. If the administration wishes to meddle in student politics, they should do so at election time; like all the other interest groups on campus. We could then dissolve our present political parties and form two new ones, the Administration Party and the Anti-Administration Party. The Administration Party could run several candidates for each position, on a slate, and allow (if by some chance it were to win an election) the administration to select the candidate to fill the office. On the other hand, all this won't be necessary if the present intervention is successful (even if it be concealed behind a facade of "student leaders"). The administration's present position seems to me to involve several contradictions and, perhaps, a little duplicity. They have said that the question of the student body presidency should be "left to the students." But then they have also been careful to furnish those misguided individuals scurrying around gathering signatures for petitions and otherwise trying to demolish the autonomy of student government, with all the ammunition in their arsenal.

I hope this administration has misjudged the temper of the student body, and I think they have. We at Carolina have traditionally recognized the importance of having a strong student government, one which we elect ourselves. The administration should not have intervened; they won't get my vote or my signature, no matter how successful they are in using "student leaders" to achieve what they want.

Jefferson Davis
544 Craige



"Did She Forget Her Sweater Or Did He Forget His Tie?"

Right v. Right

By DAVID ROTHMAN
DTH Columnist

William F. Buckley, editor of the ultra-conservative National Review, recently denounced the John Birch Society, and for his efforts got quite a bruising.

It all started when Buckley finally conceded that the Society's leaders had made a few unforgivable boo-boos — like calling Dwight Eisenhower an instrument of the Communists.

Poor Billy! His only reward was a stack of nasty letters. William Patten of St. Louis, Mo., even tagged him a member of the Establishment, which inevitably seems liberal to the rightists and conservative to left wingers.

Mrs. Lenore McDonald of Los Angeles commented: "What Robert Welch wrote in *The Politician* (imputing pro-communism to President Eisenhower) is mild."

James Oviatt of Los Angeles and Beverly Hills wondered "what Zionist Jew wrote (the column denouncing the Birchers). Could it have been Lippmann, Goldberg, or even Abe (Fortas) — Johnson's attorney? . . . I have known Bob Welch for over 15 years; I think he told the truth about Eisenhower." William Gehrke of Denver, Colo., said Buckley was using the "same old smear method employed by the liberals . . . to condemn (Welch) and what he stands for."

These tactics, Gehrke added, "don't refute (Welch's) facts." The "facts" are that the United States is 60-80 per cent dominated by the Communists.

Mrs. W. D. Porter of Lexington, Ky., asked the *National Review* editor why he had to "do it. Couldn't you have left it to the Overstreets, Gus Hall, and perhaps Chet Huntley?"

I wish Mr. Buckley best of luck in his new career as an arch enemy of the far right. Who knows — maybe the next target of his exposes will be the *National Review*.

Buckley was especially critical of the *Birchist* magazine, which hopefully isn't what its ironic title says it is: *American Opinion*.

The publication accuses defense secretary Robert S. McNamara of sabotaging our armed forces . . . and installing probable subversives among our officers.

It is entirely possible that Mr. McNamara has already reduced us to a position of military inferiority to the Soviet, which is reported now to have several weapons designed and developed in the United States but, by McNamara's edict, never produced for the use of our armed forces. "Strange things have come to pass, haven't they?"

According to *American Opinion*, President De Gaulle of France is "beyond any reasonable doubt, the Communist's chief Trojan Horse in Europe."

But don't think *American Opinion* objects to De Gaulle's proposals to weaken NATO — which Welch likewise considers communist.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach are also targets of *Birchist* diatribes, and naturally, *American Opinion* in effect would cease publication if it did not blast Chief Justice Earl Warren.

In fact, the magazine has even protected freedom by exposing Warren as an enemy agent. "The theory that the Warren court is working for a domestic, as distinct from foreign, dictatorship becomes less tenable every day," the Birchers calmly inform us.

Fun-Fare

ROLL CALL

LBJ referred to the 89th Congress as "the greatest." This ranks it with Cassius Clay. (Wick Fowler, Dallas Morning News)

PITIFUL CASE: The mountain man who lived happily until drink broke up his home. His still exploded. (Hugh Allen, Knoxville News Sentinel)

The guy was beaming over what summer camp had done for his daughter: "She found out for the first time she can talk to other people without waiting for the dial tone . . ." (Paul Light, St. Paul Pioneer Press)

If you can't bite, don't growl. (The Portland Oregonian)

The one who rocks the boat is usually not at the oars. (Bellows Falls, Vt. Times)

A good woman driver is one who can miss anything that will get out of her way.

Letters To The Editor

Dickson And The Ban

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Amidst the fury of petitions, ultimatum, and generally righteous editorials, I, as a friend of Paul Dickson and a strong advocate and participant in Student Government feel the need to reveal to the campus the fact that many student government leaders are in support of Dickson's remaining as president of the student body. Dickson has suffered and is still entertaining many calloused and vindictive dicta from persons whom I shall assume have the best interests of Student Government at heart. I personally feel that resignation is now impossible. No matter how many statements the administration may issue reminding us that they are no longer pressuring Dickson and no matter how moralistic certain campus leaders may become, the fact exists and shall continue to exist that the right of Student Government and the student body to determine its own president has been infringed upon. Any action promoted by faculty intervention would be a grievous error.

Dickson's administrative personnel have been appointed and one of the most ambitious programs ever ventured in Student Government has been prepared. Are we now to stop in the middle of the stream, hesitate on such programs as judicial reform, creation of a faculty chair supplement, educational programs to the state, campus radio, and vigorous opposition to the speaker ban simply because the president of the student body received an official reprimand? Are we not rather to note with appreciation the fact that our honor system knows no personalities and to admire the personal courage of Paul Dickson?

As a former Honor Council member and as a person still active in our court system as well as being chairman of the party of Mr. Dickson, I publicly state my support for President Dickson and urge him and other campus leaders to defend vigorously the integrity of Student Government by remaining in office.

Frank Hodges
Chairman Student Party
Third Floor, Davie Hall

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

We, the people of America, pride ourselves in self government or government by representatives chosen by the voting population. We like to think we are able to channel into office those leaders who are both politically able and morally acceptable to the majority of the country. This, in theory, sounds pleasing to the ear, let's look at the record; let's be a little pragmatic about the type of leaders we have had in the past who have suffered scandal, but have proven to be able and steadfast leaders of the republic.

There was old Andrew Jackson who was supposed to have committed adultery (sic) prior to his marriage and election to the presidency. If one has ever had the opportunity to see the outdoor drama *Unto These Hills*, he could not help coming away feeling less charitable toward "Old Hickory" due to his treatment of his former allies, the Cherokees.

Wasn't it Grover Cleveland who was rumored to have fathered an illegitimate son?

Harry Truman was supposed to have been backed by the Missouri KKK in his first campaign for congressman from the "show me" state.

And then old LBJ. Yes, the 1960 answer

to FDR came away from the fray of last November with quite a few bruises to his moral character. With Bobby Baker and Walter Jenkins as political skeletons hanging in his closet he went on to chalk up a record landslide against the Arizona cowboy.

Now, I am not justifying these great men for their mistakes or indiscretions, but I'll leave their condemnation to those "without sin." History has proven that in spite of their "shortcoming" or (as the puritans would say) "sins" they were great leaders and fairly respected Americans in the world of politics. They made contributions to our society and set examples of determination and personal stamina which have been building blocks of our nation.

I didn't vote for Paul Dickson. However, I do respect his political and leadership ability. He beat my candidate "fair and square." The majority of the student body felt he was the best candidate — that's democracy. I do not think that if the office of the President of the United States can do no better "morally" with its holders, that we as a small, though important, southern university should not be expected to become the moral messiah of the nation.

In the eyes of some, Paul made a mistake, a human mistake, but I feel that the majority of the students on campus are mature enough to judge his worth as a leader as far exceeding the damage he might have done this summer.

Hang in Paul, I'm for you.
Philip Nell
1513 E. Franklin St.

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

The Britt Commission, investigating the speaker ban law, will no doubt clip William Otis' letter from the DTH and use it to counter-balance Mr. Goldwater's recent bombshell. On the scales, at least, it will carry more weight and should bolster their confidence a bit.

Some of the arguments that are advanced by Otis, however, seem to be either illogical or ungermane even in defending a law that may well be described by the same adjectives.

He proclaims that the "law is a regulation governing the use of the facilities of state-supported colleges . . . not a proscription of the liberty of any individual," and that forbidding the use of state-owned facilities to Communists does not forbid them freedom of speech. It may be argued with as much validity that the barring of a certain racial group from state-supported schools does not prohibit that group from seeking an education . . . as long as it is elsewhere.

Otis blandly goes on to say that it does not matter whether "the law fosters or hinders the unimpeded pursuit of knowledge," that the General Assembly has simply chosen to revoke a privilege.

But it does matter — and that is the whole point that Otis misses.

Legally the General Assembly has the authority, that is already evident in that the law is on the books. The heart of the University's protest, however, is not directed at the legislature's authority, but at the nature of the law itself.

Near the end of his article, Otis is "heartened" that not a single professor has resigned because of the law. Perhaps, this is so. But, in recruiting new professors, the University is certainly at a disadvantage when it must admit that among the nation's great universities it alone bears the stigma of such a ban.

Otis' conclusion is especially confusing and weak. On one hand, he would welcome an amendment to the law (provided it did not offend the citizens of North Carolina) and on the other, he castigates the University for not being able to live with the not-so-bad law.

The fact is that the University can exist with the ban, just as a man can exist in blindness. It can exist under restrictions, and marked by stigma and perhaps, even without accreditation. What really matters though, is that the University does more than exist.

What really matters is that the University is a creative place; a place of intellectual turmoil. The ban is a step toward stifling this. That's what the protest is all about.

Richard Nichols
501 Morrison

P
e
a
n
u
t
s
A
n
d
y
C
a
p
p

