

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

A Gag Foe Says So

Tom Wicker has decided to drop consideration of a speaking engagement at N. C. State because of his opposition to the gag law.

His reaction is characteristic of those who, while not legally affected by the ban, are morally insulted by it.

Conversation with Wicker, head of the New York Times Washington bureau, syndicated columnist and UNC graduate, reveals that he had tentatively accepted the May 6 speaking date at State because it was his impression that the ban applied only to the Chapel Hill campus. Informed of the law's statewide coverage, he said he would have to reconsider his decision to come to Raleigh.

George Nicholson, chairman of the Carolina Forum, had also invited Wicker to speak here. His schedule prevented his appearance here, but at the same time Wicker's letter to Nicholson explained why he might have some ban-created misgivings.

"If these reasons (schedule conflicts) did not apply, however, I would have been given pause by the existence of the so-called speaker ban at the University of North Carolina," he said.

"I am fiercely opposed to such a limitation as that on free speech, and while the ban could not apply specifically to me, I believe that it might well be that anyone concerned for freedom of speech should refuse to appear at the University while the ban is in effect.

"This would be from no lack of love for the University; quite the opposite: it would be because I would wish to do all in my power to remove this blot from its record.

"I have every confidence, however, that the blot will be removed, and that if this kind invitation ever comes to me again I will be able to accept without qualm," Wicker said.

The General Assembly may soon have the chance to fulfill Wicker's confidence. If a special session is held, the legislators would do well to remember this example and realize that men of integrity and principle find the law totally repugnant — and the University loses in countless little ways so long as the law remains.

Put Friday On Wheels?

In an editorial last week, the Raleigh News and Observer said, in effect, that UNC President William C. Friday is neglecting the other branches of the University and ought to pull out of Chapel Hill.

"As head of a four branch university system, the president should not have his office, his most frequent contacts, his life and inescapably some of his home interests on the campus of any one branch," it said.

"Some students and alumni of other branches have sometimes resented what they felt was a Chapel Hill sense of superiority as 'the University' within the university system.

"Under any conditions some such feelings, perhaps juvenile and unjustified, but real all the same, will remain. Much would be done to eliminate them if the president of the Consolidated University did not have his office and his residence under the shadow of one branch," it concluded.

What that editorial conveniently overlooks is that Friday does have an office on the Raleigh campus and he is there every Monday that he is in the state. There are facilities available for him and his staff at Greensboro and there will be space at Charlotte, according to a Consolidated University official. Friday meets frequently with the chancellors of each branch, and not all the meetings are in Chapel Hill. If any of the campuses feel slighted, they haven't said anything about it.

The N and O doesn't say just what it thinks Friday ought to do to get out of the "shadow" of Chapel Hill. Maybe it thinks the Consolidated University offices should be moved into a house trailer. Then Friday could stay on the road all the time, traveling from campus to campus and maybe even spreading the "gospel of the University" along the highways and byways.

And in the meantime, feeling as he does, we can't understand why the editor of the Raleigh paper doesn't set up an office in every city in his circulation area and spend each day working from a different town.

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; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thomas, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobel, ad. mgr.

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.

"Finished With The Catsup Yet?"



Liberal Comment

'Deplorable' Recall Is Symbol Of Public Face Versus Private Morals

By BANKS O. GODFREY, JR.

Recent events in our national and local history have raised once again the old problem of how a public mind deals with private events which are thrust upon public consciousness by publicity. And once more it has become transparent that the duplicity in the public mind of American allows us to condemn openly that which we tolerate and enjoy privately. The bridge between the hiatus of public and private worlds is a disclosure, usually in the newspaper, to everyone of the taint in the lives of one or two people. This is a very cynical business.

What is so disastrous about this duplicity is that no one is helped by it. Instead, everyone is delivered a suffering which usually exceeds the alleged crime. It is duplicity, more than crises in identity and sexuality, which makes American public life corrupt. As Hannah Arnt writes: "In the public world, common to all, persons count, and so does work, that is, the work of our hands that each of us contributes to our common world; but life qua life does not matter there. The world cannot be regarded of it, and it has to be hidden and protected from the world." Let it be considered, therefore, that in American public life, if not in all public life (as Kierkegaard thought), the possibility of forgiveness and the restoration of a deteriorated, or destroyed persons, is simply impossible. Such restoration is closed out because the deplorable way in which we expose the private lives of public men and delight in doing so, closes out any occasion of help, either for the expositors or the exposed. And it should be obvious that our delight in such exposure is never so euphoric as when what is to be exposed involves sexuality. Americans, who are smart-alecks about sex, and Southerners, who are self-righteous about it, are so easily convinced by so little evidence that private sexual activity, once exposed, deterministically infects the large and small duties and responsibilities of men's public acts. With such a literalistic combination of delight and cynicism at work, it is then a short step before the exposed people are transformed into scapegoats for all sorts of causes and fronts. Such a destructive force, deployed publicly, about particular, unique human beings, is blasphemous.

That is why the demands of the student leaders for a recall of Paul Dickson are deplorable, and why the pronouncement of the chancellor and the Dean of Student Affairs is a miscalculation. The students wrote self-righteously, and the officials attempted to deal generally with the particularities of the Dickson case. Everyone was very pious, especially the women. And when an unbiblical and sentimental piety is unleashed on a moral issue, the piety becomes propaganda. This public exhibition runs the risk of being more outrageous than Dickson's punished breaking of a university rule.

Ironically, one woman, Lady Bird Johnson, of all people, expressed honest, appropriate and life-loving reaction in her statement about Walter Jenkins, whom, she said, we must all look upon with compassion. It is this compassion which we have unlearned to practice in the public and private worlds of our time.

By its absence, we have had to endure the libelous statements of Armistead Maupin against not only the SDS and the SPU,

but against the responsible students who cheer these organizations. Why have the issues been upstaged by childish, personal attacks? Newspapers, after all, are the chief bridge across the communities of the public consciousness. But in recent local issues it appears that more news has been made up than has been reported, and the same is the case in most of the state's papers. It must be noted that the language of emergency, the use of scape-goats, and the vulgar treatment of human beings, is a serious deviation from that tradition of journalism which knows its writers to be the keepers of the notebooks of the culture, which tradition is marked by the names and work of Ralph McGill, W. J. Cash, Jonathn Daniels, Harry Ashmore, Hodding Carter and Mark Ethridge. In such a tradition, opinionated detachment and personal slander are intrinsically destructive, and therefore unthinkable.

The risk of being a public figure (and this university is a training ground for that) is that a public man, in the limelight, has to fight constantly the growth of emptiness in himself, which is the frequent gift of power. It is to Paul Dickson's credit politically, that he has been the one who has been the most articulate, the most responsible, the most honest and the most objective in this whole issue. Politically, one can only hope that, in their public and private worlds liberals and conservatives alike will suffer themselves such loss of pride as will allow us all to petition, about our public and private lives, in the prayer which Reinhold Niebuhr wrote upon the founding of the Americans for Democratic Action:

O God, give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed, courage to change what should be changed, and wisdom to distinguish the one from the other.

There is a freedom which is more liberal than what the liberal university teaches and by which even the university lies, and the gifts of that freedom, sorely needed in our public and private worlds, are humility before one's self and others, born out of self-knowledge, and compassion about one's strengths and weaknesses.

Mike Jemmings

Tony Mason Is "Just A Fellow Who Likes To See People Vote"

Tony Mason is a UNC student who believes people should vote. He devotes much of his time to getting them to vote.

Tony is a member of the Chapel Hill Voter Registration Drive. He is also co-chairman of the UNC-YMCA Human Relations Committee.

Tony doesn't demonstrate or picket for voting rights. He doesn't think that's necessary. Instead he works in his office at the Y. There he checks voter registration lists against lists of those old enough to vote to find who among Chapel Hill's Negro community are not registered. He helps send out information sheets about registration procedures, candidates and issues to Negro homes.

Tony works quietly. He speaks quietly as well. He chooses his words slowly and carefully. His height adds emphasis to his words. Tony has short brown hair and dresses in old but neat clothes. He usually wears a patched sweater.

A native of Chapel Hill, Tony is a senior history major.

Tony began voter registration work before he left high school. He carried on this work with various groups in the community until the Chapel Hill Voter Registration Drive was formed in December, 1963. This year, Tony is trying to recruit other students to work for the drive, but he is not having much success.

Tony will eagerly take from his desk a sheet showing in figures the success of the drive.

"When the drive started work in December, 1963, 746 Negroes were registered in Chapel Hill Township. Before the primaries in May, 1964, we registered 454 more. By the time of the 1964 presidential election, the total Negro registration was up to 1,462.

Tony does not need figures, however, to tell the story of voter registration problems.

"We found that it was very hard to get people to register. People heard about the killings and persecution in the Deep South. They felt the only reason it hadn't happened here was that nobody had been fool enough to register.

"People remember or have heard from their parents how everyone in Orange County once had to go to Hillsborough to register. They remember or hear now Negroes who went there to register were arrested for disturbing the peace. Nothing like that happens anymore."

Tony says that many Negroes felt their votes wouldn't count anyway. "Some people thought Negroes' votes were burned. Others thought some votes were counted as two or three votes each."

To dispel false notions, the Voter Registration Drive began a voter education campaign. Members of the University's political science department helped write information sheets to be sent out in newsletter form.

Tony claims that the "excellence of the Orange County Elections Board" is the reason that "there has been no direct, obvious discrimination in Orange County" in recent years.

"The problem in rural areas is very much different from that in town. A Negro tenant farmer may be thrown out by his landlord if he registers. We can't ask him to take that risk."

While the discrimination problem is largely dead, Tony says its effects still operate and cause Negroes to be suspicious of the drive workers. But when we show we really want to help they aren't suspicious anymore.

To demonstrate their desire to help, the drive workers go from house to house in the Negro community on Saturdays. They distribute information, check on who is registered and urge those eligible to vote. If the registration station at the high school is open and anyone in the house wants to register, the workers will take him to register and bring him back.

On one such Saturday "field trip" Tony demonstrated the way the drive workers overcome distrust.

Tony went to eight houses. Nobody was home at four of the houses. At the other four houses nobody was home who was old enough to vote but unregistered.

One house Tony visited had a blue and white sedan parked in front. A Carolina sticker was on its rear window.

Tony knocked and a man in a checked bathrobe opened the door.

Tony told the man he was from the Voter Registration Drive. He asked the man if he and his wife were registered. The man seemed reluctant to answer. But finally he said he and his wife were not registered.

Tony checked his record. "Yes you are, but your wife isn't."

The man was surprised and a little hostile. "What do you mean?"

Tony explained to him that when he registered once he was registered for life unless he moved away or the county board called for a whole new registration. Since the man had registered for the last presidential election, he was permanently registered.

The man then seemed eager to see that his wife registered. He said she wasn't home, but she would probably be back later. Tony offered to stop back by later to take her to the high school.

The man was grateful. At each house where he found registered voters, Tony urged them to vote in the November highway and school bond referendums.

Tony was back in his office the next week, drawing up new lists and trying to get people to help in the Drive.

And so the campaign goes. But call Tony Mason a campaigner and he'll disagree with you. Ask him if he's a civil rights worker, and he'll say no to that too.

Ask him to describe himself. He'll probably stop and think a minute. Then he may grin and say, "I'm just a fellow who likes to see people vote."

Otelia Connor's Vision Of World Finds Opposition

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Otelia Connor is very willing to condemn others who are also tired of war and the rumors of wars. Perhaps the protesters see war as a factor which debases and weakens man. Killing a human being, whether in passion or duty, neither strengthens nor ennobles man. The tree of liberty may have to be bloodied every twenty years, but that does not make willing killers out of all.

History also seems to show wherever there is man, there is conflict. Surely no "moral equivalent of war" is going to make man see eye-to-eye with his neighbour. (Indeed, just what does "moral equivalent of war" mean; aren't these just words?) No man cares to have his freedom impinged upon — some are willing to give up some of their freedom so others may obtain theirs, and some are not so willing. A man should be able to make this choice himself.

Mrs. Connor wants a wonderful, beautiful world. Just how wonderful and beautiful would it be if "universal military training" and "strict harsh discipline" were compulsory? Discipline comes from the inside of man; imposed discipline brings resentment against the "ordered society" which demands it. Does Mrs. Connor want a society where man does not have the right to express his conception of peace and freedom?

Jane Marcotte
5-A Towne House Apts.

LETTERS

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

