

# 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

## Out Of The Ban And Into The Fire

It has been four months in the making, but the Britt Commission's report on the speaker ban was worth the wait. In the realm of the ideal, recommendation of outright repeal was the goal. Realistically, the commission's report — while not perfect — went far beyond the expectations of many ban foes.

It places the matter of responsibility for speakers in the hands of the boards of trustees of the schools — where it should have been and ought to be.

"The board of trustees or other governing authority of each college or university which receives any state funds in support thereof, shall adopt and publish regulations governing the use of facilities of such college or university for speaking purposes by any person who: is a known Communist or has pleaded the Fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions concerning communist or subversive activity," the report said.

In "approving without reservation," Governor Dan Moore called on the boards of trustees of the state-supported schools to meet on or before Friday, Nov. 12. As chairman of the UNC board, he will call it together at 11 a.m. Friday. He ordered a special session of the General Assembly to convene Nov. 15, to take action on the recommendation to amend the law.

During the September commission hearings, University officials expressed their willingness to adopt trustee - controlled speaker regulations, and explained the kind of regulations which would be most acceptable.

such rules would bar speakers who advocate the overthrow of the state or national government, in accordance with a 1941 law. Further precautions that would be taken "when the Chancellor considers it necessary are: that a meeting be chaired by an officer of the University or a ranking member of the faculty, that speakers at the meeting be subject to questions from the audience and that the opportunity be provided at the meeting or later to present speakers of different points of view."

Obviously these regulations are sufficient for the commission members, or they would have stipulated some other rules to be adopted.

The statement contained an important "first" with regard to comment about this branch of the University. It has been common knowledge that the creation and maintenance of the ban was almost wholly the direct result of disapproval of the University at Chapel Hill. The commission publicly admitted this and to a certain extent helped clear the school's name against accusations of "communist infestation."

"A careful review of this testimony accusing the University of being a haven for communist speakers and activity indicates that these statements and allegations were directed primarily at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, covering the period from 1937 to 1965. This testimony discloses that in more than a quarter of a century fewer than a dozen speakers from among the thousands who have appeared during these years were specifically mentioned as extremists and not all of these were alleged to be Communists. Among students, not more than five were singled out from among the more than 40,000 who have graduated from the Chapel Hill campus over this span of time," the report said.

"The testimony shows that the University would not knowingly employ a member of the Communist Party in any capacity, and direct testimony by its officers indicates that no such person is employed. No evidence to the contrary was presented to, disclosed to or discovered by the commission."

Such reassurances sound needless and almost laughable to those who really know the University, but are nevertheless important — because many people are hard to convince otherwise once they make up their mind that Chapel Hill abounds with left-wing extremists.

Unfortunately the commission declined to comment on the legality of the law — which many leading lawyers have called unquestionably unconstitutional.

The General Assembly will be forced to wrestle with the job of amending the law soon, and anything can happen when that august body gets together. The governor, the president of the senate and the speaker of the house have voiced support of the commission's ideas and this makes prospects of legislative acceptance fairly bright.

But win or lose, come special session time, we commend the Britt Commission and its nine members for fair and conscientious handling of the problem and for performing the important task of exposing the "myth of the ban" to public scrutiny.

# The Daily Tar Heel

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.

"Hey, This One's Rotten!"



## Letters To The Editor

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

This letter is in reply to Paul A. Smith's of October 31. I don't wish to criticize Smith's letter on war and peace, but rather to calm his ardor. I am in fact glad that someone has finally hit upon a solid issue or two instead of resorting to name calling. His argument that war is an occurrence, and that one can only be for or against these who propose it, and not for or against the occurrence itself is logical. Smith however, drops the hint that the political science department of UNC as a whole may be pro-collectivist or at least anti-war and pro-peace to the point of damage to U. S. security.

I am glad Smith calls a spade a spade, but to infer that the deck is full of spades can only be a generalization and a false one at that. All Smith has to do is look at the rest of the deck to see that there are many individuals in our political science department, not just one group. This tendency of condemning the whole barrel is not unlike the stereo-typing of group prejudice.

I don't have the permission of any of the professors in the political science department to mention their names, but if Smith is interested, I'm sure interviews could be set up to talk this out with at least four key political science professors. I am myself a major in political science and my conservative nature is daily rubbed the wrong way by talk of internal reforms, but I have never heard any professor, and I've had eleven of them, propose that we practice peace at the cost of U. S. security. (And my conservative vs. liberal grumblings may be classified as only two sides of a coin on which there is merit on both

sides.) These professors live in the U. S. just as we do, and while we may all have our criticisms of life here, we need only to look out into the world with the intention of finding a better government under which to live, to see that the United States is not so bad after all.

I am not implying that there is no need for improvement. Progress is the key to a strong America. But you will have trouble finding anti-American professors here at UNC regardless of their political ideologies. I agree with Smith that the security of the United States is vital, and that those who ignore this in criticizing our efforts to contain the Communist block are wrong.

I for one do not agree with all of our methods of containing the Communists, but as in a Presidential election, the opposition should fight for its beliefs until the election is over and the people have decided. Then the opposition must be "loyal" opposition and the criticism "constructive" criticism. This does not include contributing money for the Viet Cong to be used against our own boys who have been drafted to serve their country.

It means supporting your country today while working through the proper democratic channels to improve your country tomorrow. There is nothing in the constitution about universal agreement on policy. Criticism is the basis of healthy discussion, and I would be disappointed in the political science department if all of the professors agreed with the administration's every foreign policy-move. "Pro-collectivism" is a very grave term to use in connection with any citizen of the United States; it should be backed up by proof.

Bob Bennett  
102 Avery

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

One of the responsibilities of any legislative body is to constantly better the structure of government. One of the problems in this area is that too often, long range plans are ignored in favor of short range partisan interests. This is what happened in Student Legislature Tuesday night.

The University Party legislators, almost without exception, voted against a bill that would have made the student body the final judge on the question of having the election of president and vice president of the student body a single ticket as in the national elections, whereby one would vote for the men together, instead of separately, thus eliminating the possibility of having the president and vice president in different political parties. Bob Spearman, Mike Lawler, Paul Dickson and Britt Gordon all supported the proposal, as did The Daily Tar Heel under Fred Seely and Hugh Stevens, and under Ernie McCrary.

But the University Party legislators, despite Britt Gordon's backing of the proposal, and without so much as a single word in debate against the bill on the floor of Legislature, block voted against it. One UP Legislator told me that the UP delegation had discussed the bill in a meeting before Tuesday night's session and decided to vote against it, seeing no need to debate the bill on the floor.

If Legislature is no longer the place to debate bills, if a party is willing to accept a one-sided debate in caucus and go into Legislature with no intention of debating or being open-minded, if Legislators are not willing to look at situations in Student Government as they now exist and see the leadership role and responsibility of Legislature, then the very existence of Legislature should be scrutinized.

What is so appalling is that many of the

Legislators who voted against the bill Tuesday were in favor of it last year when it was introduced. It is painfully obvious that concern about immediate elections weighed much more heavily on the minds of some Legislators than did their responsibility to lead the student body. By the University Party block vote Tuesday night, the student body once again became the victim of the thinking that what's good for the party must be good for the student body.

Jim Little  
Speaker Pro Tem  
Student Legislature

## Liberal Comment

# Right Of Association Does Not Include Right Of Conspiracy To Kill

By PETER NEMENYI

Although significant civil rights legislation has recently been passed, this has not stopped segregation from being enforced by terror in many parts of the South. In Laurel and surrounding Jones County, Mississippi, for example, seven Negro stores and cafes, the COFO office at two successive locations, two churches and about 20 Negro homes have been burned this year. After every fire, the Justice Department investigates and waits for the next one. In the pervading atmosphere of fear, it is a miracle that one Negro child was transferred under Laurel's voluntary we-dare-you-to-apply school integration plan. That two other applications for transfer were withdrawn before the opening of school is much less surprising.

In the past, the use of violence and even murder to keep Negroes "in their place" was mostly accepted (by whites) locally and ignored out of state. But now that white people, some of them with good connections, are among the victims, this practice has become nationally unpopular. Thus the highly publicized investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by its own sister organization in Congress (some of whose members owe their election to the Klan), and any bill to outlaw Klan membership, will serve as a kind of safety valve, channeling the new public feeling away from the real issues and into irrelevancies.

If we take our Constitution seriously, anybody, however bigoted, has a right to associate, and have ugly or mystic conversations with his friends, in the organizations of his choice. He does not have a right to kill or intimidate people (or to conspire to do so), and these specific acts have to be stopped — by the executive. However, public denunciation of a hate group will give the Unamerican committee a certain respectability and renewed budgets. Then the committee can proceed to the next target, probably the civil rights

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Recently WKIX Radio Station in Raleigh initiated "Operation Merry Christmas," a program designed to provide Christmas gifts for North Carolina's servicemen fighting in Viet Nam. A collection taken up in Avery Dorm yielded nearly fifty dollars for this project within half an hour. Along with the collection, a petition affirming "full support" of present U. S. policy in Viet Nam met with great enthusiasm, receiving nearly unanimous backing.

We of Avery feel that the time has come to let the American public know that the majority of college students in this country are not picket-carrying peaceniks. Wouldn't it be a good idea to extend the effort of one dorm to the entire campus and show our boys over there that we are behind them? I challenge the student body of this University to take advantage of this worthwhile opportunity.

Charles R. Morgan  
President  
Avery Dorm

## 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.

