

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

ERNIE MCCRARY, EDITOR

Ed. Note — The speaker ban controversy has drawn prolific editorial comment in North Carolina and other states as well. While the debate continues in this state, legislatures of many others including Georgia, South Carolina and Kentucky, have been or are considering similar speaker regulations. So far, all have been rejected and North Carolina remains alone as the "banning state."

These are two of the most recent examples:

Harming Orderly Solution

Durham Morning Herald

Student insistence, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, on inviting Herbert Aptheker and Frank Wilkinson to speak there, seems more intent on carrying a point than on helping the institution to resolve the speaker ban controversy.

Indeed the great storm which has raged over inviting these two persons, arose over precipitate action by a student group in proposing to invite them in the first place. For had the group waited until the university trustees adopted a policy on invitations to speakers in compliance with the speaker ban amendment, the matter could have been handled routinely, without the furor aroused by referring the invitations to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees and the committee's action.

Neither the issue of freedom of speech at the university nor the issue of educational opportunity depends upon the immediate presence on the campus of Messrs. Aptheker and Wilkinson. Action by some student leaders, however, indicates that they think so. Agitation for extending these men an invitation to speak puts acting Chancellor Sitterson in a difficult and embarrassing situation, as noted elsewhere, which could have been spared him. He must now make a decision which will either reverse a decision by the Executive Committee of the trustees or which will leave him open to the charge by some of suppressing freedom of speech and of inquiry.

What the state-supported institutions, and particularly the university at Chapel Hill, need is the opportunity to settle the issues and problems raised by the speaker ban in a calm and orderly fashion. Impetuous and impulsive insistence at this time on inviting Messrs. Aptheker and Wilkinson will hamper the university in resolving the issue. There is the practical issue of keeping faith with the General Assembly, which rallied to the rescue of the university and other state-supported institutions from the jeopardy in which the speaker ban law placed them. The university stands to suffer from a continued agitation of the issue. It should be given time to resolve the issue. A responsible exercise of freedom would call for this.

Wrong Protectors

The Louisville Courier-Journal

On the page opposite this one today is a piece written by the editor of *The Wall Street Journal* arguing against a "speaker-ban" law the North Carolina legislature enacted. (The article by Veront Royster, was printed in the DTH Dec. 2.)

This law, banning Communists from speaking on the campuses of state-supported universities, was later changed and the trustees of the various universities were left with the discretion of ruling on campus speakers.

The arguments advanced in this article apply with equal force to a bill the Kentucky Department of the American Legion is pushing. In a way, it is worse than the original North Carolina law, which at least was specific. The Legion proposal is aimed at certain undefined "outside groups" and "insidious" speakers.

Kentucky's schools, an attorney for the Legion says, cannot "afford to allow their campuses to be invaded by persons insidiously motivated to create undesirable and obnoxious incitement of the student body and the community and attract degrading publicity to disrupt the orderly state of affairs."

Why is it that people who back this kind of legislation assume that the principles upon which this country was founded are so easily subverted? Why do they assume that our college students are so incapable of judging ideas on their merits? The answers might reveal an interesting psychological pattern.

In any event, proposals of this sort reflect a basic misunderstanding of the function of a university as a place where clashing ideas should be evaluated and where freedom of discussion is indispensable. The late Justice Brandeis once said: "The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

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.

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.



Barry Jacobs

'Racial Balance' In Schools Unconstitutional

The racial pendulum began to swing toward integration in May, 1954. If Adam Clayton Powell's recent proposal is accepted, the swing will be complete. The New York Representative introduced a bill that would carry integration to its illogical extreme: enforced racial "balance" in the public schools.

Under Powell's plan, no school could have a racial mixture that varied more than 20 per cent from the average in the district. Thus, if San Francisco has a population that is half Negro, no school in the city could have less than 30, nor more than 70 per cent Negroes. Neighborhood schools would become a thing of the past; bussing of students from one end of a city to the other would become common.

Powell's proposal has little to recommend it, and there are many reasons, ranging from common sense to constitutional principles, why it should be speedily smashed. The only reason that could be advanced in support of the plan is that there is some therapeutic value in having whites and Negroes thrown together in suitable proportions. There may be something to this—no doubt associating with people of different races is an educational experience—but the arguments against this bill far outweigh this one argument supporting it.

In the first place, the bill would work unwarranted hardships on many innocent children. Harlem is not a pretty sight, and it is easy to feel sorry for the children who are forced to go to schools in such neighborhoods. Many people will applaud Powell's proposal as a way to get the poverty-ridden Negroes out of the slums and into better neighborhoods to go to school. But this plan has two sides. If Negroes are bussed out of Harlem, white children must be taken into that area to preserve the racial balance.

As far as these white children are concerned, the Powell plan is a form of coercion, not of liberation. Negroes may be allowed to go to the school of their choice, but whites will be prevented from having that same choice. In short, the proposal is unfair.

Powell's plan is also unconstitutional. In fact, it violates the very May, 1954 ruling that opened the doors of white schools to Negroes. In that decision the Supreme Court declared that race was not a legitimate criterion for classification of school children. That is, a child could not be assigned to a given school because he was a member of a certain race.

Yet assigning children to certain schools because of their race is exactly what Powell's proposal would do if it were made into law. Some children would be bussed across town to schools because they were white or because they were Negro in order to balance the school's racial distribution.

Let's bring it down to the individual level. Before 1954, Johnny Smith was told, "You cannot go to this school because you are a Negro. You must go to this other school." If Powell's plan is approved, Johnny Jones will be told, "You cannot go to this school because you are white. You must go to this other school." The latter ruling is no more just than the former; if one is unconstitutional, both are.

Proponents of integration may consider Powell's plan the ultimate victory. They will be wrong. It is closer to the ultimate defeat. Final success for them would be the elimination of race as a cause of conscious distinction. Men would not be categorized according to race; they would just be men.

Under the Powell plan race will be perpetuated as a method of classification. Information on the race of students will be essential if they are to be assigned to schools according to color. Children will be kept constantly aware of the difference in the races.

As long as the racial formula is an integral part of the school system, students will not be just students. They will be white or Negroes, too. In an atmosphere where race is of constant concern, racial prejudice will flourish.

John Greenbacker

Students Missed Chance To Learn

Last Friday night a group of about 25 persons drifted into Gerrard Hall to hear a lecture by Dr. W. H. Hutt of the University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Hutt, a libertarian economist and currently a visiting professor at the University of Virginia, was sponsored by the Carolina Conservative Club.

Those knowledgeable in the field of economics might have found Hutt's advocacy of a complete free enterprise system interesting, but to many the question and answer period of the lecture proved the most significant in light of recent events on this campus.

As is usual at Conservative Club lectures, there were at least ten persons present in the audience who were leftists. They enjoy hearing and at times arguing with speakers from the opposite end of the political spectrum.

Unfortunately, several of them attempted to make Hutt appear like a segregationist, a believer in South Africa's apartheid system of national discrimination by race. They asked him if he was willing to live next to a Negro, possibly thinking that all South Africans, or at least conservative ones, were bigots.

There was some surprise in the body when Hutt told his questioner that he hadn't lived next to a Negro in South Africa, but had when he resided in Australia. He stated his firm adversity to apartheid, and cited

an incident when he defied social custom to keep a Chinese student in his own home after the University of Cape Town's administrators refused to allow the boy a room in a dormitory.

Hutt's views on freedom of speech were next tested by the leftists. They asked for his definition of free speech, and argued at length that this basic freedom should be allowed to any and all speakers all of the time.

Hutt agreed with them that freedom of speech is vital to a democratic society, and particularly to a university. He denounced all restrictions on a university that prevent an open forum.

Hutt's only reservations on the subject came to light when he said no advocates of one particular point of view should be allowed to dominate a free platform all the time. Argument on this point continued for a short while before the lecture closed, but no one stopped to place the issue clearly in the context of the times, or to relate it to the University here.

As the small group broke up, a few gathered at the front of the room to continue their debate. Conservative Club President Wilson Clark Jr. disengaged himself from one discussion to note, "You know, I really respect these people (the leftists). They're sincere."

Then, as he scanned the darkened and empty hall, he said, "I didn't see a reporter here tonight."

Maybe it wasn't news that was happening in Gerrard Hall Friday night. It was only a sign of the times.

In spite of the blown-up furor over the Herbert Aptheker invitation, this campus is filled with the conventional-minded. It is filled with persons who place Ross Barnett and Hutt under the same banner, Aptheker and Norman Thomas in the same category.

In its official speaker program, Student Government fills the scene with the center and the left of center, while ignoring the more interesting radical points of view in favor of freak shows that entertain the masses rather than stimulate the student.

Those who bothered to show up at the Hutt lecture, no matter what their beliefs, found themselves involved in a truly educational experience. Where was the rest of the study body? Where is the true intellectual inquiry of a great university?

Shackled by its own conventionalism to a tyranny of the center, the University is simultaneously engaged in a battle with the foolish state power structure for its greatest inherent right. Possibly in chipping its way out of the collective ignorance of North Carolina, the University and its students might stumble onto the apathetic ignorance lurking within its own midst.

Letters To The Editor

Save Our Trees

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I want to most strongly protest against the destruction of trees now taking place on campus in front of New East and Davie. This needless desecration of our campus is occurring simply for the shortsighted reason that it will be easier to maneuver dump trucks and rebuild Davie Hall if the trees are torn down.

Of course! It would also be easier to park if we tore up the lawn and the Davie poplar for a parking lot! In a society as clever as ours it is absurd to admit that we can find no better way of doing things than by destroying everything that has been bequeathed to us.

The true beauty of this campus lies not in buildings, but in the overarching trees which line the walks. If these are destroyed, even a few, we shall end up with a campus as stark and barren as that of State. We shall have permanently diminished that which was ours in trust.

Sincerely,
Francis H. Parker
819 Old Pittsboro

Why No Tickets?

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I called the ticket office to find out when student tickets for the ACC Tournament would go on sale. I was told that there would be none available for us. Each of the eight schools in the ACC were supposed to get an equal share of tickets for student sale. If any were left, they were to be turned over for public sale.

Our tickets were offered to members of the Rams Club instead of the students, and therefore are none for us. I think that was pretty rotten of the people who were responsible for ticket distribution to do this. After

all, shouldn't we the students be able to go to the tournament to support our team?

I hope that in the years to come that the students will be able to watch their team perform and cheer them on. Those who have tickets will have to do a lot of yelling to match that which the students would be doing. Members of the Tar Heel basketball team: we won't be there cheering for you, but we'll be pulling for you from beside our radios.

Ronnie Ashley
51 Ehringhaus

Banov For Editor

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Most of us on campus welcome Alan Banov to the race for editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*. Why Banov was not given the endorsement by the Publications Board is hard to imagine. Certainly by the qualifications the Tar Heel listed when Banov announced he was running put him above all others running.

And many of us are excited by Banov's policies which he has had printed for the last few weeks and circulated on campus, something which has made us very enthusiastic. For in the past, as well as now, the other candidates have said early in the game little or nothing with depth about why they are running or what they plan to do upon election. Alan Banov had his platform, policies and a proposed staff lined up months ago.

True, too, Alan was the first candidate to announce (many weeks ago) that he planned to run independent of any party endorsement. Herein we can look forward to a paper without political bias or the kind of slanted viewpoint we have experienced of late.

Mr. Banov, please pass your petition this way

Richard A. Klein
225 Parker

Heelprints

A friend of ours wonders if candy isn't so bad for kids after all—now that some imported sweets have been found to contain an excessive amount of bourbon.

Better not call Gov. Moore a red neck; he's awfully sensitive about this Communist business.

That 12-year-old boy who stole a Greyhound bus in Washington—he wouldn't be in so much trouble he'd only listened to the slogan: "Leave the driving to us."

If those GOP congressmen are so determined to test the efficiency of the Selective Service, why don't they try dropping out of college?

This week's self-confidence award goes to Sukarno for this statement: "Here I am, Sukarno, President and Great Leader of the Revolution. I will not retreat one step or even one millimeter!"

Judging from Sen. Morgan's speaker ban views, we'd say it takes a real patriot nowadays to be against the constitution.

—DAVID ROTHMAN

