

The Mining Journal

Upper Michigan's Largest Daily

A PANAX PUBLICATION

Founded July 11, 1946

JAMES H. LUKE, General Manager

KENNETH S. LOWE, Editor

Dr. Jamrich's Judgment

When he came to Northern Michigan University as its seventh president last July, Dr. John X. Jamrich said he hoped to promote harmony within the university. He stepped into the president's office following the most turbulent year in the university's history and he obviously was concerned about maintaining stability of administration.

In order to accomplish this, Dr. Jamrich

set up three task forces covering what he regarded as the major areas of university operations. One task force was to deal with student rights and responsibilities. Another was to study academic governance. And the third was to consider the problem of the future of the university. Each task force was to establish committees to hold open hearings at which faculty members and students would have an opportunity to express their views in a thoroughly democratic manner. Reports of the first two task forces were to be due early next year and the report of the third task force next June.

Before the deadline for these reports fell due, however, Dr. Jamrich encountered some situations calling for difficult decisions. The most dramatic of these situations occurred last Monday night when a group of demonstrators protested over the racial climate at the university by staging a "sit-in" on the fieldhouse court to prevent a scheduled basketball game from being played. The demonstrators prevailed, and the game was cancelled.

There were those who believed that the administration should have taken stern measures to suppress the demonstration and assert the authority of the administration. Dr. Jamrich elected to respond in a different fashion. Recognizing the potentially explosive nature of the confrontation, he chose to allow the black militants to make their point. For this he has been criticized — and even harassed — by some segments of the community. But — and this is important — he did not yield to demands for immediate redress of the alleged grievances, leaving the door open instead to further negotiation. Had he done otherwise he might well have inflicted irreparable damage upon student-administration relationships. Under the most trying of circumstances, he exercised the sound judgment that is the first requisite of an able administrator. For this, Dr. Jamrich deserves the solid support of the university and the community.

This, however, was only one of a series of tough decisions Dr. Jamrich has had to make since last July. The others are not so evident to the community at large but they have been basic to the reputation and continued progress of the university nevertheless.

In his few short months as president of a rapidly growing university, Dr. Jamrich has proved himself to be not only a fine administrator and academic technician but an excellent educator as well. From his beginning by seeking the opinion of others — faculty, students and townspeople — he has progressed to a position of eminent respect among his colleagues, students and fellow citizens. He has placed the emphasis on proper procedure and an admirable concept of fair play.

The university and the community have now had a chance to measure him, and he emerges from that appraisal as a citizen of the first rank, both personally and professionally.

It is no wonder that the Northern Michigan Faculty Senate gave him exceptionally high marks this week when it unanimously endorsed his judgment last Monday night and stated in a resolution that he has "established himself as a man of intelligence, industry, forthrightness and goodwill — one sincerely devoted to the best interests of every segment of the Northern community. He has succeeded remarkably in helping to heal deep-seated wounds and hostilities in many quarters and to give real educational purpose and direction. The Faculty Senate strongly disapproves of the unfair criticism and harassment" of Dr. Jamrich.

And so do all others of goodwill.

BERRY'S WORLD



© 1968 by NEA, Inc.

"Sorry, madame, we do not seat women wearing pants — and that goes for skirts, too, sir!"

Andrew Tully:

Why Not Enforce Law?

WASHINGTON — Anybody around here mind if I wonder aloud what kind of creeps we've got running this country?

Two news items make the question relevant. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black decried — again — that under the Constitution demonstrators are not granted an inherent right to do their thing in streets or other public places. And the dean of students at Fordham University, Martin J. Meade, suffered a heart attack and was in critical condition after 20 members of the Society for Afro-American Advancement held him captive in his office for two hours.

The Black deposition, in a TV interview, and Meade's shattering experience are related because Meade was a victim of the inability — hell, the downright unwillingness — of both our political rulers and the curious people who run our colleges and universities to enforce the law.

A Re-Statement

Black's statement was not news. It was merely a re-statement of a Supreme Court decision handed down in November, 1966, which upheld the trespassing conviction of 23 Negro students from Florida A. and M. University who had rallied outside a Tallahassee jail in September, 1963.

That decision served notice that there are places where demonstrators and/or protestors may not, repeat not, function without official permission. Or, as the opinion put it, the court rejected the "major unarticulated premise that people who want to propagandize protests or views have a constitutional right to do so whenever and wherever they please."

The court therefore upheld the arrest and conviction of the students, who had refused to disperse when ordered to do so on a charge of violating a Florida trespass law. Said Black's majority opinion, "Nothing in the Constitution of the United States prevents Florida from

The Supreme Court's 1966 decision already stood as part of the law of the land.

1966 Ruling

Had the 1966 opinion ruled, probably over Black's dead body, that militant students, assorted Negro thugs and defunct teachers had a legal right to take over the White House for a mass LSD trip, the oleaginous New Liberal in government would be demanding their rights. But from Maine to California, our political masters, aided and intimidated by chicken-hearted educators, have refused to enforce or abide by the law of the land.

Last September, the FBI's J. Edgar Hoover warned that "the New Left leaders plan to launch a widespread attack on educational institutions this fall," and spoke of "revolutionary terrorism invading college campuses." Hoover has been known to be an alarmist, but this time he hit it on the button.

Right All Over

Events have proved the FBI chief right in almost every section of the country. San Francisco State College was plunged into what its president called a student "reign of terror." At New York University, a Students for a Democratic Society strong-arm squad shouted, jostled the South Vietnamese observer to the United Nations, poured a pitcher of water on his head, and prevented both the observer and the New York Times' James Reston from delivering their scheduled lectures.

There has been bloody violence — and an absolute infringement of the rights of the student majority — in Amherst, Mass.; Los Angeles and Berkeley, Calif.; Washington, D.C. (of course!); Storrs, Conn.; Bluefield, W. Va. You name it. Our learning institutions attended to the discovery of truth, but untidily-discotheques were the loudest talking customers are always right.

I understand Justice Black has told intimates he "can't understand" why the assorted authorities permit such anarchy.

Editor's Mail

(Contributions are invited. Letters should be limited to less than 300 words. Only signed letters will be considered for publication. Personal attacks on individuals will be eliminated.)

Sports Telecast

Editor, Mining Journal: Congratulations to WJMR-TV and to WLUC-TV for their live telecast of what was to be a lively basketball game between the Northern Michigan Wildcats and the Pan American team. We hope this is the first of many sporting events carried live over local television.

On the other hand, a box on those crybabies who chose to litter the floor court with themselves. They are forever crying "civil rights." Now what about my civil rights? What right had they to take away from me the pleasure of seeing a scheduled basketball game? These clowns may not know it, but they blew their cover tonight (Monday, Dec. 9) and about 20,000 others were denied the "right" to see that game.

Heretofore, those antics which took place on campus were localized. Now, they have made this issue Peninsula-wide. An their local complaints have no place in our private homes. Again, heretofore, we respected their right to protest (although not necessarily condone) and to be heard. Now that they have chosen to drop their problems right in my lap right in my front room, they get nothing from me but a deaf ear.

That little martinet that was strutting back and forth across the floor should have been ejected as an undesirable. Or has Northern gone the way of so many other institutions where the tail is wagging the dog?

In conclusion, may I ask one question of Dr. Jamrich. Respectfully, sir, I request a clarification of why you chose to black out the telecast. Were you worried that we as home viewers might see something on television that might shock our delicate senses? Where was your security force? This sit-in surely didn't come about as a complete surprise. Not when the plans were laid and passed by word of mouth to around 200 students. Actually, there are about three questions here, but they are ones which you will be asked many times. By answering publicly once and for all, the air will be cleared.

J. W. McDONNELL
548 Poplar St.
Ispheming

Hal Boyle:

Two-Sex World Still Preferred

NEW YORK (AP) — We live in confused times, and few things are more confusing than the sexes themselves.

It is getting harder to tell them apart as men and women tend to ape each other more in manners, dress and talk. Some say that differences between the sexes aren't of much importance any longer anyway. They feel that society is headed toward a future in which there will be only one gender — unisex.

While such a situation certainly would end the present puzzle-moment, there are those among us who are old-fashioned enough to prefer a world in which there are two sexes — and ways to distinguish them.