

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Tom Gooding
Laura White
Bobby Nowell
Mary Burch
Art Chansky

Managing Editor
News Editor
Associate Editor
Arts Editor
Sports Editor

Bob Wilson
Frank Stewart

Business Manager
Advertising Manager

Pete Hatch

Night Editor this issue

ROTC Report Irrelevant, Political

The long-awaited ROTC Report was released Wednesday and called, among other things, for a new Curriculum on War and Defense, and for the present ROTC program to be affiliated with that program.

The report is long (40 pages) and the logic for the proposed war and defense curriculum is slow and thick. What pervades the report, in its consideration at least of the moral questions regarding ROTC, is the tone that such a moral consideration was made more to appease opponents of ROTC rather than because it was crucial to the entire issue.

"Although there is no great confidence that such matters (moral positions on ROTC) lend themselves to solution by committee investigations, we recognize a responsibility to give them consideration."

On April 19, 1969, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences appointed the authors of the report "to investigate the accreditation of ROTC courses and programs at Chapel Hill and matters relevant thereto."

Such a charge would seem to demand a critical examination of the entire ROTC controversy. It would further seem that such an examination would demand at least a presumption on the part of the members of the committee that they were somehow qualified to consider the moral question. That was their responsibility.

Consequently, on the sole basis that the committee apparently felt it could not, or really need not, examine the moral question, one might be hesitant about their ability to frame any kind of valuable report.

* * *

In any event, the report is built on some interesting logic. For example, we present three statements from within the report:

"The military, its institutions, and its ethos have for too long escaped the critical examination afforded other aspects of our national life by scholars in research and classroom debate."

"The subject matter of the course (taught by members of the proposed military department) does not (will not) reasonably come under the purview of any department other than a military department."

"Anyone obligated by the legitimate decisions of a given office (ROTC students included) performs his proper function (or ought to) through responsible obedience. He may assume, in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, that the orders he receives have been given for good reasons by one more knowledgeable about the relevant matters than he. In such a situation, the rational thing for him to do, quite apart from any consideration of possible penalties or rewards, is to obey."

Simply, there exists a contradiction in this report so blatant as to compel us to just about deny the validity of that report.

Simply, the report recognizes the need for outside review of the military. But it does not feel such review should be "reasonably" applied to the subject matter of a war-defense course, when there is good reason to believe the subject matter of such a course would be

directed by the military itself.

Further, the report feels the military, and anyone in the military, is probably "more knowledgeable about the relevant matters" concerning a course than any cadet who might be in the course. This last point almost cancels out the first point, which stressed the need for a review of the military.

Sure the military is well-informed about what is relevant. The point is that what is relevant to the military is not necessarily relevant to this University or its students.

* * *

Those who have warned of the danger of an ever-more-powerful military-industrial complex have not all merely been long-haired radicals. Former President Eisenhower first issued the same warning.

Yet the ROTC Report tends to dismiss such argument with the strange rationale that "if the argument should be taken as a valid argument for abolishing ROTC, it would, on pain of inconsistency, have to be accepted as an even more telling argument for closing down the University itself, for much of what we do here supports and nourishes, either directly or indirectly, the 'industrial-military complex' and the foreign policy of the United States in more substantial ways than our two ROTC programs."

The University may be just as guilty as ROTC of feeding the military-industrial complex. That is a good point. But it does not explain why the guilt of ROTC in that respect should not have been considered by the committee. The committee was given the responsibility "to investigate the accreditation of ROTC programs at Chapel Hill and matters relevant thereto." Why then have such relevant matters as the threat of the military-industrial complex been disregarded?

The report did propose that any ROTC student be required to take courses taught by non-military personnel that "will subject the so-called 'industrial-military complex' and the foreign policy of the United States to careful critical study and examination."

That is all well and good. But why didn't this committee subject itself to the same "careful critical study and examinations"?

The committee also asked for a course to be offered on moral and political philosophy dealing with the ethics of force and coercion. And it hoped its own discussion in the report would be taken "as an impetus for further debate, rather than as a device for closing the issue."

That is noble of the committee. But they might have examined more carefully precisely those questions of morality and philosophy before arriving at their decisions, which were supposed to have been the result of some "investigation."

* * *

The ROTC Report, despite its length and apparent complexity, does not face basic questions in the ROTC controversy. It cannot, consequently, be taken as less than irrelevant and political.

(Editor's note: Mr. Johnson served as business manager of the Daily Tar Heel from May to December, 1969.)

Dear Editor:

It is well known that when something goes wrong, you try to "pass the buck." However, if you actually look at yourself you will often discover that at least part of the blame is yours.

I think it is time for "the Establishment" on the second floor of the Carolina Union to look at themselves for a change. They need to realize that they are not beyond making mistakes.

I feel that many members of your Student Government are doing their jobs well. However, some are doing these jobs too well, others think that they are doing better than they actually are, and still others just hop on the bandwagon. They need to realize all the facts before they make accusations, and remember that accusations can cause the explosion of personal feeling and relationships which could last for life. The accusations may not even be true.

The Student Legislature and Publications Board has accused THE DAILY TAR HEEL of the mismanagement of funds and the receiving of "double salaries" by three editors. The two bodies are united in that at least three, and possibly more, members of the Publications Board are members of the Student Legislature. They make their rules and do not abide by them. Or, they make their rules and later decide to change them according to the situation. If some energetic legislature wants to jump on a bandwagon, try this for size.

First, the rules and regulations which the Publications Board and Student Legislature are supposed to abide by are found in the STUDENT GOVERNMENT CODE of 1966. Maybe after more than three years, it is time for a revision.

Secondly, the basic failure in this case is a lack of communication between the two governmental bodies and THE DAILY TAR HEEL, and vice versa. However, it seems that many members of the two bodies think they know how the paper is run. They should, but they don't.

Thirdly, without adequate knowledge of the internal workings of the paper, the Student Legislature hopped on yet another bandwagon last spring. After

Open Letter On The DTH Controversy

'SG Must Examine Itself'

conferring with past and future business managers of the paper, the Finance Committee submitted a budget for THE DAILY TAR HEEL which Legislature slashed into one of the most unproportional budgets possible. Jobs requiring more work were cut while those easier jobs were boosted financially.

How can the Publications Board or Student Legislature accuse the TAR HEEL of mismanagement of funds?

"The Publications Board shall have overall financial and administrative responsibility for all funds appropriated by Student Government."—Student Government Code, Title V, Chapter 1, Article V, No. 1, p. 92

According to the present Student Government budget, the funds used by

"The Daily Tar Heel is not \$8500 in the red... (it) has paid its bills. Is this mismanagement of funds?"

THE DAILY TAR HEEL are appropriated to the Publications Board. Who is responsible? These funds, as far as receipts, expenditures and payables are concerned, actually have not been mismanaged. The problem here is that many advertisers continuously refuse to pay their bills promptly, if at all.

At the open meeting concerning the TAR HEEL funds last Wednesday night, Bob Wilson, business manager of the paper, was misquoted, THE DAILY TAR HEEL is not \$8500 in the red; THE DAILY TAR HEEL has \$8500 in accounts receivable; that is, advertisers are \$8500 overdue in paying their bills. The TAR HEEL has paid its bills. Is this mismanagement of funds?

The second accusation is the receiving of double salaries by three editors. This is true, but where does the fault lie? Certainly not on the three editors. The students have not been informed of the background of this situation.

"Student contracts shall be drawn up for each student who receives compensation for services, prior to assumption of his duties, by the Chairman of the (Publications) Board, the Business Manager of the

publication on which the student will assume duties after signing the contract, and one legislative member of the Board. The Chairman shall be empowered to sign the student contracts after a majority of the Board has approved the contract."—Student Government Code, Title V, Ch. 1, Article IV, No. 4, p. 91.

In Article 1 of this section of the STUDENT GOVERNMENT CODE, it also states that the Publications Board is to take office on May 1 of the preceding year. Two of these members are supposed to be "student legislatures elected by and from the Student Legislature and three Presidential appointees." However, this was not done. Whose fault is this?

At the beginning of the school term, there was no Publications Board organized. In fact, it was not organized for several weeks after school started. For this period of time, Gunnar Fromen was the Publications Board because he was elected to be Chairman by the outgoing Board last spring. The Chairman is supposed to be elected from the present Board.

Nevertheless, when it came time for a pay check, the TAR HEEL contracts had to be signed in order to receive these checks. The students signed the contracts. The three editors involved signed two positions; Editor-staff, Sports Editor-staff, Managing Editor-cartoonist.

At the time they were doing the work to be rewarded these positions. In fact, one member of the Publications Board has said that one person could receive all the checks if he did the work and had signed the contracts.

The Business Manager signed the contracts which he alone had drawn up from the scarce remains of previous

"One member of the Publications Board has said that one person could receive all the checks if he did the work and had signed the contracts."

contracts. (Note the previous quote.) He went to the "acting Publications Board" for his signature and also received that of Mark Evans, member of legislature who was to be on the Board, in an effort to receive pay checks two weeks after school had started. There was still no Board to have a majority of to approve the contracts, but the necessary signatures were present and the checks were received.

As time passed, a Publications Board was finally formed, and the contracts were approved by a majority of the Board. How was any member of THE DAILY TAR HEEL staff to know that anything was wrong if his "boss" had assigned and approved his contract? The members of THE DAILY TAR HEEL staff

"are directly responsible to the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina."—Student Contract

The Publications Board realized the "error" when a salary complaint was presented to them. They jumped on the Business Manager for allowing "double salaries" and having people working who weren't on contract. The "double salaries" had been in front of them.

As for the other problem, the Business Manager was partly at fault. The staff of

THE DAILY TAR HEEL changed with almost every pay period this fall. The Business Manager noted the changes on his set of contracts and wrote the checks accordingly. He was never told and never realized that he had to inform all the other contract-holders of these changes. I know that ignorance is no excuse, but was it entirely the fault of the Business Manager?

I feel it is time for the Student Legislature and the Publications Board to look at themselves, for a change. There are many reforms needed to enable everyone involved to operate with more accord.

Look at the STUDENT GOVERNMENT CODE. Maybe it should be revised; maybe it should just be followed. If the Publications Board was formed in the spring, many of the early fall problems would not occur.

There is a need to fill the "communications gap" which is present between the paper and Student Government. Invite members of THE DAILY TAR HEEL staff to your meetings and visit their offices to see these problems as they really are.

There is a basic need to get advertisers to pay their bills promptly. Work together on this problem, and don't expect one person to work miracles by himself. Some merchants are very slow when it comes to paying students, but they thrive off of the opposite situation. Maybe these merchants with bad accounts should be made known to the students. If everyone would pressure these people to pay, the paper would not have such a large accounts receivable total.

In summary, I think it is time that we all look at ourselves, as well as at each other, and learn to work together instead of fighting. That's terrible. I should know. I've lost the friendship of fellow students in Student Government and on the TAR HEEL staff; I've lost the respect of a lady I love in the Student Activities Fund Office; I have a fraternity brother who is Business Manager of the paper; I have a fraternity brother who is a member of Student Legislature; my fiancée is a member of the Publications Board; I am the ex-Business Manager of THE DAILY TAR HEEL.

I'll admit I'm guilty. Am I the only one? Let's work together for a change!

Sincerely,
Ron Johnson



John Agar

'UNC Needs Honest Criticism'

Occasionally someone asks me why, if I dislike UNC so vehemently, I don't go elsewhere. I find the question disingenuous. It's one of those fallacies so potent that people recur to it again and again, as if to draw sustenance from it for a rational faculty which no longer digests solids. You take it like a pill: pop it into your mouth, swallow it, and don't do a thing.

Once in a long while, however, someone is honestly puzzled by what seems excessive or intemperate criticism. He feels a kind of patriotism for the University, and it hurts him to hear it, as he thinks, maligning. I tell him this:

I don't hate UNC. If anything, I love it. I'm proud of UNC's tradition as the first state university and the aspiration to intellectual things that it implies. I'm proud of Chapel Hill, too-proud of its reputation for combining the virtues of a classical city, as a congregating place for men of broad and creative intelligence, with the pleasures of a small town.

The University, of course, divides my praise with Chapel Hill. Its campus is one of the most beautiful in the nation. Its faculty is one of the most competent in the world. The physical plant of the University is constantly being updated and is as modern and convenient as the inventiveness of today will allow.

As for the range of knowledge encompassed in the University community, it is broad and incredibly

varied, yet none of it shallow. The level of teaching is as high as any large University in this country can offer. And the quality of student life, I'm sure, is as high, intellectually and emotionally, as anyone has a right to expect today.

This is well and good. The only problem with this kind of talk is that it's unprofitable. It gets us nowhere. Arranging a bouquet of flattery—one of the few things the University is completely competent at doing for itself—is unconstructive and ultimately condescending. The highest tribute we can pay the University is to bring our honest concern and uncompromising criticism to bear on its problems.

The University is under attack today as never before. Assaults wash over it from every direction, and each issue discovers a realignment of forces, new alliances, new antagonisms.

In the Blevins case, it is the administration and trustees—the official university—against the faculty and students—employees and inmates.

When the non-academic workers struck, supported mainly by students and faculty, it was the "larger university community" against the university "bureaucracy"—the administration.

The double jeopardy issue pits the administration and faculty, the "schoolmasters," against the students.

When the Town of Chapel Hill started indulging in various annoyance tactics

against the University last fall, it was the civic government of the university community against a quasi-independent State agency. But earlier in the year, when Pres. Friday and the trustees formulated the disruption policy, it was apparently a case of a State agency trying to maintain a precarious independence from the State itself.

What should be clear is that the University—whatever one thinks he means by the word—is suffering an identity crisis.

There are two ways in which the University can serve this state. It can abandon its intellectual pretensions: it can set its sights in every sport conceivable, and give only business degrees. Or it can assume the burden of becoming a modern educational institution: it can take up the task of developing an all-around curriculum to guide young people in reaching their full potential as human beings, and become the educational showplace of an unwilling and probably recalcitrant state.

Right now the administration, as the governing body of the University, is steering a middle path. The result is that they are satisfying no one. Anti-intellectualism is rampant in the state, as Orange County Commissioner Carl Smith's term, "unintelligent intellectuals" showed us this summer; while on campus there is student discontent.

A decisive commitment to one or the other of the courses outlined above would give the University a purposefulness it lacks today. Choose:

The University is owned and run by the state, with power delegated to trustees and thence to the administration. The faculty is hired by the state and has no rights beyond those ordinarily accorded employees. Students are privileged to attend the University and are obliged to conform themselves to rules established for their own good. Or:

In supporting the University the state recognizes that education must fulfill personal needs before it can benefit society at large. It recognizes that education flourishes only in an atmosphere of freedom, and therefore dedicates the University to the concept of education as "an independent society of scholars teaching and learning from one another."

Again, you may choose. I came to Carolina because it looked to me far more like a community of scholars than like the first alternative. Any criticism I have made, in this column or elsewhere, is based on this impression. I am a student, and as such I must be vitally concerned with the intellectual vigor and freedom of the University of which I am a part.

For me, and for anyone who cares about education and this University, there is no other way.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods. Offices are at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Subscription rates: \$10 per year; \$5 per semester. We regret that we can accept only prepaid subscriptions. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.