

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Harry Bryan Managing Editor
Laura White News Editor
Bobby Nowell Associate Editor
Mary Burch Arts Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Bob Wilson Business Manager
Frank Stewart Advertising Manager

Peter Hatch Night Editor this issue

Voluntary Funding Is Necessary For DTH To Be A 'Real' Newspaper, Says Free Press

(Editor's Note: This column is a "joint effort" by the Committee for a Free Press to rebut charges in the DTH editorial of Feb. 20, "Free Press Seeks to End DTH Because It Disagrees Politically.")

The Daily Tar Heel has recently heaped a great deal of verbal abuse not only in the ideals of the Committee for a Free Press, but also in its individual members. Several months ago, the victim was Tom Benton; last week, John Agar began a personalized attack on Miss Trent Oliver, dubbing her, and the entire committee—"intellectually dishonest," "simpleminded," "out of their depth when they talk about principle," "inaccessible to reason," "every thought impenetrable and impervious." The week before, he had labelled the Committee "proto-fascist." [His next column stated that he "of course" did not wish to have anyone "assume" that he "really considered Miss Oliver and her friends fascists;" but that he would not retract the epithet.] And this week, Mr. Agar has again delved into his store of invective in his efforts to refute the Committee for a Free Press.

Our Committee declines to reply in kind. We prefer to use this space to raise again the fundamental principle of human rights which our Committee has defended and which Mr. Agar and others have chosen to deny or ignore.

The issue involved is a moral one. Simply phrased: It is wrong to force people to pay for a newspaper with which they disagree or whose services they do not desire.

The arguments utilized in an attempt to justify the status quo are three-fold: (1) the "student-oriented" paper serves a "basic need" on the campus; (2) We pay taxes for many things with which we may disagree so why not the DTH; and (3) the Daily Tar Heel will fold without universal compulsory student subsidization.

None of these arguments is valid.

(1) The student government's committee finds a "basic need for a student-oriented newspaper," and John Agar objects to our analogy of the Tar Heel and the Wall Street Journal: "the Tar Heel is not the Wall St. Journal... it performs a fundamentally different function." But the fact is, the DTH does not perform a "fundamentally different function." The Tar Heel claims exactly the same privileges of a "real" newspaper (i.e., the Wall St. Journal) without being willing to accept the responsibilities of one (i.e., paying its own way). Endorsing

John Agar

Some Thoughts On Abortion Legislation

The state of Hawaii recently passed the most liberal abortion law in the nation. The new law allows nearly any Hawaiian woman to have a legal abortion. Out-of-staters must have established a residency of at least 90 days in Hawaii to qualify, which as much as says they cannot do so. Three months after pregnancy has been detected, abortion is a hazardous operation.

This is a step in the right direction; but going in the right direction, like being well-intentioned, often is not enough. The law was conceived, after all, by legislators, men whose major impetus is expediency, convenience, cost considerations; and I cannot help thinking it is a bad law.

It's hard to talk rationally about abortion because so much of the "logic" one encounters is merely a battle over terminology—which each of us takes on faith. Also, the subject has been talked into the ground without anything new and startling coming to light.

This is no attempt at settling the question once and for all: I'm not going to try what I'm sure to fail in. Besides, my own thinking about abortion is pretty much at a stand. I will try to articulate my thoughts to myself, hoping that as I do so other people may be prompted to reconsider their views.

—For the one person who's bound to write in disputing my "right" to consider the subject—oh, don't bother...

My first thoughts, some years ago, were that anyone who wanted an abortion should have means to one. This is the view of many liberal people, for two reasons. They argue that abortion is a necessity for controlling population, especially among those least able to bear the consequences of overpopulation; and they assert every woman's right to have her will over her own body.

I think the need argument is a weak one. Granting that abortion is a useful

political candidates and demanding complete editorial freedom are privileges of a "real" newspaper. Distorting the news, and the lackadaisical attitude toward the Campus Calendar and toward covering all campus events are inconsistent with the paper's role as a "student need."

If the Tar Heel claims our compulsory fees because it is a campus service, fine—let it regress to just that: a bulletin board for campus news. There is no moral injustice in that. But if it wishes the privileges of a "real" newspaper, then let its readership be allowed to support it voluntarily.

(2) The argument analogizing Student Fees to taxes is specious in the context of Tar Heel support. The "distinction" is that the Tar Heel can be purchased on a per-user basis to allow for the maximization of the freedom of the individual—the goal, one hopes, of every good government.

Another complaint often voiced by our opponents is that we have chosen to suggest Student fees be denied the DTH

rather than the Yack. Our primary concern, as voiced innumerable times, is that an agent of political opinion—left, right, or centrist—has no right to extract fees from all students! The Yack does not express political opinions.

(3) Finally, the Committee for a Free Press does not seek to "End DTH." This has been a "scare" tactic used by the Tar Heel from their first editorial yelp ("they" seek to abolish the Daily Tar Heel because they don't like it.") to Mr. Nowell's last whine ["Life Without the DTH: A Look Into the Future"]. If the Daily Tar Heel is so vital, so useful, so collectively desirable to the campus, then there is no basis for assuming that the paper would fail if financed on a voluntary basis. Most good college papers do not rely on compulsory support. One example is the Cornell Daily News—which has won more awards than the Tar Heel. Moreover, two-thirds of the newspaper's income at present is from advertising.

A campus press financed by the free choice of its readership will have to broaden its coverage, improve its format and provide more objective and more

representative opinions than ones which can offend its clientele daily, with impunity, because of a captive market obtained through a monopolistic subsidy. Utility, as well as individual freedom, favors a voluntary campus press.

The editor and columnists of the DTH have consistently advocated greater freedom for students in the past: why not now? If students are competent to judge each other in a student courts, if women students are justified in determining their living quarters and closing hours; if it is an injustice for sophomores to be required to live on campus in order to subsidize the University's dormitories; if the potential of the individual for self-determination, for free choice is so valuable, as most students would agree; then how can a coercively financed newspaper be justified!?

Obviously, it cannot. This is the reason that the proponents of Compulsory funding have had to resort to personal attacks on the advocates of freedom to attempt to maintain their privileges. It was ever thus.

Liberate yourself and others. Vote "yes" in the Referendum.



American Masks Failing In Laos, Vietnam, Paris

It has been almost two years since President Johnson announced the bombing halt of North Vietnam. He did so as an offer to the Communists to begin negotiations in Paris. Since that time, the American position in Laos and Vietnam, and in Paris has raised serious questions as to our real position, as opposed to our "official" position, in Southeast Asia.

The American posture in Laos is dangerous. President Nixon has authorized Gen. Creighton Abrams, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, to order air strikes in eastern Laos to counter the North Vietnamese threat to American troops in Vietnam. And Defense Secretary Laird defends the American military effort in Laos as directly related to a "policy of protective reaction" against the North Vietnamese threat to U.S. troops in Vietnam.

Applied merely to North Vietnam, the policy of protective reaction means American planes can bomb North Vietnamese targets in mere anticipation of defensive attacks on our reconnaissance planes. When applied to Laos, the policy means American planes can bomb Laotian targets to prevent attacks on American planes which were going to bomb Laotian targets in the first place. The logic involved is circular, to say the least.

In the almost two years since the bombing of the North Vietnamese effort to begin negotiations, the Paris efforts have failed pretty miserably. The Russian hint Sunday that the Communists now plan to withdraw from the Paris talks does not speak well for the Nixon position in Paris or Vietnam.

What this new Communist move suggests is that Nixon has failed badly in striving to settle the Vietnam travesty. Henry Cabot Lodge quit his post as chief American negotiator in Paris saying we were failing on that sterile front. Now the Communists are going to do something concrete to protest our failure in Paris. MORE TO COME



Johnson... left small hope

policy stances on Laos and on bombing North Vietnam seem to suggest that Nixon and Laird and the other elite decision-makers have some of their own ideas about Vietnam which don't exactly conform to what the American public has been led to believe. The war in Asia has been enough of a drain so far on the American way of life. The games the Nixon administration chooses to play and the stakes which it chooses to raise with even greater risk to our way of life, is a perversion of what America wants and what it has been promised.

And the small hopes which may have persisted two years ago have little now to exist for.

And as if all that were not enough, Nixon is escalating the hostilities in Southeast Asia. The administration's policy of protective reaction, a poor disguise for the American offensive, does little to improve either our political relations with the Communists and the free world, or our actual position on the fighting front. We have lost the ability to win the war, (as if we ever possessed it) and Nixon's alleged policy of gradual withdrawal and Vietnamization of the fighting would suggest we have no intention of trying to effect a military victory.

The President's position as articulated last fall would suggest that the U.S. is making an honest effort to extricate itself from Vietnam. He spoke of working towards some kind of success in Paris. But the Americans have not offered the Communists a peace proposal since last July. The Communists made their last proposal in May, but the failure of the Communists in no way exonerates the impotency of the Americans.

Nixon also claimed that along with the gradual American troop withdrawals and Vietnamization of the war, the U.S. hopefully would be able to withdraw itself militarily from the battlefield. But the latest



Nixon... increasing stakes

Eye Of The Beholder

A Greensboro district judge ruled Friday that the Swedish movie "I Am Curious (Yellow)" does not violate North Carolina's anti-obscenity laws.

Judge Kenneth Carrington, in dismissing charges against the manager of the Janus Theatre, which dared to show the film, said: "Obscenity is in the mind of the beholder."

Greensboro policemen arrested Janus' Halsey Melone two weeks ago when "I Am Curious" opened its engagement. The Chief District Prosecutor, Ross Strange, charged that the film is part of a

Communist plot to corrupt the nation's morals.

It is a common charge by American superpatriots that one of the stepping-stones to a Communist takeover is the weakening of a nation's morals by getting the people "interested in sex," and other obscene things.

It is a logic which has been used extensively by certain disseminators of news in this area, who feel that "obscenity" and Communism go hand-in-hand.

We are grateful that once again this lugubrious notion has been legally rejected.

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: Carolina Union, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.

instrument for regulating population, contraception is more useful and safer.

I don't mean that unwilling motherhood should be punishment for ignorance or carelessness. But if we're going to campaign for birth control, emphasis should be on contraception, for the reasons above.

For a woman and for society, abortion of an undesired pregnancy is cheaper and more convenient than fosterchild care. But that doesn't make it right; and it's poor policy to seize permanently on the wrong alternative merely because a better is not immediately practicable.

I hope that someday orphanages and the rest of the current foster care setup give place to something on the order of kibbutzim. I'd like to see kibbutzim for all kids. But if we strike out for free abortions, we'll have pulled the rug from beneath the need argument—at least as far as politicians understand such things—for reformation of foster care facilities.

Letter to the Editor

'Phony Anti-Pot Talk Hikes Heroin Usage'

To the Editor:

Marijuana scare theorists are fond of citing the statistic that 80% of heroin addicts used marijuana prior to getting into heroin. Of course, 100% of heroin addicts probably tested spinach before starting on heroin, so maybe spinach leads to hard stuff. What is a meaningful statistic is not the percentage of heroin users who have previously used marijuana, but the percentage of marijuana users who go on to use heroin.

Recent research indicates that only a small minority of students who have tried marijuana go on to heroin or even to LSD. On the other hand, the research also indicates that the more marijuana one has used, the greater is the likelihood that one has also sampled stronger drugs including heroin. So there is a connection between heroin and marijuana although it has been greatly exaggerated and misinterpreted.

Why does marijuana smoking sometimes lead to heroin consumption? I think the connection between heroin and marijuana is in part of consequence of the wildly exaggerated, lurid and hysterical anti-pot propaganda that kids have been subjected to by parents, teachers, police, etc.

For years kids have been told that marijuana is a "Killer Drug", but when they try marijuana, lo and behold, they don't get addicted, they don't get violent,

There'll still be unwanted children, only fewer; or, if not fewer, their existence will be inexplicable, because we'll have a "solution" for this "problem." We'll have cured half the disease and made the other half incurable.

On the second question: Yes, women should have the right to "control" their own body. I equivocate on the word because no one really controls his body. I've spoken to women who claimed that pregnancy was degrading for them, demanded that they should have had a right to abortion. But wouldn't abortion have been just as degrading? and menstruation? and lactation? The problem is that such a person isn't at home in her skin. It's no one's fault, it just is.

Still, an individual should have the right to use and abuse and rule himself as far as modern science allows. The question, of course, is, Is a fetus a human being? Does a pregnant woman have the right to decide to abort that

something-else inside her?

I've had medical students blithely assure me that a fetus is not a person. But that kind of assertion seems rather facile. People plant saplings and say they're planting trees, and with an infallible logic—

I won't push the point, and surely I won't push the analogy. I'm more than willing to be argued out of this opinion, but as time goes I find myself less inclined to be.

I would add this. I favor abortion where the mental or physical health of the mother is endangered by the pregnancy, or where the birth is likely to be of a retarded or deformed child.

I'm aware that by my own logic I ought to favor the liquidation of people whose mental or physical feebleness renders them incapable of functioning as what we call "human beings." I don't, and can't think I ever will. Which is perhaps a good place to end: On a contradiction.

Tom Robbins
Sociology Department
UNC

Readers Forum

Letters to the editor must be typed and double-spaced, not exceeding 300 words. The letter writer must indicate his willingness for his opinion to be expressed in print. All printed letters must carry the name and address of the writer(s). Letters should be addressed to the Associate Editor, care of The Daily Tar Heel, Student Union.