

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Bobby Nowell	Associate Editor
Harry Bryan	Managing Editor
Bill Miller	News Editor
Bob Chapman	Assoc. Managing Editor
Mary Burch	Arts Editor
Art Chansky	Sports Editor
Bob Wilson	Business Manager
Frank Stewart	Advertising Manager
Peter Hatch	Night Editor This Issue

Keep The Daily Tar Heel

The referendum to determine whether or not the Daily Tar Heel will exist next year is on Tuesday. A yes vote Tuesday means there will be NO newspaper next fall.

The opponents of the Tar Heel, who are backing the referendum and hoping that students vote YES, claim they can not be forced to pay for the newspaper, especially if they disagree with its editorial policy.

There are a number of things wrong with that argument. First, the students have a choice every spring, in a democratic election, as to who the editor of the newspaper will be for the following year. The opportunity does exist, because of the elective process, to choose an editor whose philosophy, political and otherwise, appeals to the students.

Further, regardless of the particular philosophy of the editor, he is a student and he is going to be the most influential voice for the students in the face of the University. Without the Tar Heel, there would be no "watchdog" that could operate as effectively as the newspaper now does.

The Tar Heel also provides the students, as well as the faculty and administration, with news about what is happening on campus. Without it, the campus would have to operate without this extra sense. How would someone know, for instance, what the free flicks were, who was speaking in Memorial Hall, how the basketball team was doing, or even, that a group of students wanted to do away with the Tar

Heel?

That's a good point. Without the Tar Heel, how could the Committee for a Free Press have gotten so much publicity on campus?

People in this University are far enough away from each other now, even with the Tar Heel. To take away that one somewhat unifying factor, would be to bring about chaos a little more quickly than it could be expected to occur naturally.

So why, one wonders, does the Free Press group want to do away with the Tar Heel? Perhaps because it disagrees with the Tar Heel politically. It says it is opposed to the newspaper taking a radical point of view. It is not that the Tar Heel takes a *political* point of view, it is that it takes a *radical* point of view. The implication is that a conservative paper would be okay.

That argument is weak, for the simple reason that the students have some say over what kind of philosophy the paper is going to have. The editor is *elected*.

The Free Press group is not opposed to the Tar Heel as an institution. It is merely opposed to the fact that sometimes in a democracy, you can't always get what you want.

But this argument of theirs should not be permitted to hide the fact that the Tar Heel is an important organ for this campus.

Vote NO on Tuesday. Keep the Tar Heel. Having a source of campus news and a watchdog of the administration helps you a lot more than it hurts you.

A Game That Isn't Fair

Dean of Men James Cansler's position on trying students for drug violations denies the student body's stance on the matter. The double-jeopardy amendment seeks to insure that students tried in civil courts for offenses will not be tried in student courts for the same offenses.

But Cansler's statement that the University will try students if the students don't try themselves refutes that law. He implied that the whole idea of student law and student government means *nothing* if the administration does not wish to recognize it.

The students can have their court system, and their legislature, and their officers. And those officers can play their games as long as they understand the limits to which they can go.

But once the students try to take a position in the game which the administration doesn't happen to like, then the game is over.

We don't especially think students should bother to play the game any longer. All that is gained by bending to the will of the administration is that the game is perpetuated.

By "the game," we mean the situation in which the students are never going to accomplish anything but what the administration wants them to accomplish. For the most part, the students who participate in student government fulfill a function for the University. They make it easier for the administration to carry on its own business.

Because there are student counts, the Dean of Men's office doesn't have to try all violations of the Honor Code. Because there is student government, the administration doesn't have to set up a special office to handle student problems. Because there is a student-run orientation program, the administration doesn't have to take the time and money and personnel to get new students

acquainted with the University.

So student government serves the administration. But it does not necessarily serve the students. In fact, when student government seeks to serve the students by sponsoring such measures as the double-jeopardy amendment, then the administration pre-empts the student's rights to establish their own laws.

It's about time the students involved in student government started thinking about what they can really do to make an impression on the administration. Compromise does not appear to work. So it might be a good idea for some kind of protest to occur. Perhaps the members of the court system, and the members of student legislature, and the members of the executive branch might all refuse to work. Even better, they might all resign in protest.

That's a lot to ask for. It doesn't make sense to request that people resign, because if they resigned, what would they have to do? They wouldn't be able to pretend they were important and actually served a purpose for the students.

The important thing to remember is that without a student government, nothing would change. The people in student government, on the whole, do so little for the students that they all might as well resign.

And even when some good is provided by the student government, the administration declares that good deed null and void.

But on one is going to protest. Protest is the coward's way out. To really prove himself, the student government member has to break his back for years to prove he is right. Then, broken and tired, he still will not realize how powerless he really is.

Ken Ripley

Soul Food: Unchain Religion From The Pulpit

"Religious comment," two co-editor candidates said last week, "should be reserved for the pulpit."

Their statement surprised and frustrated me, not only because it was so inconsistent with their promise to "embrace a myriad of philosophies," but also because it fundamentally mistakes the purpose and message of Christianity.

One of the biggest tragedies of the Christian Church, I feel, is that Christians have taken their "religion" out of the world where it belongs and chained

it to a pulpit. It's largely because religion has been confined to the pulpit and separated from everyday experience that American Churchianity has become such a virulent sham of Christianity.

Hypocrisy, legalism, negativism, intolerance, and an all-too-blind link with Americanism have been the results of a religion that touches people only during "holiness" hour on Sunday and makes a strong distinction between "secular" and "Christian."

Religion, to me, most becomes real and vital when it is forced out of the pulpit, and into practice—where it is applied in the workings of ordinary experiences.

The modern revolt against the institutional church and the formation of small non-denominational groups has often been cited as evidence of people revolting from biblical interpretations of Christianity.

In fact, the goals of many of these groups and the expressed desire of many "non-religious" people I've talked to on campus has been the same—to follow a belief that promotes interpersonal relationships, urges a hard and meaningful expression of love, hates injustice, and works for the betterment—physically, mentally, and spiritually—of all men.

And these are goals which the Bible has been involved with all along—goals which the established, status-quo church has often abdicated precisely because it has stayed piously in the pulpit.

Reinhold Niebuhr has defined religion "as the whole of man adjusting himself to the whole of life." Churchianity is abhorrent even in the pulpit; a Christian who wants to truly adjust himself in the

light of Biblical teaching to the whole of life around him would, and does, choke when artificially confined to one nice day of the week.

What good is Sunday religiosity that doesn't apply to a businessman on Monday? Or to a student in his relationships? What good is religion if it doesn't concern itself with the lives of people and involve itself only with abstract theology and forming ecumenical councils?

And what good is religion if the only time it can be mentioned, explained, explored and presented is safely behind the wooden pulpit facing rows of freshly washed, harmonious faces?

Religion has to be stripped of its religiosity and forced back into the world. The chaos, disorder, injustice, and inherent evil in the world have forced Christians "to paint or get off the ladder."

Christ wasted no words. He spoke in synagogues, but he spoke to the people in the streets. He talked about loving God and existing in a relationship with Him, but He showed through His healing and His actions that He loved men. He was unflinchingly honest, blistering the hypocrites with an acid tongue, confounding skeptics, denouncing human

suffering and evil.

He demanded complete faith in Himself and equally complete love for each other. Of those who were not already followers, He forced and forces them into complete confrontation with Him and with themselves.

"I am the way, and the truth, and the life," He says without hesitation. "No man comes to the Father but by me."

This is a hard thing to accept, but Christ demanded nothing less than complete acceptance. And he honestly said so everywhere He went.

The early apostles were no less fervent in either their triumphant proclamation that Jesus Christ was Lord and Savior or in their insistence that Christianity be an all-consuming way of life.

"Religion that is pure and undefiled is this," James writes, "to visit orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unstained from the world."

"If a brother or sister is ill-clad, and one of you says to them, 'Go in peace, be warmed and filled,' without giving them the things needed for the body, what does it profit? So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead."

Christianity, if taken seriously,

requires a Christian to be active against evil and suffering in all phases of life. Not just in Church.

Paul and the other apostles spread the Christian Gospel everywhere they went. Paul spoke in homes, in market places, in synagogues, in prison—wherever he was. No less important is it today for a Christian to speak up, to profess his faith, and to live it.

It's because Christianity needs to be taken out of the pulpit and related back into life, that I write as honestly and openly as I can. "Soul Food" every week, I don't and can't please everybody. But I am doing the best I can to be reasonable, logical, and relevant to the lives of individuals who want to become whole people in the midst of a fractured and confused existence.

I'm only one voice among many. Other Christian columns appear in countless newspapers across the country, from weekly columns like "Soul Food" to small daily columns. Others say more, and say it better.

But as a Christian, journalist, and one man among many, I can do no less and be really true to myself.

Letters to the Editor

Another Look At Student Elections

To the Editor:

For the past two years, I have been quite apathetic toward student government. The reason for this apathy lay in the events preceding the student government elections in the spring of 1968. I, a freshman, was approached by a Party Agent and given a dollar (membership fee) to attend sufficient meetings of the other party to obtain a membership card. With this membership card, I was to attend the Convention of the other party and vote for the weaker candidate of the other party—this was to insure an easy victory for the original Party Agent's candidate in the general election. This sounded really exciting to a naive freshman who saw the proposition as a chance to enter the activities of the "big time" on campus.

The night of the convention of the other party, the original Party Agent

came to me with a slip of paper. On the paper was a question that I was to ask the stronger candidate of the other party, and so that ultimately the original Party Agent's candidate would win the general election.

When the convention began, I began to see through all the foul-play that I had become involved in. As the weaker candidate gave his speech, I realized just how weak he was. Then, the stronger candidate took the stand and gave a terrific speech. I was really impressed. Then this stronger candidate asked for questions from the floor. He masterfully fielded first one question and then another. I was so won-over by his composure and knowledge that I tore up the slip of paper that contained the sticky question of the original Party Agent. I then proceeded to vote for the stronger candidate.

From that moment until just a couple of weeks ago, I was completely apathetic to the corrupt party politics of UNC student government. Yet I have always realized a need for an effective student government. Therefore I support the election of a capable independent candidate for the Presidency of the Student Body. The victory of such a candidate would force the parties to revamp their corrupt, stagnant systems. This president would not have to "pay tribute" to party agents like the one that tried to manipulate me.

I hope there are many more students who, having been apathetic toward student government for the past couple years, will see in a capable independent candidate a chance for student government to re-open its eyes to the immediate problems of this campus. If elected, this candidate would not allow student government to remain tuned in to the superficial wants of one party hack or another.

Dave Tayloe
321 West Cameron Ave.

'College Scribes To Pick MVP?'

Dear Mr. Cohen,

Since the ACC is supposed to be an association of universities, wouldn't selection of the ACC basketball Player of

the Year make more sense if chosen by persons closest to the universities? Let the campus newspaper sports editors make the choice. My judgment is that Art Chansky is a better writer and more perceptive observer than one expects to find in sportswriting. Perhaps other collegiate sports editors in the ACC share his professional competence; if so, I'd like to know their Player of the Year choice.

Michael E. Bishop
Assistant Professor
Of Journalism

Hits Candidates Stand On Religion

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter in response to comments made by Dennis Benfield, candidate for editor of the DTH, in the March 11th issue of the same paper. In his comments Benfield stated that his editorial page would contain a "myriad of philosophies" and in the very next sentence he stated "We feel religious comment, or in the case of the DTH sacrilegious comment, should be reserved for the pulpit."

This to me represents a direct contradiction. How can Benfield say that he will have all philosophies represented in his newspaper and then in the very next sentence say that he would not allow religious philosophy to appear? It seems very clear that this is no more than a candidate allowing his personal bias to dictate how he will run a newspaper.

If this is their idea of "responsible" journalism, Benfield and Benfield will be poor editors and make for a poor paper.

Richard Stoner
2408 Granville South

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.



New York—A Nice Place To Visit But . . .

Ben Singletary

Racism, Charlie? Well, There's Next Year . . .

I doubt that John Roche's selection as ACC basketball Player of the Year really took anyone by surprise. I mean, it didn't really come as a total shock.

Of course, everyone here at Carolina wanted to see Charlie Scott get the award, since many people felt he had been slighted last season and his performance this year even exceeded that of 1969. But then, this is a southern conference and the feeling was always sorta there that if the writers could pick anyone else without their motives being obvious, that's exactly what they'd do.

And they did.

So now there will always be the skeptical who say Scott was robbed, just as there will be those who contend that Roche was twice the player. There will be those who cry "racism" and those who reply just as loudly that Scott's being a Negro had nothing to do with it. And no one will ever really know the truth.

Except the writers who voted; those men from Babbling Brook Township and Three Crooked Pines and Boroughville or wherever they happen to live and write the local sports column. They'll always know who it was they voted for and, more importantly, why.

But that's really not so important now, is it? Because all the votes were counted last week and Roche had the most and nothing's going to change that now. I was thinking more in terms of the future. Suppose we all take a little trip into the great beyond and look in on the Player of the Year Announcement, 1975

(Commissioner's Office) "I know you reporters are wondering why I've asked you here for this press conference today. Well, it's that time of year again when I have the pleasure of announcing the ACC Player of the Year. This year the sportswriters have selected Carl Zbrakowski from the University of Virginia as the Player of the Year. Now

I'll be glad to spell that last name for you after the meeting, since you may not be familiar with Carl. You see, he sat out most of this season with an upset stomach. But while he was on the court, Carl was one of the greatest, scoring 6.2 points per game and pulling an average .042 rebounds.

"What's that question again, sir? Oh, you want to know exactly how many games Carl was in. Well, he suited up for two games—one against the Hot Springs Lawnmower Correspondence School and one with the Christian Athletes Out of Action. But he did real well in the scrimmages, I'm told.

"Now as everyone here remembers, there was quite a stir back in the spring of '70 when we railroaded Charlie Scott out of—er—er—I mean when Mr. Scott lost the award to that kid from South Carolina. I forget his name . . . Roche, Johnny Roche, it was. Now I know that are going to be those bad sports who will say that racism was involved in this year's selection. Well, that's just not so.

"I mean, North Carolina does have a '75' boy . . . er, Negro player who did a fairly good job for them this year. Think he averaged 41 points a game and 25 rebounds. Not bad, considering. But the point is that these writers did their best in fairly judging the boys and they chose the

best man. And, just to show everybody that these writers were without bias and are capable experts, we've asked them to indicate on their ballots this year why they voted as they did.

"Now I'm going to select a few of these ballots at random and read the comments to you so everybody will be satisfied that this voting was fair and square. Here's one from a sportswriter in Red Beaver Falls. He writes that he voted for Carl because 'he's a fine young boy and my son's roommate at UVa.' See? No racism.

"Here's one from a man who's been writing sports in this area for 30 years. He says 'I voted for Carl because I've been writing sports in this area for 30 years and I got your letter saying if I voted for him you'd put in a good word for me to get a job in another area' . . . er . . . let's get on to the next one. Here we go!

"This gentleman says 'I voted for Carl because his grandmother lives down the street from me and she showed me his baby pictures. Although I've never seen him play, she says he's a good sport and sits patiently on the bench and never gets mad when the coach doesn't play him.' Now I ask you, has one of these men ever mentioned race? Can you still doubt their talent, their motives, their sincerity?"

Hope Charlie knocks 'em dead at the Garden.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication 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.