

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 |

Student Politics Requires Humanism, Not Pretension

We have a president-elect of the student body who is not a member of a student party, the first such creature since the party system began on this campus. That he does not have the stigma of the party system attached to him is to his credit. The parties perennially clutter our campus and our heads with slogans, promises, and sickly-sweet smiling candidates who, when elected, usually contribute nothing but more of the same shallowness.

That we have survived the past two presidencies of Ken Day and Alan Albright is no credit to the student parties. It is merely a testimony to the fact that student body presidents tend to be utterly worthless.

It is difficult to recall what either Day or Albright did to merit such recollection. Both occupied an office which has proven to be rather impotent. It is impotent for two reasons. First, student leaders have no power because they are students. The University gives away only that power which it can afford to lose without an accompanying loss of influence. No power will be relinquished which is valuable. Second, the quality of student body presidents tends to be such that we need not expect them to do more than reek of an ambivalence characteristic of a politics that is utterly ineffective in advocating anything but the wretched status

positions are expected from him in the line of protocol. But that is all. At least that has been all we have seen in recent history. Coincidentally, the presidents we have had in recent history have been the products of the student parties, although there is, of course, no direct correlation.

Now we have an independent president who inherits this not very grand heritage. Tommy Bello leads us to optimistically, and blindly, conclude that the students still have some spunk left in them, that you don't have to promise the world to people to make them think you are the one for the office.

Maybe we give Bello too much credit, but it is just possible that he has what we need in a student president—not an amateurish-professional politician, but simply an amateur who neither has nor needs the pretensions of being a politician.

Bello gives us some hope that by just being a good old human, a student president might actually do something good for the students.

Bello won an uphill election, and he won it with a degree of impressiveness. We don't want to martyr him before he begins, but we are warmed that he won, and that he is optimistic about being president. He'll need that optimism. He will also need a sense of pessimism about the chances of getting things done. For as has been said of Bertrand Russell, "the truly heroic can arise only on the ground of the relentlessly real."

largest amount of energy can be expected from a political candidate is the energy he pours into his campaign. After he is elected, we can expect him to put in long hours in the pursuit of nothing very concrete. He may make policy statements and support various causes when such

Perversion Of Heart Fund

The good intention of the Heart Fund Drive being sponsored by Delta Kappa Epsilon fraternity has unfortunately been clouded by a number of solicitors who have gone about their business in a rather uncharitable, obnoxious manner. While trying to collect funds for a worthy cause, some of these individuals have pleaded rather pretentious cases with those who did not wish to give.

The idea of charity is to give if you want to. If you don't want to, you shouldn't have to. That's your right.

But some of these characters seem to have the idea that it's their duty to bother you until you do contribute to the cause.

Such behavior tends to give the original cause a rather bad aftertaste.

Recently, my husband Herman commented on the peculiar study habits of our only son Johnny. Johnny has taken to locking himself in his room for hours at a time and not coming out until the following morning. Johnny is 17 years old and has never taken such an interest in his studies before. My husband and I have often debated over whether to forcibly enter his room and find out what he is up to, but modern psychology dictates that we should leave him alone. I feel that we should find out what he is doing, but Herman says that it's not our place to pry into Johnny's private matters. We would appreciate your opinion on this matter as we read your column every day.

Worried

Schmuck—your kid's doing dope! Bust him!

This isn't a real situation—or is it? Are parents really this glib? For all of their honorable intentions, are parents really guilty of gross negligence in listening to the problems of their children? You can bet your lunchmoney they are.

So countless parents across the nation find out that "little Johnny" (who may be in high school or college or even junior high) is doing up a little grass. "But he's a nice boy and we did our best to bring him up right—with the church and scouts and all," they lament. "What did we do that was wrong?"

If kids came out of the uterus with a little sign on their bottoms stating: "I am a bomb. I will explode on or before my eighteenth birthday!"—There wouldn't be a single parent alive today. They would all have been blown to hell a long time ago.

What I'm talking about right now is communication between parents and

Revolution Of The Canines

The campus dogs have been restless of late. They roam the lawns in howling, muttering packs, and from them emanates an air of darkness.

We wonder at their society, which can not be so depressing as ours. They are relatively free of the sickness which humanity with all its intellect can breed. They are free to be free. But, as we note, they are restless.

From an ecological point of view, we might guess that the dogs are feeling the effect of an environment which has been, and continues to be, perverted by man.

The dogs sense that something is wrong, and they are disturbed about it.

The canine revolution is having its first stirrings. The organization is spreading.

If you look closely, you'll probably be able to tell which ones are the ringleaders. They look wierd, like most revolutionaries. They mutter cynically under their breath. They're sneaky, breeding upheaval.

Unless, of course, the dogs are merely in heat, which is very possible.

Robin Brewer
My Evergreen Is Wilting

A number of requests have come in over the DTH Hotline Phone, asking "What can we do with our old Christmas tree?"

Actually not an awful lot. If you are asking this question, you have more to worry about than a tree in your living room. The initial reaction here is, seek the advice of a specialist.

But since our motto is "Service With An Asterisk" we have attended a course at State University entitled, "All About Your Tree", and come up with the following list of ideas:

1. Go to your local supermarket parking lot. Open Community Chest bin and deposit tree. Leave quickly.
 2. Carve the trunk into toothpicks, guitar picks, bookmarks, etc.
 3. Invert tree, staple the tip to the floor, and use as a punching bag.
 4. Cedar sap prevents baldness.
 5. Practice suicide by self-inflicting pine needles.
 6. Attempt to break the 13-minute de-tinseling barrier, just missed by a University of Leningrad student last year.
 7. Use as a dress mannekin for a fat girl with short legs.
 8. Prune off the branches. Reinforce the trunk with steel. This is your jousting lance, very useful nowadays.
 9. Marry it and stop idle gossip.
 10. Show it to your landlord. Say, "Monthly checks make strange bedfellows."
 11. Do unto trees as you would have trees do unto you.
- Copyright 1970. No Soap Radio. Patent Re-pining.

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.

Steve Plaisance

Parents, Kids Need Communication 'Hotline'

Dear Ann Landers,

Recently, my husband Herman commented on the peculiar study habits of our only son Johnny. Johnny has taken to locking himself in his room for hours at a time and not coming out until the following morning. Johnny is 17 years old and has never taken such an interest in his studies before. My husband and I have often debated over whether to forcibly enter his room and find out what he is up to, but modern psychology dictates that we should leave him alone. I feel that we should find out what he is doing, but Herman says that it's not our place to pry into Johnny's private matters. We would appreciate your opinion on this matter as we read your column every day.

Worried

Schmuck—your kid's doing dope! Bust him!

This isn't a real situation—or is it? Are parents really this glib? For all of their honorable intentions, are parents really guilty of gross negligence in listening to the problems of their children? You can bet your lunchmoney they are.

So countless parents across the nation find out that "little Johnny" (who may be in high school or college or even junior high) is doing up a little grass. "But he's a nice boy and we did our best to bring him up right—with the church and scouts and all," they lament. "What did we do that was wrong?"

If kids came out of the uterus with a little sign on their bottoms stating: "I am a bomb. I will explode on or before my eighteenth birthday!"—There wouldn't be a single parent alive today. They would all have been blown to hell a long time ago.

What I'm talking about right now is communication between parents and

Letter to the Editor

'It's Time For Total Draft Repeal'

To the Editor:

"Over Half Viet Deaths Are Draftees" was the heading for a UPI dispatch (Greensboro Daily News, Feb. 13, 1970) reporting this fact about U.S. combat deaths in Vietnam from the U.S. Army's own statistics.

On March 15, 1970, the *Daily News* carried the heading "Parliament Opposes Rushing Toward All Volunteer Army" because "if selective service is dropped while American casualty rates remain high in Vietnam, they (top Pentagon officials) doubt whether sufficient numbers of men will volunteer, regardless of pay."

On March 8th the *Daily News* carried an article by James P. Sterba which gave examples of the way in which the Army persuades soldiers to re-enlist for 3 years in exchange for letting them get away from battle areas back to the relative



Letter to the Editor

'Faculty Misunderstand Purpose'

Dear Sirs:

As a student who has attended several Faculty Council meetings I feel it necessary to decry the behavior of many of the Council members. The last two meetings were particularly blatant examples of irrational, intolerant behavior by a large number of faculty. The general subject under discussion was the Taylor Committee-administration-amended report on ROTC. The majority of the faculty representatives have espoused extremely militaristic and/or naive views on the purpose of ROTC and the value of having it on our campus.

The predominant belief as expressed frequently at the meetings is that the four required courses in the yet-to-be-formed Dept. of Peace, and War, and Defense will make our ROTC officers more humane and ethical than non-university ROTC officers. This viewpoint seems to deny an understanding of the military system and the purpose it presently serves. And further, if the courses (such as the required Moral and Political Philosophy) truly were effective, and if as Dr. Taylor states there will be great emphasis placed on the implications of the Nuremberg decisions, the only logical conclusion, given the present nature of "our"

military, would be that vast numbers of university-trained ROTC officers would refuse orders. And given the political orientations of such men as Drs. G. Taylor and M. Adams, this would hardly seem to be what they had in mind.

The point of this letter, however, is not to reconstruct the extremely frustrating arguments propounded by the Taylor-Adams-Dawson trio, but to describe the behavior of many of our so-called educators. Even the facade of professional courtesy has been lacking. Those faculty members who have attempted to raise critical, legitimate questions, who have dared to refute the basis of the report, are treated in what can best be called a snide manner.

Chancellor Sitterson does not act like a man who is interested in hearing these crucial issues debated fully. He has continually cut off discussion on each point at the urgings of a small, vociferous, intolerant bunch of men—and only when challenged about this policy by Dr. Polgar did he desist, explaining in his typical air of naivete that he certainly hadn't meant to end debate, that he didn't realize anyone else had anything to say, etc. (Did he really not see all those hands in the air? Or did he merely see whose those hands were?)

It is notable that not once were Adams, Taylor, or Dawson denied the right to speak, while this happened numerous times to those faculty members sharply critical of the ROTC policy. Not only were the critics treated flipantly by those pro-ROTC men dominating the conversation, but typical *soito voce* comments of those men sitting near me were, "Something should be done about those radicals" and "Here we go again. Why don't they shut up?"

Continual remarks were made about the personal appearance of several of the people in the room, even including a remark expressing the desire to choke one of the faculty members with the chain he was wearing. And although the amendment stating "No student shall be treated with disrespect because of his clothing or appearance" passed, a large number of men actually voted against it.

Is this the caliber of "teacher" we should have making decisions or participating in a university education system? If this is the humane product of a liberal education, the Faculty Council had best re-think its assumptions about the value of a university-based ROTC.

Kathy Kraft
No Address

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.