

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Thursday, March 11, 1971
Tom Gooding, Editor

Solons refuse to give due credit to students

Two years ago the N.C. General Assembly killed a bill which would have made student body presidents ex-officio members of the Consolidated University Board of Trustees.

The Legislators, when faced with the bill, immediately saw Trustee meetings disrupted by long-haired, bearded students who berated the other members of the Board with loud, obscene shouting.

The bill was introduced by Senator L.P. McLendon Jr., and, although it received wide attention throughout the state, it was rejected almost immediately.

Several senators took great delight in defeating the bill. One introduced a rider which would have required student representatives to wear coats and ties and to keep their hair trimmed to a certain length.

Reflections on student integrity were crystal-clear and without provocation. These actions were an insult to every responsible college student and student leader in the state.

Now Senator McLendon has re-introduced his proposal, almost an exact duplicate of the original measure, which he says may be considered more seriously.

In the last two years voting rights for young people have been

changed for federal elections and may be for state and local elections," he explained to newsmen last Thursday.

"The trend is in this direction and has already been put into effect at Duke and Wake Forest," he added. "I hope this bill is more timely this year than in the past."

This news is both depressing and encouraging: Depressing because state legislators have refused to open channels of communication with students until threatened by the possibility of answering for their views at the polls; encouraging since such action may be an initial step toward greater legislative voice for the University community.

In any case, Senator McLendon and his 15 co-signers are to be commended for their progressive stance and proven concern for the welfare of higher education.

It is unfortunate that their fellow legislators, based on past performances, have not given students any indication of co-operation and understanding—as exemplified in the "coat and tie" rider.

If these men are genuinely concerned with educating mature and responsible citizens, perhaps they should set better personal examples.

Abortion reform needed

A bill is before the North Carolina State Senate to amend the current abortion laws.

The amended bill would allow woman to obtain an abortion during the first 12 weeks of pregnancy. The abortion decision could be made by the individual woman and her doctor and, where indicated in the law, with concurrence of close family members.

The proposed amendment provides that abortions could be done only by state-licensed doctors in hospitals and clinics licensed by the Medical Care Commission. Doctors and hospitals would not be forced to perform abortions against their will.

It is estimated that for a routine abortion, which would be medically safe and reliable, should cost no more than \$200 compared to the present cost of approximately \$500.

During the past few weeks arguments have been made that abortion is murder, a battle between sexes, a means of population control and the ultimate form of contraception.

However this is not what the abortion controversy is all about. The question at hand is: Does the state have a legitimate right and

interest in forcing a woman to have a child she does not want?

Unless a woman is among the approximate one per cent who have the qualifications necessary to obtain an abortion the existing laws give her no alternative. The basic justice and constitutionality of the laws is in question.

There are an estimated 1,500,000 abortions each year in the United States with only 40,000 classified as legal.

Under the existing laws a situation comparable to the one of Prohibition exists. By retaining the present abortion legislation, the government is supporting the third-largest criminal operation in the country. Illegal abortions net \$350,000,000 each year for the Mafia and are superceded only by gambling and drugs as a source of income.

According to a study done recently by Cyril Means Jr. the sole purpose of the statutes was to preserve the health and life of a pregnant woman under the surgical conditions of 140 years ago. The purpose has long since vanished.

In the case of Baker v. Carr the Supreme Court cited a previous decision stated by Justice Brandeis: "A statute valid when enacted may become invalid by change in the conditions to which it is applied."

The conditions have changed. A legal clinical abortion is only one-fourth as dangerous as a normal childbirth. A criminal abortion on the other hand presents a woman with a 60% chance of infection and pelvic damage.

In another case, Griswold v. Connecticut, the courts stated that, "The fundamental right of the women to choose whether to bear children follows from the Supreme Court's and this court's repeated acknowledgment of a 'right of privacy' or 'liberty' in matters relating to marriage, family and sex."

The question is not one of morality but of an individual's right to choose whether or not she wants to bear unwanted children.

Attempts to legislate morality often create greater problems. This is the case in the restrictive abortion laws in North Carolina.

The Senate can rectify these injustices by passing the abortion reform bill.

The Daily Tar Heel

79 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.
Mike Parnell News Editor
Rick Gray Associate Ed.
Chris Cobbs Sports Editor
Frank Parrish Feature Editor
Ken Ripley National News Ed.
John Gellman Photo Editor
Terry Cheek Night Editor

Robert Wilson Business Mgr.
Janet Bernstein Adv. Mgr.

Editorial candidates speak on issues

Harry Bryan

Next year is a critical year for the Daily Tar Heel.

The newspaper is much improved over last year, and the staff, composed of both journalism and non-journalism majors, has more depth and experience than in previous years. However, more improvements are necessary.

News pages should be more objective and provide a more comprehensive coverage of the campus so that no segment of the student body is ignored.

DTH editorial pages should become a forum for debate for UNC students, and columnists should be chosen so that they provide a greater diversity in opinions for the editorial page.

One of the most important things to be done next year should be putting the Daily Tar Heel on its way to financial independence. If the DTH can become independent in the near future, then more than \$30,000 that comes from student fees to subsidize the newspaper, can be rechanneled into other student organizations.

Also, if the paper is independent, it will be free from any threat of financial censorship from the administration.

Many students have suggested a subscription plan for making the DTH independent. However, I feel that such a plan could not possibly work.

A forced subscription plan would only add to fees that are too high in the first place. And a voluntary subscription plan would limit the number of students reading the paper.

The Daily Tar Heel has been a student newspaper for the past 79 years, and because of this, it should always be free to students and not be kept from a student solely because he doesn't have the money to buy a subscription.

The way to financial independence, then, is through advertising. If the DTH can gradually pick up its advertising, it can expand to bigger issues with eight to ten pages and possibly even bigger papers in the near future.

Joe Waldo

This would not only move the newspaper closer to financial independence; it would also provide more space for news to provide a more comprehensive coverage of the campus.

However, before the Daily Tar Heel can pick up enough advertising to become financially independent, it must improve its circulation so that every student is guaranteed of getting a paper every day.

The number of papers printed each day should be increased from 13,000 to 18,000. And circulation should be improved so that more papers are delivered to each floor of high rise dorms, every fraternity and sorority, large apartment complexes and centralized points on campus.

Newspapers should also be delivered to Franklin Street to get the paper out into the community and further encourage advertisers to buy more space in the newspaper.

Another means of obtaining funds besides through advertising could be through the sale of a Sunday monthly color supplement that would be distributed all over the state.

The Daily Tar Heel should definitely explore the possibility of setting up such a supplement because if feasible, it could bring in the added revenue to make the Daily Tar Heel independent in one year.

And not only would it bring in more revenue; it would also improve the students' and the University's relations with the taxpayers in North Carolina.

As I said, next year will be a critical year for the Daily Tar Heel, and I am asking the student body for the opportunity to continue the improvements that began this year.

I feel that if I am elected, I can recruit a staff of experienced and dedicated individuals to work for the improvement of The Daily Tar Heel. And if given the chance I will give the students a more readable, more comprehensive and more objective newspaper.

Joe Waldo

When I announced as a candidate for editor of The Daily Tar Heel I stated that I was running as an independent without Publication Board Endorsement, and that I was not a journalism major. Too many of us forget that The Daily Tar Heel belongs to all of us (after all we foot the bill) and not to any particular segment of the student body.

I have charged that the "machine" made up of journalism majors now controls the DTH. A few people have misinterpreted my accusation to mean that I would like to remove the journalism majors from the paper. This would be ridiculous! They do a great job; we need them; we've got to have them, but what we need at the same time is to encourage more people from all phases of campus life to write for the DTH even if they can contribute only an article every other month.

The Tar Heel is insensitive to many of the student's needs and as examples I cite these occurrences—

Carolina has the number one college choir in the Southeast, but you probably wouldn't know it from reading the DTH for it has not received its fair share of coverage—it is the duty of The Daily Tar Heel to give all campus groups their fair share of coverage be it the Freshman Soccer Team, the marching band, or the women's athletic teams. Almost every night several hundred DTH copies sit on the table at the north door of the student union which are never used. When presently there are not enough papers printed for each student it becomes increasingly important to utilize all we have. I use this example not as an issue but to point out that the DTH is indeed insensitive to students for almost ¾ of the year has passed, and there are still many problems with the circulation that have not been worked out.

I would like to see the Tar Heel establish as one of its major goals a

campaign for the student and students' rights, I want to see The Daily Tar Heel work in as many ways as possible to serve the student. I plan to publish an itemized list each week in The Daily Tar Heel of the expenditures of not only the student legislature but any other group or individual that uses money from the student activity fee. This would be only one way in many that the DTH could work to protect the student and his dollar.

The Daily Tar Heel must work towards a self supporting role. With a full time business manager increased advertising may be the way. Also I would like to see circulation increased to a ratio of one paper to one student and if possible try to deliver this paper to each student's door.

Most important I want a paper that the students can truly identify with; one that will welcome student suggestions and criticism not only on the editorial page but in the office; a paper that will turn the support it gets from the students around and give it right back to the students.

Letter

Dog slaying brings attack

To Reed Stevens:

Several days ago I saw your letter in the paper: "The next dog that steps in my yard is going to get its head shot off." It bothered me but I decided that you were simply one of a few warped individuals whom I would just have to live with and dismiss as a blight in my world.

Now I know that I can't dismiss you; last night somebody shot my neighbor's dog. The dog is kept on a chain due to a Carboro leash law which is legal and reasonable (although I personally would rather see people use fences and houses rather than chains).

The dog dislikes his chains and managed to break away during my night. Unfortunately, the bullet did not kill the dog, it only tore all of the major veins and arteries in his leg. The dog managed to crawl home somehow, but if he does not die from loss of blood, he will either lose his leg or be crippled for life.

Mr. Stevens, do you understand the meaning of pain? Have you ever heard a semiconscious animal scream with fear and hurt? It's not like on television you know—that animal will not get up and walk off of the stage during the commercial.

What is it in American culture that says, "If you don't like it, kill it"—in politics, race, war, families and even with helpless animals who sometimes commit the ghastly sin of turning over garbage cans? I have never known a dog to be born mean or destructive Mr. Stevens. They are what their environment dictates; where you find a mean dog you will usually find a cruel or negligent owner.

I hate to have to say it, but I will trust a dog far before I will trust a human. Never has a dog turned on me when I needed a friend. Money, status, and hair length mean very little to that species.

Finally, I would like to ask you, Mr. Stevens, how you would explain to a nine year old boy that someone—a member of the human race—shot his dog? Perhaps you would like to tell him?

Lucinda T. Mims
702 Oak Ave.
Carboro



Party politics SP split gave election to Ken Day

(Editor's note: This is the third in a four-part series giving a brief history of campus politics from the mid-60s through last spring. Today's article is one of the 1968 presidential race between Jed Dietz and George Krichbaum for the Student Party nomination and between Dietz and Ken Day after the nominations.)

by Rick Gray
Associate Editor

From the beginning it was Jed Dietz against George Krichbaum for the Student Party nomination.

The University Party had been ruled out. As the question in 1971 is "Are the parties dead?" the question in 1968 was "Is the University Party dead?"

It certainly looked as if it might just be. All attention was focused on the Dietz-Krichbaum fight for the SP nomination, and speculation was that if the UP nominated anyone it would be either Charlie Mercer or Dick Levy, two old-time party politicians who had been running for every office in sight since they got on campus.

Both would eventually be on the ballot, however—Mercer for vice president on the UP slate and Levy for editor of The Daily Tar Heel for the second year in a row, for president as an independent and for National Student Association

delegate, not to mention the "Ugly Man on Campus" contest.

Dietz and Krichbaum traded attacks in Legislature all year—Dietz from the speaker's chair and Krichbaum as majority floor leader. Dave Kiel, as parliamentarian, was the referee.

Feeding the fires against Dietz behind the scenes was Student Body President Bob Travis himself. Travis was a moderate Georgian who liked to work in semi-obscurity. His style clashed sharply with the Kennedy-like image Dietz presented and worked hard to keep.

As it came down to the convention the race was the classic political toss-up. Krichbaum brought all of his supporters from the quads and the fraternities, and Dietz brought delegates from South Campus and some of the less conventional fraternity and sorority houses.

Speeches were made, and questions were asked, including one from the venerable party man Arthur Hays who wanted to know if the loser would remain faithful to the party.

Krichbaum said he would not run as an independent if he was defeated. Dietz, however, said, in effect, that ideals meant more than party, hinting at a possible independent bid if he lost the convention.

The convention took three hours,

including three counts of the vote before the chair announced the results—Dietz, 373, and Krichbaum 321.

But despite all the talk of party unity, the SP was hopelessly split, and the UP was in the perfect position to play upon that split.

They uncovered a candidate that was strong at the one point Dietz was weak—administration. Ken Day, executive secretary to Travis and chief justice of the supreme court, was picked to run against Dietz.

Two independents entered the race—Levy and Daily Tar Heel cartoonist Bruce Strauch.

For vice president, the SP picked Lacy Reeves, a junior from Raleigh with considerable experience on the SL finance committee, and the UP picked Mercer.

Both races were tight, possibly the tightest in the history of the University.

Dietz, pegged all year as the biggest vote-getter in campus political history, was the front-runner from the beginning, but he had several large problems to overcome.

First, he had lost his SP machinery. Many of the party workers who had spent countless hours on the Travis campaign were gone. They either followed the lead of Krichbaum and sat out the race or they went to the UP to work for Day.

Dietz was left with an organization

with less experience and too much confidence.

Through thy first vote, the race wasn't really close. The first vote gave Dietz a 600-vote margin, but Strauch pulled 974 independent votes and Levy had another 246. A run-off was necessary.

The Day people had been counting on the run-off. It has been their only hope of victory, and they went immediately to work.

Dietz, on the other hand, and worked hard for a first round victory, and his organization completely fell apart.

Dietz himself was tired, and his charisma was worn thin. Day on the other hand had not had to work to keep his organization together. The organization had done everything for him, and he had only to campaign.

The final vote was Day 2,481 and Dietz 2,272. Mercer had won by 44 votes on the first round, and Sally Spurlock swamped Betsy Crawford for secretary to give the UP a clean sweep of the executive branch.

The SP retained a legislative majority, but the party had been severely split.

Dietz left campus politics completely, and many of his followers went with him.

The party was left with no leadership, many debts and little chance to come back the next year, or even in two years,