

# 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. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Harry Bryan, Editor

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

## Administration not doing its share in student funding

Student legislature will meet tonight to begin its annual task of trying to decide what to do with its money.

This year Student Legislature will have a little less than \$259,000 out of student fees to distribute to the various organizations that serve the student body.

The job of appropriating more than a quarter of a million dollars is a formidable one and it may take the Legislature quite some time before the 1971-72 budget is complete.

And the problem is getting bigger and bigger each year as more and more organizations are being formed and are in need of funding.

Right now there is not enough money to fund all the organizations that deserve appropriations, and there is not enough to give organizations already being funded as much money as they need.

This is primarily because some groups now getting money from Student Legislature do not really provide a service to students and should be funded by the UNC administration rather than its student body.

Robert Grady, chairman of the Finance Committee of Student Legislature, pointed out in Tuesday's DTH that the Orientation Commission, which received \$7,700 last year, had been cut out of the preliminary budget.

"I believe leaving the Orientation Commission out of the budget is a step in the right direction," he said. "We think the program should be funded by the administration."

Grady was right. It is the job of the administration to help get incoming freshmen and junior transfers oriented to the Chapel Hill campus, not Student Legislature.

There are other organizations, though, that should be getting funds from the administration rather than Legislature.

Prime examples include the marching band, the choir, the debate team and the International Student Center exchange program.

Certainly, these organizations should continue to exist. The debate team is one of the best in the country. And the choir, marching band and ISC are integral parts of the campus community.

However, Student Legislature does not have the money to fund these organizations adequately.

The ISC needs more money for operating expenses. The debate team and choir could use more money for travel. And the band needs new uniforms.

And until the UNC administration decides to do its part in funding these organizations, the band, the choir, the debate team, the ISC and other organizations not getting as much money as they should will continue to suffer.

### The Daily Tar Heel

79 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

- Mike Parnell ..... Managing Ed.
- Lou Bonds ..... News Editor
- Rod Waldorf ..... Associate Ed.
- Glenn Brank ..... Associate Ed.
- Mark Whicker ..... Sports Editor
- Ken Ripley ..... Feature Editor
- John Gellman ..... Photo Editor
- Terry Check ..... Night Editor

- Bob Wilson ..... Business Mgr.
- Janet Bernstein ..... Adv. Mgr.

Jim Feathers

## Trade union should replace SG

I guess Tommy Bello, after his busy year, is now relaxing in his easy chair thinking along with The Daily Tar Heel, the Rhodes Scholarship people and others that "yes, this has been a good year for the students." After all he did promise everyone during his campaign that it would be a good year. He continually said that it was a good year during his reign in office. So did the Tar Heel. Only a few reactionaries, whom nobody paid any attention to anyway, dissented. Now it is only logical for Bello to rest on his glories...

... even if he did have to hammer "it's a good year" into the heads of the students until they believed it. A serious critique from the left (where Bello erroneously placed himself) of TB's administration and of the coming ditto in Joe Stallings is long overdue.

Both Bello and Stallings have one thing in common—their platform was and is geared to serving the students, as opposed to the Administration, or so they say. In actuality, by the very nature of Bello's administration and Stallings' campaign, neither were or are capable of serving the students, and moreover, Bello's administration has been and Stallings' will be detrimental to all students.

Such an assertion rests on the belief the University can never serve the interests of the students as long as an administration exists, as long as students do not have full voice over matters that concern them. The only other groups that should have any say in University affairs are the faculty, the non-academic

employees and possibly the people of North Carolina (though not just the bankers, etc., who make up the board of trustees and represent only a wee fraction of the people).

I think it would be unfair to both Bello and Stallings to claim that neither believed this. The administration-laden education being stuffed down the throats of students has been distasteful to them. Both favor self-determination.

Yet neither seem to see that "administration" refers not only to University bigwigs with their vested interests but also to power hungry student leaders.

The question I would put to them is if they believe in student self-determination, why are they saying they were or are planning to serve the students? Why cannot students serve themselves? Is that not the meaning of self-determination? Why did Bello usurp this right of students and centralize all student interests into the small circle of student government leaders? Was it not a case of Bello-determination instead of self-determination by students who were left out of decision making?

If Stallings worries about student apathy (less than half of all undergraduates voted in the election) and impotency of student government, perhaps it is because student government by its nature cannot work in the interests of students.

While Bello haggled with the administration all year over visitation and student funding and gained very little, the rest of the student body sat back and

Tony Lentz

## Students need new philosophy

seeker of truth  
follow no path  
all paths lead where  
truth is here

-e.e. cummings

The young people of the world have been growing and changing over the last few years. And in the process they have shocked, frightened and otherwise bewildered the rest of civilization.

The normal, orderly rules of behavior and dress just don't seem to apply any longer. There are no absolutes in mores, belief, politics.

Many of the "older generation," as we pompously call them, have been thoroughly dismayed at the seeming lack

of reason behind the growth of the youth culture of today. They are conscious only of a breaking down of principle, usually represented in their minds by changes in dress and sexual behavior. And they have difficulty locating any positive sides to the outlook of the younger generation.

Even the most recent books about the ideas of young people seem to be groping for something meaningful to say, some means of defending the youth culture by establishing conclusively that there really is something worthwhile behind it all. And they all lose focus, unfortunately, just as they start to say anything concrete.

The basic problem, perhaps, is the lack of a new philosophy, the lack of a well-ordered means to outline the ideas of young people. Or to give them a basis in the thinking of earlier philosophers.

A simple Tar Heel columnist, it is true, has very little grounds for purporting to formulate the solution to such a complex problem. That is certainly not my intention.

But for the remainder of the semester I do intend to outline for you some ideas of my own which may spark a new outlook toward "youth culture."

Most of these ideas spring from things I have been reading in my spare time... "The Making of a Counter Culture," "The Greening of America," Aristotle's Ethics, and a couple of books dealing with history of philosophy. And last, but not least, some dabbling with astronomy and Einstein's theory of relativity.

Yes, that's right. I said Einstein. There's quite a parallel between what Einstein did to physics and what young people are doing to the social structure.

The basic idea that "everything's relative" seems to be behind much of the stress on individuality, on doing your own thing. And we'll get into that idea more deeply in a later column.

The basic concept behind the new individualistic philosophy of young people, however, gives us the name for this series of columns... Human Relativity.

We'll try to examine Love, Hate, Friendship, Sex and other such topics with apologies to Bergson, Freud, Einstein and Jesus.

I hope to stimulate, confuse and anger you. And I hope that many of you will contribute your thoughts through letters to the editor. Together we may be able to germinate a little controversy, a little study and perhaps even a little communication.



Bob Arrington

## See the funny men run

See the funny men, See them run. See them run hard. Very hard. Why are they running? Very simple: They want to be governor. Or senator. Or something.

Bobby Scott and Robert Morgan are running for senator. They have been running for three years. Pretty slow, huh? They are mad now, because little Everett Jordan has lapped them three times. In his wheelchair. Bobby and Robert were hoping Everett would get tired and drop out. They are still hoping he will. Fat

chance. Robert and Bobby will keep running, though. If Robert can't catch Everett, he will run for something else. Such as governor. Bobby is governor now. He almost cried when the mean men in legislature said he couldn't be governor again. But he will keep on running, too. Unless he decides to hitch a ride—on Ed Muskie's Bandwagon. Then he will no longer be Governor Bobby; he will be Secretary Bobby. If Ed is elected. Confused? Wait until you hear the rest.

See the man in the purple-and-gold

sweatshirt? The one with ECU written on it? He is Leo Jenkins, and he is running too. But not for dear ol' ECU. Like Robert, he is running for governor. So is that other fellow, Pat Taylor. His sweatshirt doesn't have any bright letters on it—unless certain people are watching. Then it says, "UNC".

If you are tired of watching these clowns run, walk across town. Here, other men are running. Not as many people are watching over here, because this is that other league. The one with the elephant.

There are three Jimmy's in this league. The one with the corn cob pipe and the jug of moonshine is Jimmy Holshouser. He is running for governor, and he is very excited about it. Everyone else is yawning.

Another Jimmy is pushing a piano. He is Jimmy Broyhill. The piano was made in his factory. He will sell the piano. That makes sense. Everyone knows it is easier to run with money than with a piano.

But the Jimmy we all know and love is Jimmy Gardner. He is carrying a hamburger in one hand and a red, white and blue basketball in the other. This shows he is patriotic and likes to eat. Voters like people who like what they like. When Jimmy eats the hamburger, he will hold up one hand in a fist. This will show he likes black people. Clever Jimmy. He must have been taking lessons from Uncle Strom.

Not all of these men will win their races. But that doesn't bother them. They know in every race somebody has to win... and somebody has to lose. Such as the voters.

### Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters to the editor, provided they are typed on a 60-space line and limited to a maximum of 300 words. All letters must be signed and the address and phone number of the writer must be included.

The paper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste. Address letters to Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.

### Letters

## Socialists are proud of commune

To the Editor:

Rusty Davis' letter in the DTH of March 23, and your headline, "Socialism founded on hate, blood," exemplifies the very blind hatred he attributes to socialism and the Paris Commune. Allan Pinkerton, the butcher of American working-people and perverter of the American Constitution, is hardly the basis for a rational discussion of the events of 1871. There are more responsible conservative analyses of the Paris Commune. Those interested might look at Roger L. Williams anthology of views of the Commune from all points on the political spectrum, "The Commune of Paris, 1871." It seems that Davis prefers the blood-and-guts, shoot-em-in-the-back approach to counter-revolution of Pinkerton.

As for some of the points Davis raises against the Communards:

First, the Law of Hostages was passed only after the Versailles troops began shooting all Communards who were captured in battle.

Second, many of the fires in Paris were set by the artillery of the Versailles troops bombarding the city; some were set by the Communards as they retreated to provide a barrier of defense; and some were set to avenge the deaths of loved ones.

Third, the legacy of the Paris Commune in French politics is too complicated a subject for neanderthals like Davis and Pinkerton. Serious students can consult Jean T. Joughin's two volume work, "The Paris Commune in French Politics, 1871-1880."

Fourth, the "orgy of slaughter and destruction" was not carried out by the Communards, rather it was the work of the upholders of "law and order." The soldiers of the Versailles killed between 17,000 and 20,000 Communards (men, women and children), while suffering only 877 deaths. The Archbishop of Paris was killed in the confusion following the invasion of the Versailles' troops who were killing all in their path.

International socialists are proud to include the twenty-thousand martyrs of 1871 in their heritage.

Ken Daly  
New East  
6

## Good work hurt by bad reviews

To the Editor:  
Would the Tar Heel please be so kind as to state a review policy. It has become tiring to read glowing praise for mediocre books in these "courtesy reviews." Today's paper (April 6) has one of these, unsigned, on page three.

It seems that Jack Hicks has a great deal of gall to complain about someone's opinion no matter how opinionated that person may be. Likewise, your paper seems quite wishy-washy to print everybody's little self-adoration of their self-published works, or blatant advertisements in the form of unbiased opinion.

The only loser in this game is the truly good book, or pamphlet, or show. Praise has been showered on every campus publication in the past to the extent that it's hard to believe what is written in these "reviews".

T. C. Ricketts  
Box 164

## Campaign posters should be removed

To the Editor:  
What a noble gesture it might be if the various candidates for the past elections would assume the responsibility for removing their faces from the public campus places (such as the classrooms) on which they placed them. Such faces defaces!

Hal Smith  
Royal Park Apts.