

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 21, 1971

Dishonesty hurts student fees talks

In an interview with the Daily Tar Heel Monday, Claiborne Jones, assistant to Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson, discussed the legal basis and history of student fees.

Such areas as student fees, the decision by the administration to place all student fees in a University-run trust fund and the Student Constitution were discussed.

And after comparing statements made by Jones Monday with known facts concerning the recent student fee hassle, it is obvious that either he doesn't really know what is going on, or that he and other administrators at this University have not been telling students the truth.

Jones said that some trustees feel that Student Government and Student Legislature should not have the power to omit certain organizations from their annual budget. He mentioned the Carolina Union as a possible example.

Possibly, Jones is ignorant of the fact that the trustees already require that the Carolina Union get an automatic one-third of student activity fees and that only the trustees can change that.

In discussing the move to place student fees in the trust fund, Jones pointed out two problems that he said needed solving when the decision was made.

"First, the State Auditor (Henry Bridges) could not legally audit the Student Activities Funds," he said, "and, secondly, since we could not have the funds audited, we could

not assure anyone that we had done what we had said we had done with the funds."

In the first place, according to the policy commonly used by the University, student fees are considered state funds since the state collects them. And the state auditor has the power to audit all state funds.

Therefore, according to Jones' statement, the Student Activities Fund is not state money, and the University is not obligated to have it audited by the state.

Secondly, Jones said the administration could not have the funds audited. But it is a widely known fact that Student Government asked for bids from accounting firms last fall in order to have an audit made of the Student Activity Fund office.

Jones also said that the final decisions to take control of student fees was made after William C. Friday, president of the Consolidated University, talked with Bridges, the state auditor, who advised him that a trust fund would be the most effective way of keeping track of the money.

This varies only slightly from statements made by Friday, Sitterson, Vice-Chancellor Joseph C. Eagles and practically everyone else in South Building, who said Bridges had ordered the University to take over accounting and disbursement of fees.

Yet according to Tom Gooding, former editor of The Daily Tar Heel, and Guil Waddell, treasurer of the student body, Bridges told them in Raleigh that he had neither initiated nor ordered the administrative takeover of the fees.

From Jones' statement alone it can easily be shown that students can no longer trust the administrators at this University, particularly in regard to the student fees issue.

Since the hassle over fees began at the beginning of this semester, administrators have been saying one thing, then doing another, and then denying that they said anything in the first place.

The credibility gap between the administration and the student body has become so wide that at present any dialogue between the two accomplishes nothing.

Before the funding issue can finally be settled, the UNC administration must stop playing games with the students and sit down with them in honest discussion.

Rod Waldorf

Hunnicut - pie in your face

There comes a time in every man's life when he meets an incredible person. If a man is lucky, he will meet one incredible person during the space of his lifetime. However, some of us are destined to meet as many as two.

The following is fact or fiction—you decide.

Hunnicut and a friend were in a special training program which was cancelled. Too bad. At least they thought so. To celebrate, they each bought a chocolate cream pie and, firmly gripping each other's left wrist, they took a pie in the face, Three Stooges style.

Okay. Years later, Hunnicut was telling a young lady about the experience while they were seated in a small restaurant eating ice cream from a paper cup.

The young lady was amused—actually in disbelief—at her friend's tale. She suggested they exchange blows with each other using the ice cream at hand as a weapon.

And, promptly, each had a face full. Now, all this is good fun, to be sure.

But the restaurant owner was not the least bit amused. And he had other problems, too. Drank habitually, was extremely nervous all the time and was in the throes of a divorce. So, consequently, he wasn't to steady in a crisis.

And in his opinion, a crisis this was.

"Hey, you can't do things like that in here," he cried out, rushing to their table about halfway down in the restaurant. "This is not one of those college places. This is a respectable restaurant."

So, Hunnicut and his friend proceeded to clean up their mess, using all the napkins at their table in the process. His friend then put all the sloppy tissue in her knitting bag—which she just happened to have along—and the two got up and walked toward the front of the restaurant, leaving nary a trace of the episode behind.

While paying the check, Hunnicut leaned over the counter and whispered to the wary gen, "You ought to simmer down a little."

Now this Hunnicut is not one to let a

good thing lie. And here he was an invaluable opportunity to observe one of life's truly classic characters in the flesh. So, donning appropriate attire for a respectable restaurant, Hunnicut returned to the establishment the next afternoon for coffee.

His shirt was pressed, his tie straight, his hair combed and his suit—for the first time in five years—had been carefully brushed to insure the absence of embarrassing "dust." He sat quietly, about halfway down the long lunch counter which ran along one side of the restaurant, sipping his coffee, blending nicely with the array of businessmen and shoppers who made up the restaurant's usual clientele.

The old guy tottered back and forth, up and down the counter, waiting on his customers. He kept an eye on Hunnicut, a kind of "haven't I seen you somewhere before" look in his eyes. Finally he stopped in front of Hunnicut's stool.

"Aren't you the guy who rubbed ice cream in that girl's face last night?" he asked, almost condescending.

Hunnicut looked up, and deadpanned, "What time?"

And before the old guy's seams had time to unglue, good old Hunnicut calmly poured the rest of his coffee over his head, allowing it to dribble gently over his ears and down the sides of his face.

"Ruined my shirt and messed up my suit," Hunnicut said later in telling his story, "but it was worth it."

Hunnicut is a really... well, what can you say. I've only known one other person to even come close, on style, in life, in creative power, in the ability to shape and mold those with whom they come in contact.

That's a powerful gift, and a gift it truly is. It is an ability all of us wish we had, and only a few of us are permitted to practice. And rightly so, for it can be so easily abused.

Both these people continue to be powerful influences to all they touch.

And both are old enough to be my father. Incredible.

THE JUBILEE SCENE:

HOLD IT, SON. YOU CAN'T TAKE METAL CONTAINERS



BUT THE RULES SAY I CAN HAVE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS!

BEER CANS? MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS?



SURE! DIDN'T YOU SEE WOODSTOCK? C'MON, SING YAAAAA, NANA, HA NA!



Letters to the editor

Censuring student apathy wrong

Dear Mr. Bryan: Gary Martin's letter censures UNC students for their failure to support the Peace Celebration on campus this past week. He alleges that the "masses of students" who have been exposed to this form of anti-war protest are "not just apathetic but downright proud of their apathy."

Mr. Martin is wrong in his analysis of UNC students, as he is wrong in claiming

the "Silent Majority" and the "screaming... Stone-Age boys" to be as they are because "They are born that way."

Failure to attend rallies of the type attempted in McCorkle Place indicates disapproval of protest methods that, all too frequently, have displayed disregard for students' reasoning. The grievous errors of the United States' Indochina policies may be readily criticized without

recourse to rallying under the waving, large foreign flag displayed in McCorkle Place. The questionable constitutionality of our military involvement and the immorality of calculated, wholesale slaughter of human life will not be rectified through an exhibition of hatred toward one's family in the song sung in McCorkle Place. An effort to secure signatures on a "treaty" can be undertaken without the deliberate

loudspeaker disruption of the rights of others to attend to their personal and corporate activities in Alumni, Howell, New East Annex, New East, Old East, South, and Old West buildings. Misinformation that our government has so frequently given us concerning Indochina involvement does not need to be, indeed cannot be, refuted by arguments which are themselves factually unsustainable, as is, for example, Mr. Martin's claim ad hominem that Helen Gahagan Douglas's Congressional seat was taken by Mr. Nixon. A street-dance celebration may be held in the evening without blowing horns and yelling from without at students studying within the main libraries, as was done.

Rightfully, UNC students display not apathy but purposeful disregard for those protest methods which they have found from experience to be deliberately contemptuous of their intellect and integrity.

Dennis Beskow

Bob Arrington

Budget needs SL veterans

It has recently been suggested, by Student Body President Joe Stallings among others, that the newly elected legislature, rather than the old one, prepare the annual budget.

The rationale behind this proposal is that the old legislature will always be relatively insensitive to the issues and programs debated during the last campus election campaign. New legislators, on the other hand, will be more aware of these issues because they will have just completed successful campaigns during the thick of the debate.

Ideally, Stallings is right. No question about it. That's how things SHOULD work. The trouble is, that's not how things DO work.

Despite the obvious difficulties in running the show in that fashion, the veterans of many sessions from the old legislature should be the ones to handle the next year's budget. The parceling out of a quarter-million dollars is just too

important a job to leave to inexperienced legislators.

I make this judgment on the basis of two premises: 1) The old legislators know, both procedurally and substantively, what's going on. 2) The new legislators often don't.

"Let's face it," says one legislator who was re-elected in March, "New legislators don't really know how SL works for several weeks after they've been in. For the most part, they'd just be lost during the budget session."

And, I reason, if the new people were indeed lost, someone would take it upon himself to show them the way. Lobbyists—any lobbyists—would have a field day with these new and relatively naive legislators.

New legislators would also be susceptible to the influence of holdovers from the old legislature:

"Lood kid, we put this group in for fifteen hundred last year and nobody

raised any sand—why note vote for it this year? I know; it's a good program—I'll count on your vote, huh?"

See what I mean? The list doesn't end with senior legislators. The student body president, too, might exercise an undue amount of influence over the rookies. So—God forbid!—might class officers.

Faces with all these unaccustomed pressures from all sides, new legislators might all too often cast votes they might later regret.

Presumably, a few months in SL would give them the experience they need. But by then it would be fall—too late, many feel, to pass the budget.

No, as long as the budget session is to be held in the spring, as long as there is a significant yearly turnover of legislators (and there always will be), we will have to stick with letting the old legislature handle the budget.

It's not ideal, but it's the best system we have available.

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.

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 Cheek Night Editor

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

Tony Lentz

Television accentuates youth loneliness

third in a series

I am my world. —Ludwig Wittgenstein

The accent on the individual in the "counter-culture" and the destruction of the world's mechanistic Newtonian absolutes has not been entirely constructive. For beneath all the trappings of liberated individualism, beneath the bandanas and flowers and bells, beyond the smiles and the "Wa-hah!" on a sunny day, down at the bedrock of existence there is a dark shadow.

A part of the current race against loneliness is grounded in a recognition that every man is alone... alone in a

meaning that can never be changed by smiles, sex or even love.

Each member of the human race is insulated from his fellows by his physical body, the sum of experience recorded in his memory, and the faulty means of communication open between us.

Many members of the youth culture would object strongly to this idea, claiming this generation is the most open, the most free and therefore the least lonely of any before it.

The proof, they might say, is to be found in the fact that this generation has made small, intimate groups a way of life. On college campuses, for example, young people share everything they do, from eating, sleeping and sex to homework and

research assignments. Students rarely spend more than a few minutes of the day alone, and when they are alone they are looking for someone.

I would agree, but I find part of the motivation for this continual search for companionship in the feeling that each of us is, ultimately, on his own. There is also an unwritten law which says each individual is responsible for straightening out his own head.

The accentuation of this human isolation in the minds of youth originates in many areas, most of them related to television.

This generation is the first to grow up watching Howdy Doody and Mr. Bluster fight it out every week.

It is the first generation to see the stifling insulation grow as watching television becomes a way to Nirvana when family problems arise.

And it is the first generation to have the unreal dream-world of tv impregnated into their being at the gut level, only to find it shattered by the harsh realities of a cold, lonely, polluted nation of frightened people. People racing like rats to produce the highest Gross National Product in the world... much of which is used to kill and burn the people of the world.

Is it any wonder they reject "The Establishment," the little white cottages in suburban Peoria, Ill., and happily ever after?

These are the things that lied to them,

these are the people who promised them everyone looked like Annette Funicello when they grew up and ran away with a tall, handsome Mouseketeer. Or these are the over-simplified soap operas who promise every young homemaker there is always a simple solution, that people are either bad or good and the true way to happiness is learning to hold a puzzled frown long enough for the cameras to complete a fade to the next commercial.

So television, I believe, accounts for a large part of what makes this generation "different" from its predecessors. And the difference may not be the rejection of television by young people. The difference may be there aren't enough tvs on the average campus to keep everyone quiet.

Television's part in the accentuation of loneliness among young people is certainly much more extensive than we have room to discuss here. There are the commercials, for example, which have exacerbated youthful inferiority complexes about acne, hair and virility.

And there is also, of course, the individualistic vacuum which has followed the destruction of the Newtonian absolute universe.

All of which have combined to sharpen the focus of our conception of the world, zooming in on the individual, isolating him from his fellows and implicitly challenging him to produce a justification for his existence.

Which leads us, next time, into the mind of the youth culture.