

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

Tuesday, May 4, 1971

Mitchell's victory is defeat for U.S.

Today is May 4. It is the second day of civil disobedience in Washington, D.C., in which 7,000 Americans have already been arrested.

It is also one year to the day since four students died at the hands of the National Guard on the campus of Kent State University.

Yesterday United States Attorney General John Mitchell claimed victory. The capitol had not been shut down as the demonstrators had planned, and

7,000 protestors had been arrested. Perhaps it was a victory for Mr. Mitchell and the Washington police force.

But it certainly wasn't a victory for the United States.

Those protestors will be back today, and they will be back again Wednesday. And those against the war will return again and again to Washington until United States troops are withdrawn from Indochina.

Tens of thousands of Americans have been arrested protesting the war since U.S. intervention began in the 1950's.

A total of six students were shot dead at Kent State and Jackson State last spring.

Protests against the war have moved from peaceful demonstrations to civil disobedience, and if the United States continues in Vietnam, they will probably become even more violent.

Then, Mr. Mitchell, you will have the opportunity to reap more victories.

You will be able to put many more thousands in jail, and possibly more of the protestors you so obviously hate will be shot.

And as more and more Americans go to jail, and as more are killed, you can make more statements proclaiming more victories.

If the war continues, Mr. Mitchell, it will be a victory for you.

And a moral defeat for the United States.

Howie Carr

Hollywood-type law and order

The name of the game is Law 'n' Order, Hollywood style. On one side, stand assorted rapists, robbers, junkies and general no-accounts. And on the other side of the line stand the men pledged, dedicated and paid to keep such scum out of the suburbs. No, they're not the police, and they're not the army. What they are is Hollywood's fighting force in readiness: the private eyes.

In 1971, the fictional private eye is probably in greater demand than at any time since Nick Danger, Third Eye, wrapped up his last case for the Firesign Theater.

Next year all the networks have scheduled even more private eye shows; Newsweek magazine recently thought enough of the mystery genre to do a cover story on it; and now comes word from Hollywood that the Quintessential Detective-Secret Agent, Sean Connery, will be making still another James Bond movie.

The mythical private dick, wrote Time a dozen years ago, operates on the assumptions that "1) any citizen would be stupid to leave an important matter to the police, and 2) a little misdemeanor

can be a good thing when applied in a good cause."

The private eye's case file dates way back to 1841, when Edgar Allen Poe dispatched Auguste Dupin to solve the "Murders In the Rue Morgue," but the dick didn't really catch on in America until the 1920's.

Today the two top detective writers are Rex Stout, the creator of Nero Wolfe, whose adventures have sold 60 million copies, and Mickey Spillane (100 million copies of the Mike Hammer series in the last 20 years).

Spillane sometimes appears on late night talk shows, and a couple of months back he was booked on the Dick Cavett show along with Norman Mailer.

"Yeah, I've always been on the side of law 'n' order," rasped Spillane, talking about his huge sales.

"And I've always written about crime," moaned Mailer, "and look where it's gotten me."

The private eye image has always infuriated professional criminologists, who claim that no such animal exists. One crime expert at Southern Cal did a survey recently and found that while his

students invariably knew of many real-life criminals, every crimstopper they named was a fictional character.

The fact remains that real-life police work is a drag, and if you don't believe it, some week try watching "Adam-12," the series the USC criminologist claimed was the only realistic one on the air.

As with every other craze, someone is bound to be trying to make some money on it, and private eyeing is no exception.

"There's a thrill in bringing a crook to justice through scientific CRIME DETECTION," reads one such ad, which includes an offer to get a FREE Blue Book of Crime "packed with thrills, (which) reveals exciting 'behind the scenes' facts of actual criminal cases."

Another similar ad offers its readers "an easy home study plan, lapel pin, certificate and rewarding future."

The classic detective story style, which one critic described as similar to "writing by a gifted child with a poor education," has also received its share of knocks over the years, the most recent coming in last month's National Lampoon. The best parody of the whole genre, though, was done by Firesign Theater, a band of four

crazies from "the state of Los Angeles" whose alleged performance for President Nixon two years ago inspired their album "How Can You Be In Two Places At Once When You're Not Anywhere At All."

Well, the flip side of that album is "The Further Adventures of Nick Danger," a parody of 1940-ish detective radio shows. It's got every cliché ever written, as at one point when Nick remarks, "I felt like I was being kicked in the head by the whole chorus line at Minsky's. The biggest long-shot Louie at Hialeah wouldn't put a fin on my fate now." Or when Danger's nemesis Lieutenant Bradshaw tells Danger to "save the wisecracks for the warden," or reminds him that, "you're lucky we didn't burn you on the Enselmo pederasty case."

Despite all the putdowns, the private eye lives on, a symbol of what someone on the Saturday Review described as "the glorification of toughness, irreverence, and a sense of decency almost too confused to show itself."

Can you imagine what Mike Hammer would say about somebody who called him that?

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
Bob Chapman Natl. News Ed.
John Gellman Photo Editor
March Cheek Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.
Janet Bernstein Adv. Mgr.

Brad Stuart

Science should get a fair shake

Because of an errant type-setter, last week's science column was dismembered and pieced together apparently at random.

The basic point of that column was that the ecological crisis can be solved through science.

If that crisis is satisfactorily resolved, it will not be because of altruism or moral outrage, but because pollution and other activities involving the abuse of technology are fast becoming unprofitable. Pollution hurts the economy which hurts the polluters.

The previous column called for an interdisciplinary program of "systems analysis" at UNC to study methods to help solve our ecological and economic problems through technology. Since the writing of that column, I have learned that such a program, called "operational analysis" is presently being planned at UNC. Details will be forthcoming.

From ancient times, science has been attacked as the root of 211 manner of evil. Indeed it has been applied in very destructive ways—just as have all religions and philosophies.

But to attack science, rather than its politico-economic applications, is to attack the very foundations of knowledge. For science is merely a part,

though a very important part, of man's total system of intellectual inquiry.

Science is an art—an art which is very fruitful in giving man knowledge of himself and his world. This knowledge is potential power. It can advance or destroy him.

It is a shame that certain misguided amateur ecologists, theologians and liberal artists persist in attacking science separate from the whole ecology of learning. Because of this increasingly fashionable "disenchantment" with science, many good minds will study four years in this university without attaining any firm basis of knowledge in science. They will be persuaded that pursuit of this knowledge is not worth while.

This "disenchantment" with science is apparent outside the university as well. The post-Sputnik science boom, begun in Cold War fervor, has subsided as that fervor dies.

Yet science is progressing faster now

than ever. For the first time in history, individual atoms were photographed recently at the University of Chicago. Photographs were published in the April "Scientific American." Yet there was, if anything, barely a ripple in the popular press.

Self-programming computers have been developed and a pioneer in the new technology has predicted superhuman artificial intelligence within the decade. The story is buried in the back of a "Life" magazine. The cover story is of co-ed campus dormitories.

Men land on the moon and literati ho-hum, declare the venture a "boondoggle" and complain that it was in "poor taste."

Professor Hendricks of UNC pioneers clinical use of protoglandins, revolutionary (cheap and effective) birth control chemicals. Most UNC students have never heard of the work.

Public apathy towards science is

reflected in the government's present policy towards research. The funding of non-defense oriented research remains static, while costs increase drastically. Researchers here complain of lack of funds. Funds are channeled mainly into areas where immediate application is foreseen.

Pure science, which has brought many of the most important advances, is neglected. Technologists from folded SST, NASA and defense projects are unable to find work, while their skills could be used in other areas. Necessary research is not done; needed projects to solve our environmental, transportation, housing, communication and population problems are not begun.

The problems of our technological society can be solved, but only if apathetic and reactionary attitudes are reversed. Only through education in all broad areas of knowledge can we hope to find the wisdom to survive this century.

Consolidated University plan the best for N.C.

from The Greensboro Daily News

The long history of attempts to create an empire for state-supported higher education in North Carolina is a sad one. Even before Governor Scott created another commission to march up that hill, the hill was littered with discarded plans. There was the Board of Higher Education, created in 1957 but gradually undermined by the General Assembly. There was the Carlyle Commission "pyramid" structure, created in 1963 and, alas, nullified by the General Assembly.

We gather from press reports that the Warren Commission, which is still huddled over the question, has merely recapitulated this history, bumping from pillar to post in search of a formula. A few weeks ago it was said that the commission wanted to tear apart the consolidated university, bringing all state-supported institutions under a super board. Now it is rumored that the super-board-deconsolidation plan has gone under, only to be replaced by another.

According to Roy Parker Jr. of the Raleigh News and Observer, the Warren Commission "suddenly" last weekend rallied around a plan that would put all 16 institutions under a board of "regents," with a kind of super-administrator at the top called a "chancellor." The idea is said to come from California, although as everyone knows the higher education picture out there can hardly be called a study in harmony and brotherly love. It was, says Mr. Parker, urged on the commission by Wallace Hyde of Asheville, a trustee of Western Carolina U.

We are inclined to be skeptical, on principle, of any idea, however

appealing that commends itself "suddenly" to a study group, but the regents plan, if proposed, should be examined on its merits.

Yet we continue to wonder whether any plan of super-centralization, whether you call it a board of higher education or a board of regents, will ultimately fill North Carolina's needs. The choice we face may turn out, indeed, to be a choice of evils—a choice between a system in which each institution and each board of trustees has real policy and budgetary authority, with all the legislative rivalries that entails—and a tightly centralized system in which the trustees and administrators of each institution become mere figureheads, exercising a paper authority that means little against a powerful bureaucracy in Raleigh.

The drawbacks of the first system, which is pretty much what we have, are clear: Each institution, and its friends in the political arena, are tempted to use the legislature as a court of last resort, even though legislators have amply demonstrated the short-sightedness of their judgment.

But the alternative is if anything worse—with each institution at the mercy of faceless, unaccountable agency functionaries lacking ties to the day-to-day life and problems of a campus, yet wielding enormous and arbitrary power.

We hope North Carolina doesn't have to choose between the two; indeed it need not do so. But if the choice is that clear-cut, we would infinitely prefer the status quo, with all its unfortunate rivalries and wastes. We say so, reserving judgment on the "regent" plan's details, for one inescapable reason:

It is an illusion to believe that by establishing a super-board of any kind, call it what you will, politics will be eliminated from higher education. Clearly history refutes such a notion, as we noted to begin with. Excessive centralization, as the experience of the old Board of Higher Education as well as the Carlyle plan demonstrates, will be challenged, then weakened, then dismantled by the General Assembly. It follows—does it not?—that the more excessive the centralization, the more authoritarian the power granted a super-agency, the more rapidly it will meet that familiar fate.

Yet costly duplication and overlapping must be avoided; the question is how to avoid it. There is, of course, one kind of mild centralization with which North Carolina higher education has learned to live. That is consolidation. The Consolidated University is a going concern, and whatever rivalries exist among its various branches are for the most part contained and resolved within the family before policy or budget disputes are placed before the General Assembly.

That being so, we fail to see why the Warren Commission continues to fancy these alien, imported and high-flown theories of super-bureaucratization, and does not content itself with a more modest and workable proposal that UNC consolidation be paralleled in regional universities.

Such a plan would assure a necessary and tolerable degree of co-ordination without the kind of centralized tyranny we associate with the regents' system, which is so foreign to the history of state-run higher education in this state.



Hitler would have been proud

Letters

Reader attacks Jubilee...

To the Editor:

...and the students were taken again. Everybody got in the act to rob us students for the Jubilee weekend. This Jubilee certainly has to be the worst since 1968 (the last time it was held on Navy Field).

The best performance of the lot (Tom Rush), you couldn't even hear. The entertainers, which I listened to before judging, were simply inappropriate for that type occasion. They failed miserably to gain the audience's attention (the applause for Alex Taylor was typical of everyone's mood).

It's ashamed they wasted so much money for such poor entertainment. Next year a student referendum should allow us some choice in the matter for at least a selection of the name group.

Perhaps the acoustics of the place ruined it.

I hope the student body will join me in boycotting the first home football game to show the Athletic Department how we resented not being allowed to use Kenan. Or maybe the place or the entertainment didn't matter because it provided a cover to get high or stoned in public.

But, of course, the merchant-hucksters were there to steal our money for food

since the only law enforcement was to prevent bringing your own.

I can't believe some of the people I saw were really human beings. If they were, I can understand why they need syringes to face life. If those bearded, dirty, hippie, geeks are the college students of this country, we're in trouble. I haven't seen such a freaked out group since they cleaned out the Tempo.

But there certainly were alot of people present who didn't pay, which my student fees went to entertain. I feel taken.

Arlan P. Garvey
Carrboro

.. and the DTH editorial staff

To the editor:

I demand a formal public apology from the Editorial Staff of The Daily Tar Heel who have censored nominations for the proposed WORST MERCHANT OF THE WEEK Award. Student must exert a united effort to stop the robbery by the Franklin Street hucksters. The fight has been obscured by the traitors of the Tar Heel who have cut and refused to print letters submitted by myself and others

exposing fraud. Only with the resignation of those responsible will freedom of the press be restored to our student newspaper.

The Tar Heel, as an involuntarily financed paper can not have the option to reject views submitted by those who are forced to pay for it! Every student on this campus has as much right to have his views published as any of the lousy "contributing editors." As a student newspaper, The Daily Tar Heel, has a fundamental responsibility to the students of UNC only—not the Chapel Hill merchants conspiracy.

The Tar Heel should lead the fight to stop the "milking" of students here by refusing to accept advertisements from unscrupulous merchant-hucksters instead of not publishing students' letters exposing the conspiracy. The swindled student has no recourse but possible exposure of the huckster in the DTH so that someone else will not suffer unjustly. The DTH is failing its responsibilities sadly.

Arlan P. Garvey
Carrboro

(Editor's note: The DTH would have printed the letter or letters mentioned in the above letter had they not been libelous.)