

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

Saturday, November 6, 1971

The Daily Tar Heel awards of the week

The Devil Made Me Do That Award: to Channel 5 editorialist Jesse Helms, who commented last week on the new Church of Satan in California: "They'll probably be sending missionaries to N.C. State and Chapel Hill." Then he added darkly, "But that would be like hauling salt water to the ocean."

The They Aren't Dick Tracy But They'll Do Award: to Nixon, for appointing two legal scholars to the Supreme Court. Powell, we hear, is the nation's foremost authority on loose leash laws, while Rehnquist has consistently supported Nixon's preventive stop-and-search, no knock and beat to-a-pulp crimstopper notebook tips.

The It's Your Fault Not Mind Award: to the federal court which gave the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department permission to go ahead with their test explosion of a 5-megaton nuclear device even though scientists suspect the Great Aleutian fault lies near the test site and earthquakes might be triggered.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.

Doug Hall News Editor

Lou Bonds Associate Ed.

Lana Starnes Associate Ed.

Mark Whicker Sports Ed.

Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Paddy Hughes Adv. Mgr.

Ken Ripley

Soul Food: prayer amendment bad

Prayer is a good thing for a Christian. I fear, however, that the proposed Constitutional amendment to allow "non-denominational" prayer in public buildings, particularly schools, is not so good.

The school prayer controversy is coming to a head Monday when the U.S. House of Representatives votes on the "prayer amendment."

Supporters of this amendment rally around the cry, "Let's restore God to the classrooms." They are chafing under the 1962 and 1963 Supreme Court decisions outlawing organized and required prayer in public buildings.

The proposed amendment is short, amazingly so for our usually verbose legislators, and reads:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the rights of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in non-denominational prayer."

Should the "prayer amendment" gain the two-thirds majority vote it needs to pass, it will go to the Senate, where opponents say they aren't sure it can be stopped. From Congress, as we all learn in political science, it goes to the states for ratification.

Monday is therefore crucial to both sides. If the amendment is to be killed, it must be done in the House.

And, I feel, it should be killed. Not only does the amendment resurrect a whole host of questions that still need to

be answered about the relationship between church and state, the bill itself is vague and raises serious questions of its own.

The Today's Army Wants to Join You (and BYOL) Award: to the General Accounting Office survey, which estimated that 130,000 members (five per cent) of the armed services are alcoholics.

The If We Eliminate Panties, There Won't Be Anymore Panty Raids Award: to House members, who rejected a proposed requirement that colleges receiving federal aid admit women on the same basis as men.

The Raymond Burr Scattered Scruples Award: to Supreme Court nominee William H. Rehnquist, who in his attempts to dodge questions before the Senate Judiciary Committee, said he could not forsake "what I feel is my duty to my client" whom he named as Nixon and Attorney General John Mitchell. Maybe he can persuade Agnew to plead the Fifth Amendment more.

The Gangrenous Gobbler In Every Pot Award: to U.S. Department of Agriculture officials, who suggested that Swift & Co. try cooking poisonous PCB chemical deposits out of 50,000 contaminated turkeys rather than suffer an estimated \$300,000 loss by destroying them.

The Suppose They Gave An Anti-War Program And Nobody Came Award: to the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, who sponsored an anti-war program Wednesday night that attracted only 15 people.

The Beast To Soothe The Savage Music Award: to Publications Board Chairman Charles Gilliam, who asked for the resignation of WCAR's station manager Bob Foreman, after receiving complaints of Foreman's incompetency from WCAR business manager Murray Poole, who incidentally was appointed station manager. This is Radio Free Chapel Hill signing off.

Letters to the editor

Campus police are not all bad

To the editor:

From time to time we hear different notions concerning the "Campus Cops." Some stories are complimentary - others are to the contrary. The following I experienced on Tuesday, November 4.

On Wednesday afternoon, I was told by a doctor at the infirmary that I had an acute case of pneumonia. By my own choice I decided not to stay in the hospital that night. The next morning after very little sleep I had almost fainted once and had dizzy spells. I asked if a car from the campus police could pick me up and take me to the infirmary. Officer Edmonds picked me up and took me to the infirmary and Arthur Beaumont picked me up when I was finished. Although this was just routine duty both men were very pleasant and went out of their way to help.

Although most of the dizziness had subsided I was still leary of driving my car. I decided to pick up a prescription at the hospital that the doctor had given me. I parked in the back near the mail room and infirmary and was gone about five minutes. When I returned there were two officers there, one had just finished writing a ticket. I explained to him that I had pneumonia and the condition that I had been in that morning. His reply was, "You better be glad you came back when you did 'cause I was going to have it towed."

I left rather angry believing that at least a slight injustice had been done. The next closest parking place was two blocks away.

These two instances have given me mixed opinions concerning the campus police. There are many good officers on the staff of the campus police, I'm sorry that one or two soil its reputation.

Hadley Whittemore

Data wanted on campus food

To the editor:

I would be very interested in receiving the following information from anyone who feels that he has become ill as the result of eating sandwiches supplied by

the Student Stores Servomation Service to the various snack bars and other food facilities on the campus - particularly on Wednesday, November 3.

- 1) Type of sandwich eaten.
- 2) Date and time sandwich was purchased.
- 3) Campus food facility from which sandwich was purchased.
- 4) Date and time illness began.
- 5) Symptoms (Please be specific: Did you have diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, fever, other symptoms?)

A postcard reply will be sufficient.

Cynthia Snow
236 McCauley Street
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Alumnus lauds Dooley program

To the editor:

I have never written a letter to an Editor before but the current football controversy at UNC compels me to do so. I was a member of the student body at UNC for seven years during the Hickey regimen and had the opportunity to watch several football teams that failed to play up to their potential with the exception of the 1963 Gator Bowl team. This failure could be attributed to a lack of discipline, dedication and desire on the part of some of the players.

I was, therefore, quite pleased when in 1966, Coach Dooley and his staff were hired to bring winning football to Carolina. I understand that the practices in the spring and fall of 1967 were very spirited and rough which resulted in several former squadmen voluntarily quitting but still keeping their athletic scholarships. I might add, there were very few complaints, if any, from UNC students, alumni and faculty at that time. In fact, his efforts were applauded. Since that first year and every year since, the number of dropouts have declined until now only an insignificant number quit for various reasons; but still keep their scholarships if they stay in school.

There have been many improvements since Coach Dooley's arrival to the UNC campus. For example, the grades of the players have greatly improved. In

previous years, as many as 40 percent and more of the freshman football team would flunk out before their sophomore year. On the 1969 undefeated freshman team not one freshman player flunked out. Another improvement I have noticed is that the players seem to have more pride and confidence and conduct themselves accordingly in all situations.

In closing, I support the Dooley program 100 percent. Under the most difficult situation, he and his staff have built a winning program at UNC. Although there is reported there are some problems in this program, it should be remembered that there is not any program conducted that is perfect and the players who have not quit and the coaches have exhibited a willingness to work these problems out. I for one do not put a great deal of faith and belief in the Committee of Concerned Athletes. In fact, it is their motives which should be investigated since they have made several scandalous accusations.

For example, without being present at the practice and after the coaching staff was cleared of any negligence by a responsible committee, they have cruelly used the tragic death of Bill Arnold to further their own belief and faith in the statements of support of several former four-year players such as Tony Blanchard, Mike Smith, Don McCauley and Flip Ray, which for some strange reason has not received the same newspaper coverage as has the dissent of the Concerned Athletes.

If I ever have a son, I hope he is fortunate enough to have the opportunity to play under Coach Dooley for several reasons, one of which is discipline. In the past several years there has been a breakdown of discipline in all areas of The University of North Carolina and other schools as well with the exception of the athletic community. UNC needs more men with Coach Dooley's dedication and conviction to again instill discipline and pride in all phases of UNC's programs, including academic ones. Coach Dooley and his staff deserve the respect and support of all UNC supporters - students, alumni, administration, faculty and friends who want a strong, disciplined program.

W. Sam Shaffer, II
219 W. Washington St.
Greensboro, N.C. 27401

University sinks into mediocrity

To the editor:

The Publications Board action of November 2 concerning WCAR and Bob Foreman raises several fundamental questions on student activities and the University as a whole. Mr. Foreman willfully dropped his student status because he saw WCAR as the only channel for his creative energies at UNC. His organizational and programming reforms attracted others who recognized WCAR's potential as a forward-looking organization.

I have always been under the impression that a university and its organizations were not simply vocational training schools, but a spawning ground for original ideas and outlooks. Surely the Daily Tar Heel has not become the award-winning paper it is by training students in how to write news stories or how to set type. Our student activity fees do not go just to teach someone to balance a budget, or at the worst, to teach the dirtiest aspects of the political system. If these are indeed present functions of student activities, then one can only assume that it is because these basics are not being found in the classroom.

According to the executive budget breakdown released this week, a large portion of student fees are going to office supplies, telephone calls, and postage meters. However, an attempt for a genuine contribution to the student body - a quality and innovative campus radio station - is ignored, perhaps stifled by the Publications Board and members of the executive office. WCAR was only beginning to get national attention from record companies and media organizations. The turmoil ensuing from the political game-playing is at best a substantial setback.

With sadness, I view the incident as only another example of this University's sink into mediocrity. UNC may not be an isolated case, for many feel this decade has already become the Stagnant Seventies.

Randy Crittenton
526 Morrison

Killing dogs is crime to nature

To the editor:

Last evening, as I walked to the library, I noticed the numerous amount of dogs that were lying here and there. I then remembered something I had read that made me wonder as to what kind of world we are living in today. I wondered what this campus would look like without all of these canines who seem to

come from everywhere, lumbering deeply along, minding their own business and stopping occasionally to receive a pat on the head from a passing student.

The article I read reminded me of a movie I saw not too long ago. It had something to do with over-population in the United States and the authorities aborted all babies born to a family that already had a child. It is so similar to what these so called authorities here in Chapel Hill are doing to these poor animals. Their term for extinguishing dogs is "put them to sleep," but we all know that this is just a mild way of saying that they are going to be killed.

When I think of people who are a part of this crime to nature, I wonder if it can't be stopped. What people, who are as well-educated and so suited to life, as the residents of Chapel Hill think they have the "authority" to play judge and jury in the life of a dog, who was born into this world with only one means of survival - man! He is under the mistaken impression that man is here to be his best friend and that man will take care of him. We were put here for a purpose, along with a brain, a pair of legs, arms, and hands to make the best of our lives.

We can look for and find love, but a dog, he has to sit back and wait for someone to love him, and if not, he has but one choice and that is to try it on his own. I think he has it rough from the start. He's born in a litter of maybe six or seven pups and maybe, if he's lucky, he has a good blood line or is a thoroughbred - that means money and money alone to the man.

Since it is quite obvious that a dog is not our equal, I think something else is even more obvious; let's show him that he is still man's best friend.

Jenne Taylor
Airport Road

Reader blasts DTH columnist

To the editor:

For the last month or so, there has been a weekly waste of space in the DTH in the form of columns by Keith Weatherly. His feeble attempts to present the conservative/reactionary viewpoint on campus have amounted to little more than the energetic flapping of his right wing.

In the last few weeks, Weatherly's views have been predictably simplistic. Regarding the deaths of 41 inmates and 9 guards by the New York State Police and National Guardsmen at Attica, Weatherly noted that "bleeding heart liberals" had blamed everything but the true cause of the revolt: the inmates. When the N.C. Vets for Peace advocated amnesty for draft resisters and deserters opposed to the Indochina War, Weatherly labelled (or is it labeled?) them as "opportunists." But Weatherly failed to explain how veterans, who have served in combat in Indochina (unlike Weatherly, who hasn't served at all) can be opportunistic in asking amnesty for those who refused to go.

Weatherly has also satirized housewives who watch soap operas, implying, in his own sexist way, that they're just feeble-minded females. Last week Weatherly managed to label the entire population of China as "Public Enemy Number One" (comparing the government in Peking to the Boston Strangler), denounced the U.N. membership for not kow-towing to the U.S. "Two-China" policy, and demanded to know, in the best jingoistic, "White Man's Burden" tradition, why we can't just revert to "Big Stick" diplomacy and "to hell with everybody else." Pretty heavy, Weatherly.

Weatherly epitomizes right wing emotionalism. With little logic and a few selective facts, Weatherly can always bluster forth and trump up a pseudo-sophisticated defense of the status quo or the government's latest mistakes. At times he indulges in right wing fantasies, the stuff of Bill Buckley's dreams. Ordinarily, though, Weatherly is just full of - hyperbole.

There are usually several letters highly critical of Weatherly in the DTH after each of his disasters appears. But Weatherly cavalierly dismisses to rebut criticism - he merely ignores his critics. Most notably, he never responded to the N.C. Vets for Peace offer to hold an open debate on the amnesty issue.

Perhaps there is a constructive, conservative viewpoint that could help advance political debate on campus. But Weatherly's simplistic jive certainly isn't it.

Gary Clark
Chapel Hill

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 Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.