

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, December 1, 1971

N.C. Republicans off to shaky start

When Frank Rouse, new chairman of the North Carolina Republican Party, accused the Democrats of stealing the last three gubernatorial elections in the state, it looked just for a while as if the campaigning and barb-throwing were going to get hot and heavy in preparation for the elections a little less than a year away.

However, following the show on WUNC-TV - during which he made his charges - in his first statement, by the way, since being elected

chairman of the N.C. GOP - Rouse took it all back.

He was quoted by some reporters as saying, "I went too far."

Now we don't place much faith in Alex Brock, executive secretary of the North Carolina Board of Elections. As a matter of fact, considering how Brock has fought the right of college students to register in the towns in which they attend college, it's not all that safe for them to turn their backs to him.

And it has been rumored over the years that Democrats have stolen an election here there (such as in Madison County where dead people registered and voted one year) and that ballot boxes have been stuffed on occasion - though not necessarily during Mr. Brock's term of office.

But the idea of the Democrats stealing three consecutive gubernatorial elections is a little far fetched. If anything, they aren't smart enough to pull it off; in fact, probably no one is.

The whole affair just doesn't say much for North Carolina's Republicans when the man they elect as their leader puts his foot in his mouth the first time he opens it.

Little guys are Nixon's new targets

from the Charlotte Observer

A young correspondent for the radical Underground Newspaper Syndicate is being denied a White House press pass for "security reasons." This may mark the first time a reporter has been excluded from the White House on the excuse that he represents a physical threat to the President.

Correspondents from Tass, the Soviet news agency, and some other Communist media have regularly participated in Washington news conferences. But they apparently seem less dangerous to the White House than home-grown radicals.

Tom Frocade, the 28-year-old UNS reporter in question, claims to be a "non-violent person" with nothing in his background to suggest danger. Frocade believes the White House is afraid he will ask embarrassing questions that other reporters might shy away from.

That is one explanation. Another is that the administration's underlings have decided to practice a little on the small, radical end of the media before returning to battle such well-counselled giants as the New York Times, Washington Post, Boston Globe, Columbia Broadcasting System and even Daniel Schorr.

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.

Paddi Hughes Adv. Mg.

On Either Side of the Mushroom

by Woody Doster and the Student Health Service

Question: Does marijuana have worse effects on driving than alcohol? I heard recently that it doesn't, but I'd like more information. -Signed, B.C.

Dear B.C.: As a rule, with both alcohol and marijuana, performance deteriorates as the complexity of the task increases and as the degree of intoxication increases. Driving is an extremely complex task, involving psychomotor coordination, judgement, perceptual acuity and attention. The subject of driving while intoxicated with alcohol or marijuana has been studied, but the results are by no means conclusive.

One study found that those who had smoked marijuana were able to make significantly fewer mistakes in driving when using a driving simulator. Those intoxicated with marijuana were aware that their driving ability was adversely affected, but most felt they could compensate by driving slowly and cautiously. Those statements are similar to those sometimes made by those who drive and drink.

Two other considerations must be taken into account in this study. First, there was significant "overlap" in subjects' ability to simulate driving in the two groups. Some, intoxicated to the legal limit with alcohol, were able to simulate driving better than those who smoked pot. Individuals varied considerably in both groups, and the results found were ambiguous because alcohol intoxication was to the legal limit, while marijuana intoxication was closer to the amount ingested during "social" use of the drug. Another investigator felt that measures of attention are the best predictors of driving ability, and on this index those intoxicated with alcohol and marijuana showed similar deterioration of simulated driving performance.

The issue of whether marijuana affects driving ability less than alcohol remains controversial at this time, but the fact remains that performance on this complex task is affected adversely by both drugs. Driving while intoxicated

(whether with alcohol or marijuana) is not the way to continue a long happy life. We might amend the old maxim to read: "If you have been drinking or smoking, don't drive."

Question: I really get stoned when I'm smoking marijuana, but one of my best friends doesn't get nearly as high. Do you know why? -Signed, Mary.

Dear Mary: There are many factors that determine how high one gets when smoking marijuana. These factors include frequency of use, strength of the drug, the personality of the user, and the environment in which the drug is taken. A key factor in your question is whether you consistently get higher than your friends on the same amount of the same

drug. Assuming this is the case, we can offer some information that might be helpful.

The characteristics of the drug and the personality of you and your friend can help explain this effect. Although there are great individual variations in the effects of this drug, in some there is evidence of a "tolerance." That is, after smoking marijuana (consistently, over a period of time) the user does not get the same "high" as previously on the same amount of the drug. One explanation is that your friend may have developed more tolerance to the drug effects than you have, accounting for a lesser high.

However, it is also likely that part of the effect you described may be due to a need for "cognitive control," a personality factor. Some individuals exert a great deal of control over their emotions and their impulses, while others do not. Such control over subjective experiences can prevent becoming really "high" even when relatively large amounts of marijuana have been used. Others who do not have this personality characteristic are able to get high on very little of the drug due to their ability to relax cognitive control. The same is true of alcohol intoxication.

It is also interesting that "cognitive control" can be imposed on a marijuana high, thereby suppressing the drug's effects. That is, a person who is "stoned" is often capable of diminishing many of the effects when the need is urgent. Again, there seems to be an analogous situation with alcohol. An alcohol intoxicated individual can often suppress the effects of his intoxication (at least for short periods of time) when more control is needed (for example, when stopped by the police while driving.)

The difference between you and your friend then, may be in part due to individual differences in need for cognitive control. This need for control varies greatly among individuals, and the ability to exert control depends also on the amount and strength of the drug used. In most cases, the ability to exert initial cognitive control, and the ability to impose cognitive control when already high both diminish as the degree of intoxication increases.



Carlene Judy

Campus inaccessible to the disabled

I pity you for your ignorance in thinking the wheels on this chair can stop me, when it is solely the barriers you and I create that can stop me.

I pity you the burden that you carry - the false belief that I am that burden.

I pity you for refusing to accept what I have accepted - my disability.

I pity you for the insensitivity that makes you seem unreachable. But most of all, I pity you for pitying me.

-Gayle

And that's what it's all about. I write this not for your pity, but because I need your help and interest, one person to another. And maybe to explain some things you never thought much about. The following are my views and feelings. I represent no group; I do not presume to speak for all other students with physical disabilities. Some will agree with me; some will not.

I want UNC-CH to take a stand, to form a policy, and hopefully to make plans for providing a campus truly

accessible to students with physical disabilities. There are on campus a large number of such students; but this is no indication that they are being served well. I believe from my experience, and from talking with others, that UNC-CH is not responding to the needs of these students systematically, sensitively, or effectively. This is especially true of students in wheelchairs, and it is from a wheelchair perspective that I write this.

This is not to say the university is not responsive at all. Some of my immediate needs have been met (looks like housing will be worked out by next semester, there is now a ramp to the rehab trailer), and for these accomplishments I am truly thankful. But that doesn't excuse the way I had to get these things. It meant months of running from one office to another, talking to numerous people, hassling, pushing, informing, and constantly trying to make people aware. It meant much time, energy and trouble for me, my parents, my professors and some administrators. And as things stand, it isn't as if future students would really benefit from my efforts. They, each and everyone, singly will have to repeat this

tedious process with no guarantee of success.

This experience has crystallized several reasons why I think it imperative that the university take some action. 1) No one office or administrator feels he has the authority, and therefore the responsibility, to make the decisions which would make the campus more accessible. 2) No single office feels its efforts are really crucial or helpful because there is no concerted effort by all offices of the university. Why make housing available if the classrooms aren't; why make classrooms accessible if the sidewalks aren't?

3) I realize financing is a major obstacle. To make the total campus completely accessible will be very costly. I am not asking for the campus to be fixed by next year. I can accept the fact that presently there is not appropriate funding available. But that is not a valid excuse for doing nothing to change this in the future! Funding sources are available if the university is willing to look for them. But as far as I can tell, there are no plans being made; and as long as that continues, funds will not be found.

4) The university's response to the

needs of students with disabilities has been individualized and piecemeal. Thus, are buildings totally inaccessible, new buildings totally accessible, and buildings unsafe accessible - like the grad library. It has a ramp that needs to be lengthened. It is unsafe at any time, but probably impossible in rain and snow. This library has a men's restroom accessible to wheelchairs because a male graduate student pushed for one. There isn't a modified women's restroom because there was no woman grad student to push for one at that time. Getting from one building to another is often made difficult by open gutters and no curb ramps. So far it seems each student has battled it alone with the help of his/her department. This is absurd. But at least it has accomplished some changes. 5) There is an amazing number of students, faculty and people in administration who are really interested in these problems!

What I am really fighting here is not just architectural barriers - they are minor problems compared with the attitudinal barriers that support them. The fact that I cannot move my legs is inherent in my disability. The fact that I can't get into some buildings is not inherent in my disability. It is caused by architectural barriers which are rooted in social and cultural values concerning disabilities. For instance, I use wheels; you use legs for mobility. But I could be as mobile as you if the world were built for me as it is for you.

No one complains about having steps and doors to make a building accessible for you; but my request for a ramp is seen as deviant, "impossible," too expensive, unsafe for others, etc. But the buildings are made for you, not because steps are inherently safer, more effective, more virtuous than ramps; but because the majority of people walk. And it is this majority that build buildings with little thought for those who may have somewhat different means of locomotion.

Why should the university respond to me, only one student and a member of a minority group (one, however, that is increasing rapidly with war, cars, football, etc.)? This point has been argued too many times - why should the university respond to any minority group's needs?

If I feel UNC-CH is so poorly equipped for wheelchairs, has given only limited response to these problems, is not planning in any noticeable fashion for the future, why don't I go elsewhere? Because only one other university in N.C. offers the grad program I am in, and it is almost equally inaccessible. And because I should be able to choose where I will go, as any other student. Physical disability should not have to be the major factor in one's choice of schools, vocations, activities, etc., unless it actively prohibits the activity - like going out for the track team. There is nothing in my disability that impairs my ability to effectively do grad work. And I want to do it here.

Mohammad Qasim
106 A Sue Ann Ct.
Carboro

Letters to the editor

Athletics not in business of education

To the editor:

Despite the apparent desire to see the issue of athletic support die, Mr. Moseley's letter in the DTH of 11/17/71 should not go unanswered.

First there is the respect our athletic department holds among its contemporaries at other universities. While this is undeniable, it sidesteps the question of the respect of athletic departments within universities in general. The answer to this is found in the second point: the role of athletic programs in the university. What does the athletic program contribute? Entertainment? Yes. Educational enrichment? Probably not. A few scholarships, but at tremendous sacrifice to their recipients. The only reason the program is probably tolerated is that everyone else has one (which is why it is hoped NCAA faculty members will curb present excesses).

That the death of a football player stirs up such a storm is simply that to many it represents the logical conclusion of the programs presently used to produce big-time football. Like the professor who does research to the exclusion of his students, so also the coach whose main objective is to win without contributing to the educational process (he is a member of the faculty) is a blight to the University. One psychologist in a four hour course can

teach you more about team togetherness than five years in an athletic program

Finally while I can not evaluate the motives of the Concerned Athletes, I can question the athletic scholarship fund masquerading as the Educational Foundation.

Don't get me wrong, I participated in intercollegiate athletics throughout my undergraduate career and I still make athletics a part of my daily life. Nonetheless I find I can not wholeheartedly support the athletic program as it is presently constituted at Carolina.

Walter Baggett

Israel termed a racist state

To the editor:

This is in response to recent letters which characterize Israel as a poor little victim state, incapable of aggression.

Jane Gabin, in her response to Mr. Weatherly's letter, defends Israel as not being imperialistic, and justifies Israel's acquiring - as she puts it, in self defense - land strategically necessary for survival. She states that Israel is small and surrounded by hostile countries which

vow to drive Israel into the sea. Surely this statement is misleading. First of all, the evils of occupation are minimized by saying Israel "acquired" land instead of saying conquered or confiscated. This in itself constitutes a typical example of Zionist propaganda. Any Israeli aggression is played down, whereas the very existence of the Arab countries is considered a threat.

The statement foolishly made by a former Arab leader during a moment of hysteria, about throwing Israel into the sea, is repeated over and over by Zionists in the hope that Americans will attribute this man's reaction to all Arabs. In actuality, it was Israel who threw the Palestinian Arabs into the desert and expropriated their land. The surrounding Arab countries absorbed as many of the refugees as their economies permitted. The remaining refugees were left to rot in camps. The Arab countries and the UN have supplied whatever help was given. Israel has accepted none of the responsibility for her own actions in displacing these people!

The Zionists don't mention that the Arabs under Israeli occupation are now facing humiliation and repression. Michael Adams of the Manchester Guardian summarizes his detailed account of the Israeli occupation of the Gaza Strip (January 26, 1968): "I had my ups and downs during four years as a prisoner

of war in Germany but the Germans never treated me as harshly as the Israelis are treating the Arabs of Gaza Strip, the majority of whom are women and children." It is noteworthy that Israel has always refused to let commissions from the UN Committee on Human Rights investigate the living conditions and treatment of the Palestinian Arabs under Israeli occupation.

For further consideration: If Israel is such a peach loving country, why did she destroy more than 7,000 homes on the West Bank alone since the occupation of 1967 (Dayan's "Neighborhood Punishment" program. The terminology is his.) Why is Israel evacuating so many Arabs from the Gaza Strip into other parts of the occupied territories? Why do they refuse to withdraw from Arab lands - will this aggression gain them peace? If Israel is not imperialistic and expansionist by nature, why is she building new kibbutzes all over the conquered territory, and why did she annex Jerusalem? This was done in defiance of UN resolutions. It is indeed ironic that Israel was created by the UN and yet she defies almost every one of the UN resolutions!

Why does Israel invite people from all over the world to live in Israel just because they profess the Jewish faith while denying "Right of Return" to the 1,500,000 Palestinians born to the land?