The Daily Tar Keel

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, February 19, 1972

The Daily Tar Heel awards of the week

Neighborhood Award: to Red China, which will be hosting Nixon and all the other "dignataries" next week. At least maybe it'll get Clifford Irving off the front page.

The "It Pays To Advertise" Award: to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which (with the help of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police) finally caught up with Karleton Armstrong, a member of the Ten Most Wanted list since the bombing of a University of Wisconsin laboratory in August of 1970. The arrest was made in Ottawa four days after Inspector Efrem Zimbalist, Jr. devoted the last minutes of his Sunday night 500. television program to describing Armstrong, his younger brother and the other people wanted in connection with the case.

The Royal Goose Award: to Labor M.P. William Hamilton, who called Prince Charles, the Prince of Wales, "that young twerp" after discovering that Charles receives a tax-free annual income of \$273,000.

The First the Beatles, then C, S, N & Y Award: to that multifaceted Canadian rock group, Steppenwolf, which just announced its breakup. During their four-year career with Dunhill Records, Steppenwolf recorded 11 gold records and made \$7,000,000 in personal appearance

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell News Editor Lou Bonds Associate Ed. Lana Starnes Associate Ed. Mark Whicker Sports Ed. Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Norman Black . . . Managing Ed.

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Murray Pool Business Mgr. Beverly Lakeson ... Adv. Mgr.

The There Goes The fees. America, however, still has those other great Canadian artists like Andy Kim and Guess Who.

> The Jesus Christ, We Hadn't Thought Of It That Way Before Award: to pornographic publisher Ralph Ginzburg, who began a three-year federal prison sentence Thursday with the words: "I'm dying for everybody else's sins."

The Horny Problem Award: to Kaziranga, India, whose game protection plan has allowed the near-extinct one-horned rhinoceri enough time to get down to business and propogate themselves to the self-sufficient number of

The Vanity Fair Award: to Pat Nixon, who is taking her own hairdresser - Mrs. Rita Desantis with her to Red China. In these days of unbalanced budgets, Pat, wouldn't it have been simpler just to buy a wig?

The Great Rip-Off Award: to Morrison Residence College, which has passed a resolution restricting student candidates to one poster per floor. Now there's only one too many on every floor of Morrison.

The Perserverance Award: to anyone who has read this far into this terrible mess. Warning: It's not going to get any better.

Letters to the editor

AFROTC ad insult to students

To the editor:

In the February 16 issue of the DTH, an ad for AFROTC appeared which we. the undersigned, feel is an insult to the intelligence of UNC students. This ad appears to be a disgusting attempt to attract a certain stereotyped portion of the student body by capitalizing the words "high" and "dope." The creators of this ad seem to think that there exist stereotyped students, perhaps labeled drug-oriented radicals or liberals, whose interest in the Air Force can be developed

and captured by using the words "high" and "dope" in the same sentence as "Air

Do the creators of this ad really believe that students, like Pavlov's dogs. have been so conditioned to respond favorably to the words "high" and "dope" that they will respond similarly to the Air Force, if these words are associated in some way with the Air

We urge the AFROTC to abandon such a low-level advertising display. If

NCE IN OFFICE

such ameboid promotions, in which the Air Force attempts to assume the shape of the stereotyped cult it endeavors to reach, continues, we wonder how it will capture the interest of radical fourth grade students at Max Meadows Elementary School.

Holly Farris 217 Joyner

Robert's Rules an aid to SL

To the editor,

Much has been offered recently in support of the report of the Presidential Commission on the Goals and Structures of Student Government, particularly by the Commission and by President Stallings. Until now I have stomached most of the arguments for reorganization in the report in hopes they would be quietly dismissed. The continuing support of the proposals of the Commission by Gerry Cohen in Monday's DTH has forced me to break my silence. Although there are many faults in the proposed reorganization, space will permit me to point out only one.

Those who support the plan for reorganization have charged that the procedure used by the Student Legislature, which is by and large parliamentary procedure based on Robert's Rules of Order, impedes and leaves some people out of the decision-making process. President Stallings expressed his and the Commission's proposal when he said he would like to see the new council be able they? to "discuss rather than debate issues," To adopt such a plan would lose two important advantages which the present procedure used by Student Legislature has: (1)protecting the rights of the minority and, (2) providing a structure for an thereby encouraging debate.

In regards to the first advantage, it should be noted that parliamentary procedure was designed with the protection of the rights of the individual in mind. Rachel Vixman, President of the New York Metropolitan Chapter of the American Institute of Parliamentarians, testifies that this is the case:

Through the ages, parliamentary law has been introduced as organization principles-rules on conduct. It is based on freedom of speech,

respect for the dignity of man, In the principle and justice for all, the principle of majority rule, the right of the minority THE ROAD OF / THE STUDENT PRIESIDENT CANDIDATE to be heard, and

the duty to abide by the will of the

It is difficult to see how Student Legislature operating under a system of rules designed to protect the rights of the minority and the individual's right to speak could leave some of its members out of the decision-making process.

The second important advantage of the present system of decision-making in Student Government is that it allows for debate. President Stallings and the Commission would have us believe that it would be better for a small group to discuss issues than it is for the 55-seat Legislature to debate issues. The decision-making process, however, can only be hindered by a lack of debate. both in terms of its ability to protect individual rights and in terms of its ability to provide reasoned discourse. Walter Lippman points out why:

For the the absence of debate unrestricted utterance leads to degradation of opinion. By a kind of Gresham's Law the more rational

is overcome by the less rational, and the opinions that will prevail will be those which are held most ardently by those with the most

passionate will. For that reason the freedom to speak can never be maintained by objecting to interference with the liberty of the press,

of printing, of broadcasting, of the screen. It can be maintained only by promoting debate.

It escapes me as to why some would throw away the tools of debate and still hope to reach the best decisions. But, then again, none of those supporting the reorganization have said anything about trying to reach the best decisions, have

Richard Robertson Student Legislator, MD VI

Letters to the editor

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.

Ken Ripley

Soul food: corruption limits human greatness

It gets harder to believe in "the basic goodness of man" with every morning newspaper.

But we manage to cling to the illusion with some kind of hope. We talk about "human dignity" and point with pride to our many undeniable achievements. Someone is always available and willing, even in the worst of times, to proclaim the greatness of man, his promise and

Illusions are cheap. But not so cheap, for instance, are the lives of N.C. mental patients who suffer from patient abuses and "the lack of treatment within the state mental hospitals" according to the N.C. Mental Health Association.

Not so cheap are the lives of 23 children in North Carolina who have died because of parental violence in the past seven months, or the 306 children who have been "confirmed as physically abused with their very lives threatened by their parents and relatives."

Not so cheap are the lives of children who must be bused from one school to another because a racist society can't

naturally integrate itself. And not so cheap as our illusions of . goodness are the lives of those who dieevery day in Vietnam, Belfast and on the streets of our major cities because of one crime or another.

The illusions of man's greatness sound hollow when we read how he poisons his own environment, succumbs to violence at whim, and lives in fear, hatred and mutual suspicion.

"Human dignity" seems farcial when we can look around on campus and see how lightly we respect the dignity of each other, how we so often use and depersonalize people as "things." There was no dignity in the nymphomaniac who recently captivated several dorm floors, nor was there any dignity in those who took advantage of her. There is no dignity in vandalism, perversion and obscenity. But our vices are sadly more than human.

Human corruption, man's wickedness and cussedness, severely limits man's claims to greatness and nobility. Man may be basically good, but he is also basically

bad. All reform movements and revolutions, most religious thought, and man's intangible conscience are concerned with abolishing the constraints of human corruption. But here, too, we cherish our illusions.

We blame society, political systems, lack of education, even God, for evil in the world. And we try to abolish evil by tinkering with the structure of our lives. But more often than not, I suspect, the problem with people is people. And if any major change for good is to happen in men, that change must come from

Those who believed that education would change man, especially late 19th century humanists, found their dreams shattered by two world wars. Education merely made bad men smart; not smart

Those who blame society for human evil and who want to legislate morality have found throughout history that no society has been free from human flaws and that morality, despite all best intentions, cannot be accomplished by mere fiat. A people can be forced to act morally, but they cannot be made moral.

We blame the political system for human inhumanity and turn to reform or revolution for help. But changing the structure of politics, history has shown, does not change the politicans. Communism has not abolished human evil any more than capitalism. Political systems may foster evil, but men perpetuate it.

A recent newspaper headline read, "Modern Science can cure social ills." But man's technological skills depend on the social conscience of those who wield them. Science is only a tool to increase man's knowledge; it is only as useful as the very human scientists who wield it.

Even religion alone cannot relieve man of the corruption and imperfection that binds him. He can expand his mind through meditation, but he is limited by his own nature. He can go through all the outward trappings of religiosity, but they need not ever touch the center of his life.

If we are ever to be relieved of all the hate, greed, cruelty, selfishness, stupidity

and prejudice that inflicts so much misery on mankind, we have to concede we need help. Human nature - not society, politics or religion - must be changed, and we cannot by ourselves change human nature. We are what we are.

Such a change is a revolutionary process, and humbling. But one of the biggest claims of Christianity is that such a change is possible through Jesus Christ. If man cannot change himself, then Christ has made it possible for God to work in men to change them. When a Christian talks about being "reborn," he means that his entire nature is slowly being purged of human corruption and 'transformed into the image of Christ."

"Therefore, if any one is in Christ he is a new creation," Paul writes. "The old has passed away; behold, the new has come." Christianity doesn't offer plastic surgery for corrupted men; it promises an eventually complete cure.

Such a cure may be slow and painful, but at least Christ promises complete recovery well worth looking into.

Joe Hill

Democratic union to solve SG problems

doubt is more desirable than the present parliamentary parcheesi. Yet before this proposal can be railroaded through, it might be advisable to look at its causes and its possible consequences. Efficiency aside (and even this may be doubted), is the reorganization plan desirable, or does it come at the expense of democracy and

political relevance? According to Gerry Cohen and others, the proposal was drafted in the belief that the student body at present is overgoverned. There are 55 legislators chosen from districts so small that little effort is needed to get elected. Ideology takes a back seat to personality in these campaigns and representatives rise invisible to their constituents. Thus there are elected a number of political hacks such as Charles Gilliam (he reportedly said once that he would oppose any bill, regardless of content, introduced by Cohen) who make it nearly impossible for the legislature to pass constructive bills. Moreover the legislature constantly works campaign promises. This is the argument

of the reformers. In place of the present system, the reformers are suggesting a 16-member council, guaranteeing proportional representation for graduates, two seats each for women and blacks and one seat for the president. The council is to be elected from 15 large districts (the president at-large), at first drawn geographically but subject to be changed to, for instance, academic divisions. With larger districts, competition of responsible candidates will result, and

representatives will be visible to electors. My argument opposing this plan will have three parts: an analogy which I think basically is applicable, a questioning of how democratic the new system might be and finally a questioning of the relevance of student government as a

At the turn of the century during the Progressive Era of American history, reform movements arose in most cities

alliance between political machines and special interests. The machine politicians rose to power through the many localized wards usually behind the immigrant working class vote. The reformers, who mostly included businessmen and high professionals, considered the corruption the fault of corrupt individuals and favored at-large elections that would make candidates more accountable and more responsible to the city. City government was to be streamlined and

But as pointed out by historian Samuel P. Hays, corruption was not the result of evil individuals but rather of a separation of political and economic power within the city. Politics was the only door of upward mobility for immigrant groups. Because of universal suffrage immigrants were quick to take advantage: Special business interests. which exercised the real power in the city, had to make deals with the politicians to insure favorable politics.

In terms of efficiency the proposed in opposition to the president making it opposing the ward form of municipal But this became too costly and too without money. Even if this is not true, is may be relevant is in analyzing why the cry for reform came from the masses. pushed to establish government in a business-like fashion - centralized and efficient. The consequence was that "political power would no longer be broadly distributed, but would in fact be more centralized in the hands of a relatively small segment of the population."

The analogy is relevant in two ways to the situation here. In the first place, the troubles of present student government may partly stem from undergovernment, not overgovernment. If few are represented in a 55-member body, how is it more will be represented by only 15? The guarnateed minorities are along superficial race and sex lines, indifferent to the possibility that all blacks and all women might not be the same. Moreover, ideological minorities will have little voice. If elections become quiter competitive, is there not a danger of their being dominated by students who usually have different political views from those

will be of the wishy-washy sort who in trying to represent everyone represent no one?

But these arguments aside, if the goal of student leaders is to create more interest and participation by other students, it seems strange they should suggest cutting back the number of legislators (unless of course they see the streamlined council as tools and stepping stones for their own political aspirations - remember Tommy Bello?). It does not take a political wizard to realize that the fewer hands controlling power means the less interested the rest of the people are in participating. If elected representatives are raised to such prominence and visibility as suggested, the ordinary students will appear as not important.

Why should they participate? Perhaps the only thing that can be said about the present government is that while not very democratic it is more

democratic than the proposed plan. The second reason the above analogy

reorganization of Student Government no difficult for him to carry out his government, which allowed a corrupt uncertain, so the reformers, pretending it not likely the elected council members student government is so ineffective. It may be, I suggest, that student government is divorced from the real power at the University. What is student government in the face of the administration? Parliamentry games?

It seems that reformers of student government should worry less about efficiency and more about the aims of students. Students in the main are consumers (and some also work). They are interested in getting a good education (and/or protecting their jobs) and perhaps also in promoting a better way of living. The only effective method I know to win significant concessions from the administration is not to have a small body of representatives but to organize. A democratic union would not only insure participation by all interested but would also immediately confront the issues.

Teachers' assistants at the University of Wisconsin won demands by unionizing. This union has also become a wheel for reform at the university. Is this not a

better proposal for us?