

JIM HUMMEL, Editor

SUSAN MAUNEY, Managing Editor
MARK MURRELL, Associate Editor
JONATHAN RICH, Associate Editor

EDWINA RALSTON, University Editor
JOHN ROYSTER, City Editor
CHARLES HERNDON, State and National Editor
BETH BURRELL, News Editor
CLIFTON BARNES, Sports Editor

TOM MOORE, Art Editor
DONNA WHITAKER, Features Editor
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor
ANN PETERS, Weekend Editor
NORMAN CANNADA, Ombudsman

The Daily Tar Heel

89th year of editorial freedom

Protestants, Catholics should compromise

By DAVID GILTINAN

Second of a two-part series

The Easter Rising of 1916 marked the beginning of the Catholics' war for independence in northern Ireland. The uprising could hardly be termed a military success. Public support for the rebels was almost non-existent, and after only a week of fighting the insurrection was crushed.

Then the British made a fatal mistake. In the month following the rebellion, 16 of the rebels' leaders were executed. The effect was to create 16 martyrs to the Republican cause. Public opinion shifted dramatically in favor of the "freedom fighters." Thus, in the years of guerrilla warfare against the British that followed, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) was able to count on the support of a largely sympathetic Irish civilian population.

By mid-1921, the British Government was in a genuine quandary. Guerrilla tactics by the IRA in the south were taking a terrible toll in bloodshed. To Lloyd George, then prime minister, surrendering control of Ireland to the Republicans must have seemed like an attractive way of getting rid of a very messy problem.

In Ulster, however, the northern Protestants threatened mass resistance to their inclusion in an independent Irish state. Their motto was simple: "What we have we hold." Inclusion in an all-Ireland state, where they would be in a minority, posed a threat to their power, and was to be fought at all costs.

Intransigence on the part of the Ulster Unionists meant that a compromise between Irish nationalism and Protestant desires to preserve the status quo was inevitable. Finally, after months of difficult negotiations between the IRA and the British cabinet, the details of that compromise were hammered out. On Dec. 6, 1921, an agreement known as the Anglo-Irish Treaty was signed at Downing Street.

Ireland was to be partitioned. Twenty-six of its 32 counties were to be granted independence. The other six northeastern counties, those with a Protestant majority, were to remain a part of Great Britain. Thus Protestant

supremacy in the north, where Catholics were outnumbered two to one, was assured for another 50 years.

It would have seemed likely that once the million Protestants in northern Ireland got their way, they could have begun living in some semblance of harmony with the half million Catholics. It was not to work that way, however. Fear of the "Papist threat" heightened, if anything. The neighboring Catholic Republic of Ireland was perceived as a constant threat. This fear took its expression in persistent, systematic discrimination against the Catholic minority. In this way the fuse was set.

That fuse was lit in 1968, when young Catholics — and a few sympathetic Protestants — began a series of civil rights marches asking for an end to discrimination. They were beaten by angry Protestant mobs, who saw civil rights for Catholics as a first step toward unification with the southern Republic.

The explosion finally came in August, 1969. Riots occurred in Derry and Belfast, in which the notorious "B-Specials" of the Royal Ulster Constabulary became almost indistinguishable from the Protestant mob, as they fired submachine guns and tear gas at rioting Catholics. British troops had to be deployed in the streets of the two cities to preserve law and order, which was suffering severely at the hands of the police.

It was not long before gratuitous brutality on the part of the British troops provoked angry reactions from the Catholic population. The inhabitants of the Catholic ghettos were driven to seek protection from their would-be protectors. And so the IRA rose from the ashes, to supply that protection.

On Oct. 31, 1970, the Provisional IRA killed its first British soldier on the streets of Belfast. After 50 years the men of violence were back in business. Tragically, subsequent events were to drive the Catholic population into relying on these men. When British troops raided the Catholic ghettos on the night of Aug. 9, 1971, and arrested 342 men to be held without charges; or when 13 civilians were shot down by the British army in the streets of Derry on "Bloody Sunday" in Jan. 1972, what option did the Catholic people have, except to turn to the IRA for protection?

In response to the growth of the IRA, Protestant paramilitary groups called the Ulster Defense Association (UDA) and the Ulster-Volunteer Force (UVF) sprang up. Sectarian killings became rampant and the spiral of violence escalated further.

Meanwhile the politicians struggled to find a solution. Successive British governments have grappled with the problem. Ultimately, every proposal for power sharing between both groups has foundered on the rock-like intransigence of the Protestant extremists. In the meantime, the handful of Catholic extremists in the IRA continues to embark on a campaign of terrorism and violence, despite a large-scale erosion of popular support in the last few years. And the death-toll mounts steadily.

Solutions? I can, sadly, offer none. One thing, however, seems clear. As long as Catholics generally, both north and south of the border, think of Irish unity as the only solution, and as long as the Provisional IRA draws its mandate from this vague conviction, no peace is likely. It simply is not possible — nor desirable — to coerce a million unwilling Protestants into a "United Ireland." The IRA could do with a strong dose of realism.

So, too, could the Ulster Protestants. To expect half a million Catholics to sit back and put up with institutionalized discrimination is asking for trouble. It is time that the rights of the minority in northern Ireland be recognized. Catholics must be granted a real say in government. Both groups need to shrug off the fear and suspicion which is the legacy of the past. They must escape from the prison of their history.

For most of us, even in the Republic of Ireland, the troubles in northern Ireland no longer penetrate our consciousness very deeply. The images of death and violence flicker across our TV screens and are banished from our minds. We have become numbed to the tragedy. For the people of northern Ireland, trapped in the prison of their own history, it remains a grim and abiding reality. Let us hope, and pray, for their release.

David Giltinan is a graduate student in statistics from Cork, Ireland.

Money matters

To say that that the budget hearings last year were a total disaster would not be fair to the members of the Campus Governing Council who spent hours deciding how \$185,000 could be divided fairly among 37 campus organizations. To say that the hearings were a success would be a slap in the face of the organizations that felt funding cuts and denials resulted from a lack of time and communication on the part of the CGC's Finance Committee.

Campus organizations submitted their budgets Thursday along with requests for funding for the 1981-1982 fiscal year. During the next few weeks, members of the Rules and Judiciary, Student Affairs and Finance Committees must decide which organizations merit a share of student fees and how much they will receive. This is not a task that can be taken lightly and while there have been steps taken to combat the problems that damaged the hearings last year, there are still some serious problems in the process.

With the exception of one representative, the newly-elected members of the CGC do not have first-hand experience in the campus budgeting process. One of the major complaints of organizations last year was that the members of the committees were not fully aware of their responsibility to determine fairly the amount of money each organization should receive. Finance Committee Chairman Mike Vandenberg admits that, as novices, they have a lot to learn about funding campus organizations.

Individual members of the CGC have expressed a sincere concern to see that campus groups are treated fairly and objectively during the hearings, but unless the representatives have a working knowledge about the budget system, the confusion that plagued last year's proceedings will reign again.

During last year's proceedings, most organizations either had their funding requests severely cut or completely denied. As a result of this, an Appeals Committee was established specifically to handle complaints from organizations that felt they were treated unfairly during the hearings. But members of the CGC and campus organizations must remember that the committee's function is to judge procedural violations, not budget cuts.

With a 12 percent inflation rate and no student fee increases in the past two years, someone is going to have to take a cut somewhere. The Appeals Committee should not be tied down listening to budget cuts complaints when there is no more money to allocate.

CGC committees have been given two extra weeks to review budget requests, meet with organizations, study treasury laws and send evaluations to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee now has three weeks to determine cuts before the final hearing on Saturday before the last week of classes.

Former CGC members and other students familiar with the budget process have met with committees to ensure a better understanding of the system by the new representatives. While these steps are commendable, only the conduct of the members at the hearings and the decisions made will determine whether this revised process should become permanent.

Letters to the editor

Attack on Moral Majority degrading, spiteful

To the editor:

Although I am by no means a supporter of the Moral Majority and condemn its actions just as heartily as Roger Lancaster, I neither appreciated nor enjoyed his article (A modest proposal for the Moral Majority, DTH, March 17). The Moral Majority is serious in its intent and it is gaining disciples and power at an alarming rate. So how could the petty and sniping observations of Lancaster show anyone that the opponents of the Moral Majority are equally serious and committed?

I do realize that the article was intended as satire, but in my opinion, it failed as such. I recognize the title and intent from a similar work written by Jonathan Swift which bitterly castigated the English landlord system in Ireland. His work was successful (and humorous) because he concentrated his attack on an institution both corrupt and horribly cruel. As I said before, I do not support the Moral Majority, but I do not believe it is either of these things.

Also, I was offended from a Christian point of view. I am a Christian and it hurt to see something as valuable to me as the Bible so spitefully and degradingly used. Who gave you that right, Lancaster? You took the easy way out; instead of intelligence and respect, you chose ridicule and degradation. You wrote not biting satire, which could have been most effective if properly handled, but a malicious cheap shot.

Finally, I am sure there will be many more letters from equally offended students, but probably most of those students will be supporters of the Moral Majority, and therein lies the true harm of the article. As a result of your "modest proposal," Lancaster, they have been made martyrs, and what better way to win support for a cause?

Sarah Park Stuart
2608 Granville South

Irresponsible Crum?

To the editor:

Everyone knows that Coach Dick Crum, the coaches and their families, and the football team went down to Houston over the Christmas holidays. Everyone knows the Tar Heels defeated Texas — right; had an enjoyable time — right; and left six players and two trainers in Houston — wrong!

That's right, Dick Crum — ACC Coach of the Year — left eight members of the team on Jan. 1, 1981, at the hotel where the team was staying. I know because I was one of the persons involved. Of course, this incident is not known, except



by Crum and a selected few, because in my opinion it would create an undesirable image for Crum and the football program. Not even all members of the team were aware that we had been left behind "on our own" in Texas.

The unwanted eight realize that rules are meant to be followed. It is a fact we all were told what time the buses would be departing for the airport. But, Carolina had beaten Texas the night before — New Year's Eve — and 7:30 a.m. was an early departure time. Even though we were the only ones left, a number of the other players made the buses by accident. It was ensured that all players received wake-up calls on practice mornings prior to the game, even if calls were not requested. I personally requested a wake-up call the night before the morning of departure and I did not receive it.

In my judgment, Dick Crum exhibited unethical actions, because he was well aware he was leaving a number of players behind. We all could have possibly made the original flight back to North Carolina because of a flight delay. But, I suppose Crum did not feel obligated to contact us at the hotel to inform us of this development. This occurred after a law enforcement officer from the hotel contacted him concerning our absence.

Although responsibility is shared by both parties, Coach Crum was responsible for our safety and well-being. Crum should have realized everyone probably did not have adequate money for a trip home after being in Houston for nearly a week.

I seriously question Crum's judgment and his way of setting an example — leaving someone stranded 1,200 miles away from home. Someone could have been injured and that would have been very detrimental.

Finally, I believe it is unfair for the players and trainers left behind to pay for their plane fare home. It is a matter of principle, and in my opinion, reflects an irresponsible and insensitive attitude on the part of Crum.

Tony Ebron
224 Ehringhaus

Paper praised

To the editor:

Never before in my four long years here at UNC have I been as thoroughly satisfied with *The Daily Tar Heel* as I was with your March 16th issue. It seemed the staff writers, instead of whipping off sloppy works of journalism like they frequently do, spent the necessary time to

piece together engaging news, and the end product proved enjoyable to read.

To be specific, the articles on North Carolina arts, Willie Nelson's unique brand of music, the Horace Williams Airport controversy and David Poole's comical experiences in front of a live camera were well-written, informative and insightful. I thank you for restoring my faith in our newspaper. Let's see if you can maintain this quality.

Jim Bryan
212 McCauley Street

Letters?

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor and contributions of columns for the editorial page.

Such contributions should be typed, triple-spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing. Column writers should include their majors and hometowns; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.

Bottle bill a starting point for conservation

By JIM HUMMEL

The debate over whether to require a deposit on beverage containers is gearing up in state legislatures across the country. Proponents of the so-called "bottle bill" in North Carolina are vowing to fight industry lobbying that has defeated the bill since it first came up in 1974.

The bill, which would require a 5-cent deposit on any bottle or can that "contains a beverage under carbonation," has met stiff opposition from bottle manufacturers and beverage distributors who claim the legislation would cause inconvenience and inflation.

"We don't hesitate to say that there will be problems," said Rep. Marie Colton, D-Asheville, who is co-sponsoring a bill that will be introduced in the General Assembly on Tuesday. In addition to the 5-cent deposit the legislation calls for a one cent handling charge to help defray retailers' costs.

The bottle bill has been a controversial topic in many states because of confusion about what impact it would have on consumers. Colton is right that there will be an initial adjustment period, but given the increased costs of production, energy prices and environmental considerations, the pros of the bill far outweigh the cons.

Because bills across the country appear to be gaining support — Maine, Connecticut, Michigan, Iowa, Oregon and Vermont have already passed deposit legislation — industry groups are pouring a great deal of money into fighting the bills.

"The bill goes to the jugular of the industry," said Roger Bernstein, a spokesman for the Glass Packaging Institute in Washington. "Instantly it raises the price of soda and beer and it puts people's jobs on the line."

Bernstein's comments indicate two misconceptions about the bottle bill that will have to be corrected in the public's mind if there is to be any hope for passage. Many people consider the 5-cent deposit a tax, but it is more an economic incentive. People are under no obligation to return the containers, but in the states that have bottle bills there is a 90 percent return rate.

The other claim by industry is that a bottle bill would eliminate jobs. While there would be an initial loss of jobs in the bottling industry, several reports from the federal government indicate that jobs created by handling needs would exceed those eliminated by a 2-to-1 margin.

On the state level, Colton said she had been working hard on the bill and would fight industry pressure on the legislators. She said there was documentation of industry contributions to political campaigns and that by exposing the information, elected officials would be less likely to

bow to special interest groups. "There is a full-time lobbyist over here (at the legislature) and some bottling companies have sent each member of the House a case of soda," Colton said.

On the national side separate bills were introduced this week in the House and Senate that are similar to the bill in North Carolina, but require a 2-cent handling fee. "We're in for a long fight, but we're optimistic about our chances," said Tom McGinnis, an aide to Sen. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., who supports the legislation. In the House, 33 congressmen have signed a bottle bill sponsored by Rep. James Jeffords, R-Vt.

Another complaint from the industry is that it is being singled out unfairly. "Bottles and cans have become the symbol of a throw-away society," Bernstein said. "If we want to address the problem of litter and conservation, let's go to the heart of the matter. We should not isolate one thing but work to conserve in all areas."

Bernstein's comments are accurate, but what he fails to realize is that you have to start somewhere. While it may prove to be an inconvenience for some people, a bottle bill is a good place to start if the nation is committed to protecting the environment and saving energy in the years to come.

Jim Hummel, a junior journalism major from Crafton, Mass., is editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*.

THE Daily Crossword by I. Judah Koolyk

- | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| ACROSS | 27 Of the | 48 Interest | 13 Vane dir. |
| 1 Use a | 32 Exams | 50 Deceive | 21 Thorax |
| 5 Rodeo rope | for 42A? | 56 Swap | — de- |
| 10 Ardor | 33 Dill, old | 57 Sailors' | France |
| 14 Italian | style | 26 Eagle's | 25 Declaim |
| wine center | 34 Larry | 58 Lulu | asset |
| 15 Musician's | Bird's org. | 59 Kind of | 27 Indigo |
| org. | 35 See 20A | 60 Kind of | shrubs |
| 16 First son | 39 He helped | 61 She pre- | 28 Descartes |
| 17 Use a | modernize | ceded Miami | 29 Senseless |
| drudge | 40 White or | 62 Redacts | 30 Dogpatch |
| 18 Macbeth's | Blue rear | 63 Signal for | denizen |
| title | 41 Bancroft | correct | 31 Colleen |
| 19 Rickey | and Boleyn | time | 32 Latin poet |
| fruit | 42 They care | DOWN | 33 Entrance |
| 20 Patients | for cupids | 1 Impulsive | 36 Disturb |
| who require | 45 Viper. | 2 Notice | 37 Maroon's |
| patience | 46 Sout: Fr. | 3 "Take — | medium |
| 23 Huntley | 47 Muse of | from me" | 38 Like a |
| 24 Wallace | history | 4 Game played | slugabed |
| 25 Different | | with 46 | 43 Circus |
| | | cards | performers |
| | | 5 Suda | 44 Grmlin |
| | | 6 Off like — | 45 Changes |
| | | 7 Examine | 47 West |
| | | carefully | Painter |
| | | or hastily | 48 — die |
| | | 8 Sahara's | 49 St. Laurent |
| | | surface | 50 Toward the |
| | | 9 Gilbert and | mouth |
| | | Sullivan | 51 "The Gift |
| | | product | of the —" |
| | | 10 Pastry | 52 Dieter's |
| | | 11 Secular | spread |
| | | 12 Draws | 53 Fed |
| | | a bead | 54 Time long |
| | | | past |
| | | | 55 Biblical |
| | | | book |

Yesterday's Puzzle Solved:

