

volume ix,
number 23

THE JOURNAL

march 20, 1974



Senator Mark O. Hatfield

Court Rules on Firecrackers, Elections Appeal

by charlotte porter

The Student Superior Court heard two cases Sunday night, 17 March, 1974, one concerning firecrackers and one appeal of the Elections Board decision to validate the February elections.

In the firecrackers case, assistant Attorney General Keith Shannon began the case by asking for a contempt of court ruling against one of the co-defendants, who had failed to show up for the case or notify the attorney general's office that he would be absent. Chief Justice Tom Duley ruled that the student must appear before the court the following Sunday to show due cause why he should not be fined for his failure to appear.

The two students were charged with throwing firecrackers from a second floor Moore Hall window at a group of 13- and 14-year-olds who were working with Project 31, in conjunction with the Salvation Army and a group of graduate students.

The Attorney General's office charged that the pair were in violation of the UNCC code and North Carolina law by their possession and use of explosives.

Security officer Fred Stewart, called by the Attorney General's office, said that at the time of the incident, about 12:30 p.m., he was making a routine patrol behind Moore Hall when he heard

the explosion. Stewart hadn't planned on arresting the violators, he said, until they became abusive.

Associate Attorney General David Sturgis added in further testimony that the young people had been washing cars behind Moore, and that there had been witnesses to the act who refused to testify in court.

The defendant present in court pleaded guilty and called a witness who substantiated his claim that the firecracker was indeed thrown, lit, by the defendant, but that it had failed to explode and did so only after being lit by a person behind the dorm.

Taking the chair in his own defense, the defendant assured the court that his absent roommate was innocent of all charges. He further testified that he had no idea how the firecrackers came into his possession.

The Attorney General's office asked the court that the defendant be found guilty, and asked that the court recommend definite suspension for the remainder of the academic semester.

After brief deliberation, the court ruled that since they were concerned with a precedent case, the penalty of suspension was a

Continued on page two

journal photo/john baynard

Hatfield, Macquarrie Speak At Forum

by george berkin

Among the most exciting intellectual events at UNCC this year was the University Forum program that featured two speakers talking about the anatomy of freedom. The large group of people who hosted the program deserve mention for the work they and others did in bringing the event to this campus. These people include Mrs. James E. Fogartie, Dr. D. W. Colvard, Dr. Ed St. Clair, Donald M. MacKay, Richard Butterfield, and Dr. Earl L. Backman.

The morning's featured speaker was the Rev. John Macquarrie. He is currently the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, University of Oxford. He has been Professor of Systematic Theology at two distinguished universities on both sides of the Atlantic, and is since 1968 involved in a leadership position in the World Council of Churches. Introducing Dr. Macquarrie, Professor St. Clair alluded to his wide popular and technical writings.

The afternoon's guest speaker was Senator Mark O. Hatfield. Best known for his co-sponsorship of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war in Vietnam, Senator Hatfield is currently involved in congressional work to curb the destruction of air and water natural resources. The first two-term Oregon governor since the turn of the century, the liberal Republican from Oregon has also been active in the legislative removal of the draft.

Dr. Macquarrie began the morning session by acknowledging the difficulty in making an analysis of freedom. This theme is much talked about, he said, but due to the illusive nature of freedom, often its understanding is left to the poets. As an understanding of freedom will increase that freedom, our present search is well justified.

He said our first impulse toward an understanding of freedom differs from most searches in that we define freedom in negative rather than positive terms. Free animals are without cages, as free citizens are without compulsions. Not part of the empirical world, freedom is in a sense nothing at all, rather it implies open horizons. Thus begins the paradox of freedom.

Leading the list of modern philosophers whose ideas Dr. Macquarrie incorporated into his analysis, Macquarrie developed Sartre's conception of the human being as one who separates himself from the world of things.

Man, no longer at the mercy of the adaptive forces of evolution, asserts his independence of nature. He now adapts his environment to his own benefit, instead of the reverse order of authority. While an animal is free in the sense of the "freedom of the wild," the animal lives in total biological determinism. Man on the other hand, in a negation of nature itself, has transcended his biological nature and now lives both determined (subject to laws of nature and finitude) and free.

This freedom, by its very nature, has no empirical characteristics and is therefore always a mystery and something illusive. The full awareness of freedom comes only in the depths of decision. After the moment of decision, the consequences of the decision became the annals of history. Hence the significance of freedom.

Macquarrie compared a decision done in freedom with the Christian creation *ex nihilo*. As

God created something out of nothing, so too men create something (a free action) out of the "nothing" of freedom. Foremost among the things man creates is man himself. Man is thus, according to Macquarrie, the co-creator with God of himself.

Macquarrie then parenthaseed by asking what evidence we have for maintaining that man's freedom is qualitatively different from that of animals. He begins by agreeing that we cannot "prove" the reality of freedom, because it is an empirically oriented scientific something. But freedom is the presupposition of all arguments, judgements, and moral decisions. A denial of freedom dissolves these real things to mere random happenings instead of acts.

Macquarrie next drew from several famous existentialists. Kirkegaard identifies this anxiety as the dizziness of freedom when

Continued on page two

BSU Protests Sanskrit Article

by susan cole.

Amidst a general feeling of TGIF the Sanskrit spring issue was distributed Friday morning, March 15. By noon all issues had been recalled by the editor and several hundred had been confiscated by the Black Student Union.

Contained in this issue was a story by Bill Holder entitled "Fucking a Nigger on Saturday Night". The plot involved the rape of a black woman by a small town white man. The BSU was offended by the material and felt that the contents and implications they carried outweighed the artistic value.

A conference was called at 3 p.m. in the Cone Student Union for the Sanskrit and BSU to state their positions. Dean of Students, Dean Rash, and Associate Dean of Students, Betty Chafin were present to represent the administration and keep the meeting in order.

Dean Rash stated that the administration would not attempt to censor the media, but at the same time, would not support any act that would alienate different groups on campus.

In stating the Sanskrit's

position, editor Jeffrey Beam said the story was not meant to offend, "My own personal feelings were that the story was problack and that the black girl was raped and that after that scene I felt very sympathetic with that girl, as much as a white person could."

He apologized for the misunderstanding, saying that perhaps the title was unrepresentative of the story but added that he would not support changing the story.

In defense of their position the BSU made a statement that they would not try to censor the Sanskrit but felt that Beam should have added an explanation of the story showing that it was not meant to be racist.

After this statement the conference was dismissed as the BSU left the room. Member of the BSU gathered several hundred copies of the controversial Sanskrit and burned them in trash barrels in the middle of the campus.

Editor Beam is working at present on a distribution plan which will probably be implemented later this week.