

The Daily Tar Heel

Second Class Postage Paid at Chapel Hill, N. C.

How Not To Succeed In Politics

Now we have seen everything.

The Daily Tar Heel, in its 72 years, has never failed to hit the streets. Good or bad, liked or disliked, it has appeared with inspiring regularity, often despite a multitude of difficulties.

Friday night, however, someone got the idea that this tradition was in danger. At approximately 11 p.m., a delegation of self-appointed printer's apprentices arrived at the Chapel Hill Weekly's shop, where the DTH is printed.

To say they looked like "something the cat dragged in" would be extremely complimentary. They were, in short, disheveled and dirty.

When a DTH staff member questioned them, he found that they were supporters of a campus candidate. They were there to "make sure the paper got out," because it contained an article favorable to their man. Apparently, they had fears that the opposition would snatch the paper from the presses and burn it . . . or something.

Our staffer told them to vamoose, assured them that the paper would appear just as it has since 1893, and added that no one would be allowed to interfere with the precious article backing their candidate. He further reminded them that the paper would not be distributed until 4 a.m.

The strangers said they would wait.

They were dispatched to the other side of the street, and there they waited, chatting with the candidate, who had arrived on the scene.

Now our staff members began to have gnawing doubts about the purposes of the "protectionists." Accordingly, two of them decided to stay on.

Ironically, both the infiltrators and our staffers fell asleep. While they snoozed, the circulation manager came and went, and the DTH was circulated in perfectly regular fashion.

About 6 a.m. our staffers awakened to find the papers already distributed. The night visitors, however, were still waiting.

The opportunity was too great to pass up. Our two staff members proceeded to gather several stacks of old Chapel Hill Weekly editions, placing them furtively in the back of a truck. They drove off with the night riders in hot pursuit (in a hearse, no less).

After a half-hour's merry chase all over Chapel Hill, our staffers decided enough was enough. They stopped, showed their pursuers the contents of the truck, and informed them that the DTH was where it should be — namely, in front of residence hall doors, etc.

Apparently, this display of unmitigated honesty by our staffers was too much for the cynics to take, and they went home cursing. Our staffers went home and laughed themselves to sleep.

Yes, now we have seen everything.

The Presidential Candidates

By PETE WALES
Associate Editor

The Great Debate fizzled Friday.

Both presidential candidates were there, speeches in hand, but the audience was not. Those who came were largely party workers and other candidates.

Dickson had substance but was not eloquent. Carson had eloquence but no substance. If we had to judge, we'd say Dickson came out slightly ahead on the questions. But then most of the questions were from his side.

What it boiled down to was a specious exchange as to who started which idea or program.

One thing did become apparent though.

We had heard that Carson was trying to ride Spearman's coattails. Now we suspect he may be trying to ride Dickson's as well.

His speech began as expected.

There was reference to the record and how he had "watched" Spearman at work. There were words about Campus Radio, the project with which Carson has spent most of his time this year.

Then he lapsed into a few programs which we could have sworn were originally brought up by Dickson earlier in the campaign. He started talking about student discounts and a fair prices commission. These are things SP vice-presidential candidate Don Wilson has been working on all year and which started out in the SP platform.

There was a marked contrast in the two speeches, however. Running all through Dickson's

proposals were subjects vital to the University and students — issues of great importance to the quality of education here and the role of students in obtaining and improving it.

Carson's emphasis, on the other hand, was with more mundane items — problems of the student's physical comfort rather than those of his mind.

It is this basic difference in approach to Student Government, coupled with our awareness of the very small role Carson has played in the Spearman administration, that brings me to endorse Dickson as the best man.

What has made Spearman's year so great is that the President has been able to deal effectively with all the administrative trivia and produce substantive ideas and programs at the same time.

Largely with the help of his vastly underrated assistant, Mike Chanin, Spearman has had Student Government running at peak efficiency and has successfully initiated numerous worthwhile programs such as the Fine Arts Festival and the Residence College Project.

All this presumes that he had some ideas to start with.

Paul Dickson is much more in the tradition of Bob Spearman than is Carson.

In Spearman's administration, Carson has been little more than a glorified committee chairman. Legislators on both sides agree that he is the most ineffective and lax Speaker of Legislature in the last five years.

At the same time, in the same administration, Dickson has been cranking out still new ideas for new programs and improvement of old ones.

Not all his ideas are in acceptable form, but at least he's thinking.

Dickson also has the courage to take stands when he believes in an idea.

We can never forget the statement Carson issued to the DTH on the NSA referendum. For several days, both sides had counted him as one of them. The non-committal statement made both sides mad and settled nothing.

This lack of backbone cannot be tolerated in a President.

Clearly then, Dickson has the qualities of leadership so obviously missing in Carson.

But what about getting things done?

Here we have had to look at the men around both candidates. It is the underclassmen of each party that will be doing the work and carrying out the ideas of the leadership next year.

Almost man for man, we find more capable people, more people who have been instrumental in carrying out Spearman's programs, in the Student Party.

The University Party is truly the party of Spearman. All its most effective personnel are graduating.

Not only are the younger members of the Student Party better men, but those who have graduated are still around in law school and in the nether reaches of Student Government, still contributing behind the scenes.

Bob Spearman will be in Oxford next year. Don Curtis will be out making his first million. Where will Carson turn?

If any criticism can be leveled at Spearman-Chanin, Inc., it is that they have not provided for the future in terms of their own party. They have nurtured many good men and women, but they have been from the other side of the aisle.

LETTERS

TO THE EDITORS

More Freedom Without Clauses

Editors, The Tar Heel:

My position opposing fraternity bigotry has been sharply criticized in recent weeks. It seems somewhat academic now to comment on the University's right to outlaw discriminatory clauses, since they have already been outlawed. But two other issues have been raised in the discussions of the last weeks, and these issues deserve further thought.

First, the question has been asked: will abolishing bigoted clauses do any good in abolishing the practice of bigotry? David Owen, for example, in his letter to the DTH was extremely pessimistic about any practical effects of the ban on discriminatory clauses.

It seems to me hard to predict the results of the Faculty Council action. But we all should know by now that rules can shape men's hearts — for better and for worse. What was unacceptable before legislation can become acceptable afterward.

Attitudes do change, as recent studies of the American South have shown. Part of the process of change is for leaders to take a new position thereby making that position more acceptable to others.

Instead of arguing that it is hopeless to fight bigotry, Mr. Owen should have argued that because bigotry is difficult to uproot we must fight it harder and more persistently. We should regard the outlawing of discriminatory clauses as merely the beginning of the fight.

From this point on, the fraternities and sororities should be responsible for ending bigotry in practice. If this does not happen, hopefully the University will take further action.

This brings me to the second issue: what is liberty? Much of the defense of fraternity bigotry has been made in the name of "liberty."

It is said that "freedom" will suffer if fraternities are "forced" to accept people they do not want to accept. How sad and ironic it is to hear people defend freedom in this way while at the same time they remain slaves to antiquated customs.

The discriminatory clauses and all they stand for are a

profound restriction on freedom. Only those who wear the blinders of bigotry cannot see this. The clauses decisively restrict the freedom of thought and the freedom of experience of the fraternity and sorority members themselves. These clauses say, in effect: "Negroes are not like us. Jews are not like us. Catholics are not like us. Non-Anglo-Saxons are not like us."

But how do bigoted fraternities know these things are true? They have ruled out any way of actually testing the validity of clauses which were not even of their own making. This is the very essence of prejudice. It is "pre-judging" an issue on irrelevant grounds — grounds that make it impossible to discover that the truth may be different than we presupposed.

The pity in the struggle over discriminatory clauses is that the fraternity members whose freedom might be most expanded are the strongest opponents of the new rule. Now that the rule is passed perhaps it will stir new ideas in those who thought that in the word "nigger" they could sum up reality.

Lewis Lipsitz
Dept. of Political
Science

Light Explains TV Revolving Fund

Editors, The Tar Heel:

During the recent campaign for Student Body Treasurer, some confusion has arisen over the Student Government policy and practice of replacing residence hall TV sets.

Eight sets were to be replaced each year, enabling each residence hall to replace its TV set every four years.

Accordingly, last year's Treasurer, Dick Akers, authorized accordingly, last year's Treasurer six sets have already been replaced; the remaining two will be replaced in the next two and a half months.

The reason for not replacing all eight sets at once is quite simple. This life of a TV set is somewhat unpredictable, and leeway was needed for the unexpected. Two good examples may be taken from this. The Ehringhaus set was stolen, and the estimated repair bill for the Avery TAV was almost half the cost of a new set.

James W. Light
Treasurer, Student
Body