

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.
ERNEIE McCRARY, EDITOR
JACK HARRINGTON, BUSINESS MANAGER

'They Wouldn't Understand'

Most Carolina students think the Student Peace Union is an odious organization.

We disagree.

Odorous is a better word.

This august assemblage has made many intellectual and artistic contributions to the campus of the University. About three years ago, for instance, they showed their concern for the historic buildings at Carolina by inscribing them with painted facsimiles of the SPU emblem.

But their enthusiasm did not stop there. Through the years they have shown their constructive dedication by picketing the Naval Armory, writing clever sayings on the steps of South Building, picketing South Building, writing clever sayings on the steps of the Naval Armory, picketing President Friday, and writing clever sayings on the steps of President Friday's home.

During 1965 Orientation Week they even took note of the fact that many incoming freshmen were depressed and discouraged about their new life at the University. Staging an elaborate extravaganza with the Hound Dog Missile in Y-Court, they provided a refreshing comic relief from the monotonous grind of registration.

We've got to admit it. Up till yesterday, they were a pretty funny group.

At that time, SPU chairman Charles (Chuck) Schunior of Evanston, Illinois, announced the manner in which he hopes to see the "International Days of Peace" observed in Chapel Hill.

On October 15 and 16 (today and tomorrow), the Peace Union is urging all local residents to forego one meal and eat soup instead. This effort is in conjunction with the International Days of Protest, a worldwide call for demonstrations from the "Viet Nam Day Committee of Berkeley." During these two days, massive "demonstrations" and acts of civil disobedience will be staged on four continents and in over 30 American cities to protest U.S. aggression in Viet Nam.

SPU chairman Schunior pointed out quite clearly why his group has decided on using the "fasting" tactics in Chapel Hill.

"People would notice a huge demonstration," he remarked, "but they wouldn't understand it in a political and moral context."

You are right, Mr. Schunior. They wouldn't understand it.

They wouldn't understand why American students — students blessed with the liberties that are unique in our Republic — would want to undermine the efforts of those who are seeking to preserve our liberties. They wouldn't understand how even the most disrespected element on campus could find the stomach to direct its bitter fanaticism against other young Americans who are dying for them in Viet Nam.

No, Mr. Schunior, they wouldn't understand it all.

So, it seems, you settled on the soup idea. You decided to ask people to fast and save their money and give their money to you, and, ultimately you would to CARE. No one is insensitive to the plights of starvation.

The SPU must have realized that no one objects to CARE. No one is insensitive to the blights of starvation and sickness that exist around the globe today. No one can tolerate the sight of a needless death.

Some of us, however, grow a little nervous when the SPU becomes the middleman for the money.

It is a well-known fact that booths were set up at the recent Peace March on Washington at which campus radicals could pledge aid — both personal and financial — to the forces of the Viet Cong. The possibility that Carolina students might indirectly be furnishing similar aid is both repulsive and frightening.

Mr. Schunior pointed out that a political booth will be set up in Y-Court for discussion of the beliefs of the SPU. We think this is a healthy idea and we urge all thoughtful Carolina students to drop by and ask a few pertinent questions.

Just don't stand too close.

Armistead Maupin, Jr.

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Ernie McCrary, editor; John Jennrich, associate editor; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thoms, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Rohl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobel, ad. mgr.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all ap news dispatches.

"Man, What A Relief, Like I Thought It Said 'Soap'"



Liberal Comment

More Public Opinion Polls On Section 14(b)

By ROBERT KEISER

Mr. Hennessey: "But these open shop men say they're for unions."

Mr. Dooley: "Shure, if properly conducted. No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly in wages 'an dam few mimbbers.'" Thus, Finley Peter Dunne cogently expresses a liberal's reaction to attacks on the union shop. Conservatives, such as William Otis writing in the DTH, however, argue with some facts and figures and raise some important questions, and liberals must deal with these.

Supposedly, one poll has illustrated that 67 per cent of the electorate feel that "an individual should have the right to hold a job regardless of his affiliation (or non-affiliation) with a union." Such a figure suggests that President Johnson and a majority of both houses of Congress want to repeal 14(B) against the will of the overwhelming majority of the American people. On the other hand, if we consider the results of a June Gallup poll, we discover entirely different results. Asked: "Do you think a person should or should not be required to join a union if he works in a unionized factory or business?", 49 per cent, less than an absolute majority, answered one should not be required to join a union, and almost as many, 43 per cent, said one should be required.

Even these figures, however, do not capture the realities of public opinion. In fact, many of the people who responded to the poll could care less about 14(B), and if we measure intensity of attitudes, we probably would find a majority of the strongly-concerned favor repeal. Ohio and California Republicans discovered this by suffering stunning defeats in the 1958 elections when they made "right to work" a major issue in their campaigns.

Otis' figures on union growth are no more relevant. What if unions have grown proportionately more in the open-shop states? This is to be expected; they are the states with the most workers available to be organized. What liberals argue is that the repeal of 14(B) would increase the rate of union growth to a much larger level.

Conservatives disagree with this approach because they believe the union shop violates individual freedom. And we must admit it does take some amount of freedom away from the worker. Yet, before we get all excited, we should examine the problem of freedom more fully. The only restriction placed upon a worker concerns the payment of dues in a plant where a majority of his fellow workers have voted for the union shop. He still can refuse to join the union or take part in picketing, and he can even cross a picket line. In addition, he can participate in union activities and he can try to persuade a majority of his fellow workers to terminate the union shop.

Moreover, we must consider other freedoms to promote in work life. Those who espouse the "right to work" should support a full employment policy, guaranteeing every American a job, maybe even a decent job. Second, effort could be generated to increase the worker's freedom of control over his work life — over matters like type of work, procedures of doing it, and other working conditions. And third, adequate wages are necessary if the worker is to possess the freedom to seek a more creative life for himself and his family. Freedoms such as these mean much more to the worker than the trivial freedom of 14(B), and unions, despite all their faults have led the fight for many of these.

In the opinion of many, an individual should not be required to pay dues to a

union, because some are corrupt. But good unions should not be injured on account of bad ones; the solution to this problem is not 14(B), but stricter corrupt practice acts and a better educated worker. Yet, it is argued that good unions should not need the union shop, and if they do, this only reflects upon the worth of unions. To say the least, this is a hard requirement to place on an organization whose function involves conflict and bargaining with a powerful opponent. Workers, unfortunately, or less educated, more apathetic and less likely to participate in organizations than are middle-class people. Even a good union, therefore, can be seriously injured by the prohibition of the union shop. To admit this does not question the worth of unions; rather it casts judgment on a society which allows so many of its members to be unprepared and unfit for democracy.

More than anything else, the repeal of 14(B) has symbolic value. For years, business has thought the South to be a last refuge from unions, and labor has resigned itself to this, also. If 14(B) is repealed, labor leaders might believe they have a chance here, and increase their organizing activities. Unions possibly could educate the working-class whites and the Negroes on their common economic interests, and this would make the South a center of liberal action. Then, we really could begin to talk about individual freedom. That's why we desire to repeal 14(B), and failure this year does not preclude success in the next one — Everett McKinley Dirksen notwithstanding.

Robert P. Lucas
308 Aycock

End The Battle

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

I feel that this nonsense involving the Nurses' Dorm should come to a crashing halt. As Miss St. John (President of Nurses' Dorm) pointed out in her letter of October 13th, the names of the mystical foursome do not appear in her roster or I might add, in the yearbook either.

Thus it is becoming increasingly obvious that some joker is playing the gaddy and trying to create disharmony for its own sake. And it's deplorable to see your staff cartoonist continue to stultify himself by his fatuous sketches.

Let us then bring this internecine dichotomy to its deserved finale and stop pitting male against female. There are other very serious problems affecting this University that need to be discussed and debated. Let us drop this childish pettyness and move ahead to the really important issues confronting Carolina.

Hugh Owens
11 Vance

ANDY CAPP



Letters To The Editor

Recall Petitioners Should Present Student Leaders

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Since the first article concerning the Dickson case was published, nothing of importance has been added. The case presented at that time by a group of student leaders has merely been knocked around in a mud-slinging controversy. I was not a student here at UNC last year as I was on active duty in the U. S. Navy. Therefore, I feel that I have no say in regard to the Dickson case itself. However, when the reputation of this University is at stake, then it is of great importance to me. The Dickson case seems to be growing statewide attention more and more each day. Conscientious citizens are beginning to question this case. It is time for action.

First of all, the Dickson case has never fully been presented to the student body. I have learned a few more facts each day by reading the newspapers from nearby cities. It seems that they know more about what is happening at this University than the students. If the student leaders who advised Dickson to resign his resignation did so out of concern for the Student Government, then they should present the case. They have failed to follow through in their belief, unless this was just a hoax to make themselves appear in a better light to the student body. It is their responsibility to see that the student body is given an unbiased explanation of both sides of this case. They assumed this responsibility when they asked Dickson to resign on behalf of the student body. If there is to be a recall petition circulated among the student body, then it should originate from these same student leaders and not from any Tom, Dick or Harry on campus who might hold a grudge against Dickson. Several of these petitioners have come knocking at my door, but they do not represent any responsible group, political or otherwise.

The Dickson case has become like a rolling stone which will cause an avalanche unless it is stopped. The student body will not let it slow down, nor will the citizens of this state. They are becoming concerned about what type of institution they are supporting. Furthermore, no worthwhile legislation will be completed by the Student Government until this matter is cleaned up once and for all. It will remain a constant thorn in anything they attempt to accomplish.

Therefore, I challenge those student leaders who requested Dickson to resign. I challenge them to carry through with the responsibility they assumed. I challenge them to stop this rolling stone which they started. For if they do not, then the burden rests upon their shoulders and not Dickson's. Dickson has presented his case. Now the student body must present their case, either in a "vote of confidence" or else in a recall of the student president. There is no other road.

Robert P. Lucas
308 Aycock

Story Importance Is Key To News

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

"Hey, you're supposed to be on our side!"

So say some Student Government officials when The Daily Tar Heel tosses barbs next door.

"Play it down. It could hurt the University." Instead, the DTH gives the story banner headlines.

"Scandal-sheet newspapering! We told you to play that story down. Don't play it up again."

Attempts at arm twisting such as that statement are common in newspapering. They are generally matters of form — points of honor to groups whose interests are being pickled in printing ink. The arm-twisting groups know they won't succeed, and the newspapers ignore them.

However, so much squealing has come from some SG leaders recently that it seems they really think The Daily Tar Heel is abusing its function.

This only shows a misunderstanding of the DTH's purpose. The Daily Tar Heel is not in business to promote the best interests of Student Government or the University. It tries to do both those things, but it is in business to report the news.

The Daily Tar Heel should not play down news out of concern for the University. A university newspaper should determine the play it will give a story by weighing two factors: importance of the story and student interest in the events concerned. Any story that commands great student interest and is important to the future of the University should be given full play — banner headlines and all.

LETTERS

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters should be typed, double spaced and include the name and address of sender. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length.

True, a story may be withheld until the likelihood of unnecessary damage is at a minimum. But, once a story is printed, it should be played according to its newsworthiness. That's journalistic honesty.

If SG leaders realize that The Daily Tar Heel is a real newspaper and not just a Student Government subsidiary, then the squealing should stop. The DTH cannot regard some institutions as "more equal than others." Its barbs may hit next door as well as in Raleigh.

Mike Jennings
324 Aycock

The Great Tow

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Jay Brilliant has blasted the traffic cops in a recent critique of the October 2 dragnet towaway. In part he is griping about "undefined and imaginary borders of the insufficient spaces allotted." What struck me, however, was not his resentment of the regulations and their enforcement, but his flamboyant descriptions of both the style in which the towaway was executed, and of the copper mentality that lies behind this style.

A rather sagacious analysis of police attitudes is implicit in Brilliant's observations. The dragnet towaway shared many stylistic peculiarities with the bombing of North Viet Nam, Operation Match, and any number of similar activities. It was suffused with the same preoccupation with smooth, machine-like coordination at all levels of command, the same painstaking preparation to insure success in all contingencies and to muffle obstructive criticism by secrecy before the fact and inflated verbiage after (front page article on Tuesday, October 5), the same organizational pride in whipping chaos into order, subjugating nature, or overcoming natural human lethargy and self-centeredness, the same compulsion to actually use a system once it has been established.

What I object to is Brilliant's unwillingness to let the policeman have his fun. Dragnet towaways and similar police operations are the only sources of ego exaltation the profession provides. Admittedly, towing charges are annoying in themselves, but Brilliant should have stomachached the ego degradation which seems to have nauseated him worse than the charges.

Isn't the policeman entitled to something? Should we criticize the corner cop for the thoroughly human desire to experience in a small way the satisfactions of operational command, as long as the results of the operation satisfy the public's interest?

Aside from the simple justice involved, it would certainly be unwise to do anything that would weaken the appeal of operational command, for it is precisely by governmental and corporate operations that we are inadvertently laying the foundation of mass economic affluence on which we can build a truly humanistic society one day long after I have given up the ghost.

Bill Michaux
1018 Morrison

Baboonery

Quote of the Week—By Dr. John Buettner Janusch of Duke University, as he prepared to embark on a long-term study of prosimians:

I enjoy working with baboons and lemurs because the baboons remind me of my colleagues on university faculties and the lemurs remind me of undergraduates. Lemurs are bright-eyed, bushy-tailed and can't believe the world is the way it is. Baboons, on the other hand, are intelligent, sociable, clever, untidy and you can't trust them.