

The Daily Tar Heel

75 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor
 Donald Walton, Business Manager
 Terry Gingras, Managing Editor
 Rebel Good, News Editor
 Shari Willis, Features Editor
 Dale Gibson, Sports Editor
 Joe Sanders, Associate Editors
 Dick Levy
 Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager



Student Enterprise Needed At Carolina

The South Campus bus experiment represents an important victory for student initiative at UNC.

Congratulations are in order for John McMurray and Bill Darrah. Due largely to their perseverance the bus system has concluded a profitable and efficient first week.

To be sure, there remain several areas of concern, such as whether South Campus students should have to pay to ride to class just because they live so far away. They do, after all, attend the same university as everyone else in Chapel Hill.

But these questions can be settled by fall. The system has already shown itself remarkably open to improvement, as seen by its overnight expansion to include Franklin Street, Victory Village, and Parker-Teague-Avery in the route.

The primary reason for supporting the bus line, however, is that it is student owned and operated. The implications of the status extend far beyond the buses.

Many of the ills which have plagued this campus for years or even generations are economic in nature. Who remembers a year gone by when complaints were not heard concerning the Book Exchange or the downtown merchants or taxis? Yet, as an advertisement in the buses reminds us, the transportation system represents a triumph over obstacles of long standing.

These grievances have remained largely unredressed because the economic framework of this campus has always been "state socialism." If a service is to be provided either the Administrator for student government must garner the proceeds or there will be no service. Some few, specialized services have functioned privately, but these comprise only a small percentage of the total local economy.

Philosophically, who owns or runs what is irrelevant pertaining to what already exists. But creating an oligopoly by restricting competition is relevant when needed services are not provided.

Richardson Program Relevant To Students

The Richardson Fellows program is about to enter its second year at Carolina.

The birthday of most institutions is hardly newsworthy. But in the first year of its existence the Richardson program has proved itself to be among the most valuable experiences on campus.

There are, of course, other programs at UNC which are ostensibly geared to acknowledge and reward future leaders. The most famous is the Morehead Scholarship program.

The Richardson Fellowships go beyond any of these in providing meaning to the lives of the selected individuals. Not only that the Foundation chooses so few to participate. Or even that the selection committee is comprised of established leaders in various fields.

What is significant about the Richardson program is that it

initiative at Carolina are, of course, the Umstead Act and the Trustee Regulations. Together, they effectively prohibit individual students, and in many cases student government also, from undertaking financial ventures on this campus.

These must be attacked in the courts if the efficiency gained by allowing free competition is to be realized.

Until then other action is necessary. Several alternatives could be followed, each of which would allow unobstructed entry into the market here at UNC.

The first possibility is to incorporate student government. This would allow the Umstead Act to be bypassed and would enable student funds to be used to compete, if desired, with the Book Ex or other merchants on a large scale.

Or a stock conglomerate corporation could be formed, consisting of a series of ventures run by students for profit.

But the most important alternative would also be the simplest. That is: encourage vigorous activity by any groups of students interested in providing any sort of marketable good or service.

Within this context one can see that the bus system should remain in student hands. A Board of Directors should be formed consisting of students and faculty and competent members of the administration with students mandating the course to be followed. Individuals running the system would be students, paid either by salary or by incentive.

The opportunities thus opened for students interested in business enterprises would be tremendous. More important, student control would maximize responsiveness of the bus system to student wishes.

This same principle must be broadened. Wherever gaps exist, student entrepreneurs should rush in to fill them.

If we are to solve our problems, we must rely on no one else. The bus system has shown that if you want something done at Carolina, there is no better way than to do it yourself.

The prime inhibitors of private



Mike Cozza

Nixon, Kennedy Turn Tables

Richard Nixon has never been noted for his pragmatism in dealing with urban problems and race relations. As a matter of fact, most observers have felt that Nixon has been purposely catering to southern convention delegates by maintaining a conservative position on these issues.

A week and a half ago, however, Nixon went on nation-wide television with a policy statement that surprised most of the political analysts so much that they didn't really know what to say about it.

Basically, Nixon's approach to the problems combined his old conservative belief in free enterprise with a new pragmatism and a sense of hope. It was a strange blend.

"For too long," Nixon said, "white America has sought to buy off the Negro—and to buy off its own sense of guilt—with ever more programs of welfare, of public housing, of payments to the poor . . . payments that kept the endless, dismal cycle of dependency spinning from one generation to another."

That was the old Nixon talking. But then, right in the middle of his speech, the newest "new Nixon" appeared.

"Our task, our challenge," he asserted, "is to break this cycle of dependency, and the time to begin is now."

John Taylor

Summit On Floor 10

The sign over the elevators read "10th Floor House Meeting Tonight. Everybody come." At the appointed time, the witching hour, the door swung solemnly and majestically open and in walked the house president. There were four guys studying in the social room. Nobody else was there.

The president surveyed the scene and beat a retreat, muttering as he left the room, "This is discouraging." The four in the room apparently had not read the sign, or had forgotten about the meeting, for none of them could figure out what it actually was that was discouraging.

The president returned in a few moments with the elected house officers and announced, "You guys have just been drafted."

"For what", one of the four replied.

"For the house meeting." The president waited a few minutes as a few arrived and took their seats. Then he rapped on the table with an empty ginger ale bottle and announced that the meeting would come to order. But it never really did. Most of those present knew one or two of the others, and the assembly grouped up and stared across the room at each other. There were three orders of business, none of which were resolved, and innumerable wisecracks about everything under the sun. The time came to appoint a committee and everyone in the room suddenly remembered homework that was

Nixon went on to elaborate an exciting partnership of private industry and the federal government which would "develop the opportunities that lie untrapped in our underdeveloped urban heartland."

In short, he was proposing a program of incentives for private industry, "to make acceptable the added risks of ghetto development and of training the unemployed for jobs."

What's even more surprising than that, Nixon even had something good to say about the black militants.

"Much of the black militant talk these days," he declared, "is actually in terms far closer to the doctrines of free enterprise than those of the welfarist '30's—terms of pride, ownership, private enterprise, capital—the same qualities . . . that for two centuries have been at the heart of American success."

And the former Vice-president even declared that his proposals were oriented toward "more black ownership, for from this can flow the rest: black pride, black jobs, and, yes, Black Power—in the best sense of that often misapplied term."

It's hard to say what the political repercussions of Nixon's new policy will be among those southern convention

delegates, but there is already evidence that it has been met with interest by members of the northern, black community.

In fact many black leaders are now saying they might even support Nixon if he constructively builds his new policy and convinces them of his sincerity.

While it may seem strange that Richard Nixon has moved to the left on the urban problems, it is perhaps stranger that Bobby Kennedy is suddenly moving to the right, seemingly to the position that most people thought was Nixon's a few months ago.

Speaking in a late telecast the night before last Tuesday's Indiana primary, Kennedy stated his position on problems in the cities.

He spoke in generalities, putting emphasis in two particular areas. First was insistence on law and order and the assertion that violence in the cities was "unacceptable." Second was the declaration that the "federal bureaucracy in Washington" was becoming too large to meet the needs of the people.

Evidently Kennedy was trying to make a last minute appeal for conservative votes in Indiana because he feared Senator McCarthy had already sewed up many of the liberals.

It's hard to imagine Bobby Kennedy appealing to conservatives, but we'll have to admit that this has been a topsy-turvy political year that's been full of surprises.

First McCarthy almost won in New Hampshire, then Johnson suddenly dropped out of contention, and good old northern-liberal-ADA Hubert Humphrey suddenly became the darling of the South.

Now Richard Nixon and Bobby Kennedy are switching positions on a major campaign issue.

What in the world will happen next?

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed, double-spaced and signed. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.

In Letters

A Liberal Answers

To the Editor:

It's funny how a lot of people who would do anything in their power to cure a sick dog or cow would prefer to shoot a man who becomes a criminal or rioter. "Humanitarians" like Henry J. Taylor of the Richmond Times Dispatch call it "sick sentimentality" when someone suggests that the rest of us might be at least partly responsible because some of our fellow men are unwilling or unable to obey the laws of society.

Let us assume for a moment that criminals and rioters are what they are solely because of their own cussedness and unwillingness to "shape up." What do we do about them? The obvious answer seems to be to punish them to make them get in line.

Unfortunately, this kind of treatment works with only a very small number of criminals; we have several hundred years of evidence from here and abroad to show this. What do we do with those who won't respond to punishment? Lock them up permanently or shoot them, it seems.

Now one suspects that Mr. Taylor is secretly in favor of the second alternative, and that wouldn't be surprising when you consider that the Mayor of Chicago, no less, is in favor of this method of dealing with arsonists and looters. But if you pressed Mr. Taylor he would probably show himself a "humanitarian" and opt for the choice of locking them up and throwing away the key.

But what a dismaying choice to have to make: putting thousands of lazy, good-for-nothings permanently on "relief" in prison! Granted you might get a little work out of them, if you applied enough force, but it's doubtful that they would pay their own way.

Many people realized some time ago that the solutions just proposed don't work, but there are always a large number of "conservatives" around, like Mr. Taylor, who insist that the way to progress is to repeat the failures of the past. As a liberal, I'm inclined to attribute this tendency on their part to cussedness and unwillingness to "shape up," but, instead, I take a "permissive" attitude toward conservatives and say that they are simply products of their environment.

I also feel that I'm responsible for Mr. Taylor's environment being what it is, and I'm going to do what I can to change conditions in this country in a peaceful, democratic way.

There are a lot of people today who say that the conservatives in the establishment have been given every opportunity to get an education and learn what this country needs, and that they have done nothing to better themselves. These radicals insist that the establishment must be punished and its activities disrupted to make it get in line.

And, they say, if the power structure won't respond to punishment, then the only solution is to have a revolution. We must either shoot those who won't cooperate with the revolution, or lock them up and throw away the key.

But I am a liberal, so I take a "permissive" attitude toward these radicals and say . . .

Yours truly
 Tom Cabarga
 Chapel Hill, N.C.



The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publications Board, daily except Mondays, examinations periods and vacations.

Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1060, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514.

Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.

Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.

From the Minnesota Daily