The Baily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom Wayne Hurder, Editor Bill Staton, Business Manager



Dale Gibson, Managing Editor Rebel Good, News Editor Joe Sanders, Features Editor Owen Davis, Sports Editor Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager

Library Treats Students Unjustly In Cutback

The UNC library has committed a gross injustice against 26 of its employes, an injustice they should not allow to continue.

Because of overhiring on the part of the library this year, it has decided to cut back on the number of hours its student employes can work.

What does that mean for the students? It means that the students, many of whom have determined their budgets on the basis of the number of hours the library had earlier told them told could work are in a financial bind, a serious one.

The order from the library officials is particularly damaging to those students who are on a work-study program; they get one dollar for every hour they work. Thus, when their time is cut, instead of losing a \$1.60 an hour, they are losing the \$2.60 an hour they had counted on making.

So what's the reaction of the Library officials who are making the students pay because they miscalculated? They seem to think the students can get jobs elsewhere to make up for the cut in time.

That's an absurdity, as many of

the students who had their time cut back found out last Monday. Many of the 26 went by the Student Aid office to find out what job opportunities were available. The answer: none.

What now? As one student lamented, "I cannot take out a loan; I am already up to my ears in debts. It's going to be a struggle to make it through the year."

The library might have hired less people at the start of the year and then hired some more during the year if it found some of the workers quit. But no, they couldn't do that; they had to take chances with the finances of those students who depend on working a certain amount every week in order to get through school.

Rather than punish these 26 students for their own shortsightedness the library should accept the punishment involved in messing up their budget in order to keep their promise to these students that they can work a certain number of hours per week. The library should immediately start letting these 26 persons work the number of hours it said they could work when it hired them.

Politicization Of Masses By Radicals A Futile Effort

From the Harvard Crimson

RADICALS view American society as being dominated by a relatively small group of people-an elite, more or less tightly co-ordinated, that benefits considerably from the present system. Under this upper crust lies a vast semi-oppressed white lumpenproletariat and a clearly oppressed black proletariat.

Such an analysis of the situation leads a radical to the conclusion that his tactics should be to politicize the masses so they recognize that their class-interest is being thwarted by a tiny minority.

So the Progressive Labor type cuts his hair, puts on a T-shirt, and goes to work in a facotory so he can talk to the workers and educate them about their true plight. The fallacy of such an approach lies in the assumption that the process of converting someone else to one's own beliefs is a purely intellectual one. It is wrong to suppose that all one has to do is to present the worker with facts and figures and expect him to be "educated" into understanding that his real enemy is the capitalist establishment. It is a myth that a lifetime of cultural and social indoctrination can be nullified by any cool and rational expose.

The amazing ease with which George Wallace has managed to divert the attentions of the working-class from real inequities to imagined and irrelevant ones demonstrates the power of values that have been long instilled. When the working class man frets about his "high" taxes, he does not pause to worry about the loopholes by which the rich escape paying anything like a fair share because he is preoccupied instead with the thought that his money is being given out in some fraction to welfare recipients. He is more suspectible to the latter viewpoint because all his life he has been taught to believe that a man should work for himself to amass as much wealth as he can in ceaseless competition with everybody else.

The radicals have correctly identified their constiuency-the

people who are attracted today to Wallace-but they have no way of reaching these people. This disjunction has crippled the American social movement.

Moreover, even if the Left miraculously managed to stimulate the working class to full class-consciousness and succeeded in pulling off a social revolution to supplant the old elites with a workers socialist state, there is no assurance that a solution would have been affected.

From our meager knowledge of socialist states in practice (quite apart from what Marxist theory predicts) and the dismal history of the Soviet Union in particular, it is likely that another stultifying bureaucracy and an intolerant, repressive system would emerge in this country. The problem of alienation from a society that is based on the dehumanizing principle of competition between humans will not automatically disappear in a state which places the worker's interests before those of other classes. In the Soviet Union in fact other classes have sprung up and this development is inevitable as long as there has been no fundamental change in the prevailing value-system. The task before us is not to create a new kind of state but a new kind of

AND THE only place to start is with yourself. The principles of the good society aimed at creating what Fidel Castro calls the "communist consciousness" have already been glimpsed by many people. This has been the great spiritual contribution of the hippies to the American political thrust of today. Unselfishness, generosity, no hangups about one's personal possessions-this is the faith on which the improvement of future human societies depends. Along with these go the quintessentially hippie virtues of individual self-creativity and confident self-expression, a reverence for beauty, a gentleness and openness in one's dealings with others, an unwillingness to submit to rigid schedules.

Mike Cozza

'Conservative Trend' Is Guff

We've heard a lot of talk lately about the conservative trend in American politics. And that's all it is-talk.

The people who are promoting this so-called "swing to the right" have some clever arguments to prove its existence. But they will not stand up to cool, udicious scrutiny.

In describing their trend, the conservatives will tell you that it began just before the 1966 election, when Americans first became disenchanted with the Great Society. They will tell you how Americans realized the futility of

If given a free choice, 57 per cent of American votes would prefer someone other than the three major candidates.'

liberal programs and voted in a crop of

Republican conservatives. But they will be wrong. The leading Republicans elected in 1966 were New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller, New York City Mayor John Lindsay, Oregon Senator Mark Hatfield, Illinois Senator Charles Percy, Massachusetts Senator Edward Brooke, and Michigan Governor George Romney. If you told a

egotistical

about

conservative that these men were conservative, he'd laugh in your face. Yet he expects you to believe they are the shock troops of the rightward swing.

Probably the best argument a conservative can make today centers around the presidential campaign. He can assert that Nixon and Wallace, who are conservatives, are running strongly while Humphrey, who has always been a liberal, is far behind. And he can probably

produce the latest poll to prove his point. There is one poll, however, that he might have a hard time explaining. A recent Lou Harris survey-the only poll of its type that we've seen-reveals that, if given a free choice, 57 per cent of American voters would prefer someone other than the three major candidates.

Of course there is room for error in any survey. But 57 per cent is a conclusive figure, especially when you remember the conservatives have two good candidates (by their own definition) while the liberals have only Hubert Humphrey.

No Value

A conservative, of course, will argue that this poll really doesn't mean very much. After all, the major campaign issue is law and order, and anyone for law and order must be a conservative, right?

Wrong. Nobody condones wanton violence, least of all a liberal. No one has fought as hard for civil rights and economic progress as the liberal, and no

Tass This is out to Eastern Monied

Interests !

I have published the

It's to be found

Best of STRALLEH!

It goes on sale

today!

I am 51 ALL IT It has happened! The shabby but virtuous great proleterian dorm artist. rube revolution has sold

one would more hate to see all the accomplishments go down a violent, reaction-producing drain. And many of the strongest law and order people are northern blue collar, union workers who

are liberals on economic matters. While emphasizing law and order, there is the risk of overlooking the issues that usually play an important role in presidential elections. Bringing in that sense of history conservatives always claim to remember 1964.

In that campaign Barry Goldwater, a true conservative by anyone's yardstick,

'Conservatives won't give up. They'll continue to peddle their snake-oil arguments to whoever will listen.'

had strong reservations about Social Security, Medicare, TVA, nuclear test bans, and even graduated income tax. If there were a conservative trend today, certainly there would be much talk about abolishing these liberal items.

But there is not. Even Richard Nixon, whose forces killed the non-proliferation treaty in the Senate, won't admit he's opposed to it for fear of the political consequences.

Even George Wallace has called for

increased Social Security benefits. And Wallace almost physically pulled Curtis LeMay from a microphone the other day when the general began to talk about nuclear weapons in Vietnam.

Fight Communism

Speaking of Vietnam-and about foreign policy in general—the conservative line is, and traditionally has been, that we must fight communism whenever and wherever it threatens anyone. Almost without exception American conservatives have supported U.S. involvement in Vietnam and have castigated dissenters for "giving aid and comfort to the enemy."

If there is any lesson about the war that we have learned in the past year-from primaries or polls-it is that most Americans reject the conservative position. They are dovish, they don't seek a military victory, and they especially don't want to get stuck in another Vietnam in the future.

So there you have it. The "rising tide of conservatism" holds little water. But the conservatives probably won't give up. They'll continue to peddle their snake-oil arguments to whoever will listen.

But don't be suckered in. Remember how in touch with the mood of America the conservatives hve usually been.

They fought Social Security ever inch of the way. They opposed Medicare and test bans and non-proliferation. They supported a militant foreign policy. They said we'd win in Vietnam if only we'd send more troops and bomb the north. They predicted the great "silent America" would elect Goldwater. And they said McCarthy didn't have a chance in New Hampshire or Oregon or anywhere.

Now the conservatives say the country has suddenly turned to the right.

They are as right on this as they have been on everything else.

Vocabulary Makes It

"I don't care if it's wet and squishy long as I've got my Maharishi Glued on to the dashboard of my car."

In 1948 the conversation was cars.

It was new chrome jobs and piston rings, special camshafts and tachometers on the walnut-panelled dashboard. It was channeling, chopping, lowering, raking; it was bore and stroke, transmission ratio and special fuel. It was street slicks and quick stops, away at the light and who's-chicken-off-the-clif, and most of all it was a man someone knew who could fix something.

In 1958 the conversation was Hi-Fi.

It was woofer and tweeter and input. It was components and hook-ups, amps and ohms. It was special assemblies and a hand-rubbed Philippine mahogany cabinet. It was a Garrard turntable and a

By Bobby Nowell

pair of Altac speakers in just the right corners of the room. It was a Fisher amplifier, acoustical panelling, diamond needles, and most of all it was a man someone knew who had the parts to fix anything.

In 1968 the conversation is all Karma. It's who's got it smoother, who's got the purer sound of bliss. It's who's soul is best tuned up, and whose mind is in harmony. It's heaven-on-earth in low gear and a resonance in the heart. It's shifting into a higher plane and play-it-again Sam with the dulcimer. It's beads, Khurtas, and Indian accessories suitable for the cosmic trip, it's a room full of incense for just the right sound for your inner peace. And most of all, it's a man someone knows who can choose a mantra to fix any soul.

If the cars paralleled the new technology of speed, airplanes and rockets thrusting miles into oblivion; and if Hi-Fi was the reflection of the micro-technology of TV tubes, radar sets, and all the mysterious electronic devices of James Bond and Cape Kennedy; then the Guru-wave we are in now must reflect something.

Despair, perhaps; withdrawal from the race of engines and turntables, from the sonic boom and the strontium bomb. It's into the tomb womb of "it's not happening to us" on the skin side outside, or if it is, it doesn't count because where

it's at, is in. So there is mystery in the day to day combat with Now; but there are also parallels that are striking, for the chatter is reminiscent and the sound is the same. It's a smoother running engine, tumtable, or soul. And we all have our favorite

brand name. Hare Krishna, Krishnamurti, Meher Baba, Maharishi, Parmahansa Yoganada, Satchitananada-it's just a list of current available parts. And someone is sure to know a man who can get it for you-whole soul.

he also suggests that Legislature should reverse all previous precedent (i.e., editors of all student publications receive a salary

Re. Roger Thompson's letter printed on Wednesday, October 23 concerning, "since when did students start getting paid for 'doing their own thing'?'

Letters To The Editor

Student Govt.

was no other

raised my salary

choice but to

Whoopee - doo! There

turn into a capitalist

23¢ this year.

The question of who is to be paid in Student Government is one which certainly, demands more time and attention than Mr. Thompson has given it in his letter. Is he saying that because a student agrees to take on the

responsibility for a project that he should not be financially compensated for his time and effort? If so, then the \$22,540.00 which Student Government will pay to compensate over forty students this year (source: 1968-69 Student Government budget is also "lining the pockets," as Mr. Thompson puts it, of some "do your own thing" people. Perhaps he is saying that people who are working in Student Government on a salaried or a commissioned basis are not "do your own thing" people. He might ask the President of the Student Body or the Editor of the Daily Tar Heel if they are doing their own thing. Clearly, the question is much more complex than

Mr. Thompson gives it credit to be. Concerning the issues of financial compensation for the "three students" working on the Course Evaluation Booklet which precipitated the Oct. 23 letter. Mr. Thompson again has missed the point. In mentioning "three students" I presume that he is referring to the Editor, the Computer Analyst, and that part of the book's budget set aside for Staff Salaries. If Mr. Thompson is quarreling with those people who think students should be paid for a good day's work, why did he forget to mention the fact that financial compensation is also planned for at least four members of the booklet's business staff? The services carried out by the editor, the computer alanyst, the editorial staff, and the business staff are equally important to the creation of a final product. Why should one group be paid and the other group be expected to work long and hard for "free"?

I agree with Mr. Thompson that Student Legislature would be wise if it "drew up a set of clear guidelines that

(would) outline how and when students merit payment for Student Government work." But it seems incredible to me that now, and always have) and refuse payment to people who commit their time and energy to a good cause merely

Paid SG Workers Get A Boost

because they are students. True, Student Government cannot afford to pay everyone a salary or a commission, but it would be a good idea for us to examine the problem in a systematic, rational manner. Self-righteous indignation in the form of "I don't get paid, so why should you get paid?" is senseless and serves no one's cause, let alone that of a fair, "credible" student government.

> Sincerely Doug Morgan Chairman, **Publications Board**

UNC Band Praised After Drenching

In a time when it seems as if everybody is trying to downgrade everybody else, we would like to take one of the few opportunities which arise to heap praise on one of UNC's most neglected organizations-the Marching Tar Heel Band.

The band went out in the torrential downpours Saturday at Kenan Stadium to put on a show that the University can easily be proud of, especially since it's hard for the University to find something like that these days. Major Yesulaitis and the band sat in the rain longer than most of the fans, splashed through a 13-minute halftime performance with near perfection, and provided most of the inspiration and spirit when the wet stuff shorted out the cheerleaders' electric megaphones. How many other University bands would have attempted such loyal

Yes, the band put on a great show, and

what do they get in return? Nothing. They put long hard hours of practice into each week's show and the University gives them nothing. Besides that, the Marching Tar Heels have to pay a fee at the beginning of the season just to allow them to do this.

Once upon a time, the band received free date tickets at all home games and to all away games-like last season for instance. It started out that way this year, but then the price went to \$3.00, and now it has moved to \$6.00 just as everybody else. Date tickets are all the band had. Now they're gone.

Our hats are off to a DAMNED GOOD BAND. What would this stingy University do without the Marching Tar Heels?

Sincerely, Alan Dry Dennis Benfield Chris Cobbs Garth Bissette Richard Furr Glenn Jarrett Garry White Bill Bovender Don Davis **Bob Poole** Jimmy Price Henry Schmulling

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods.

Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news-933-1011; business, circulation, advertising 933-1163. Address: Box 1080, 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.