

# The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor  
Bill Staton, Business Manager



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

## So Far-Inaction

By ALAN M. FISHER  
Visiting Assistant Professor

Regardless of how the present turmoil is eventually resolved there are a few lessons. It is to be hoped that the resolution will be shortly forthcoming and satisfactory to those concerned—the workers. But as not-so-innocent bystanders we might learn something.

TO THE CONCERNED STUDENT AND THE WORKERS we owe a debt for your dedication, sense of moral responsibility, and maturity. The same cannot genuinely be extended to any other group of persons, save those who

*'Faculty meetings indicate that faculty members are capable of much talking, saying little and doing even less.'*

supported the workers. To extend gratitude to the President and Chancellor is like thanking the Governor for sending out "only" 75-100 troopers and for not shooting anyone, yet. All the functionaries had it within their power to make changes in this neo-plantation system and to prevent the problem and none of them chose to exercise it. Neither has any administrator officially and publicly condemned "disruptive forces" on the campus.

The faculty meetings indicate that faculty members are capable of much talking, saying little and doing even less. Some of us are so concerned with publishing that we forget that our profession is that of "teacher." Students

are little more than IBM cards. (Nor has the Administration, in deed, chosen to reward those who teach well, who are concerned about students, popular rhetoric notwithstanding.)

### Moral Leader Myth

There is a myth that scholars and teachers are moral leaders. In this society it appears that faculty are neither willing to lead nor are we willing to act on behalf of that which we may think is right. Action has become anathema to us; we think that we can cure society's ills by conducting a spate of faculty meetings at which we behave in a genteel, distinguished manner. There are even some of us who see nothing wrong with society, nor with this campus.

If action is required it must come from you. While your position in life is much more tenuous and instable there seems to be no other force for change. You must convince the other students that supporting and demonstrating in behalf of moral causes is necessary—that public opposition to mass murder and to oppression of the poor and dark-skinned is as important as public support for being a good basketball team. But the pursuit of moral goals need not preclude being tactical. So far your actions indicate great responsibility. Perhaps it may not be necessary to take more radical steps but reality seems to suggest pessimism.

There is a small core of faculty that is also committee to improvement of this University and this society. But they are still a minority and even they can perhaps only mobilize support and not lead. As for the rest of us, remember that we stand in the wings closely observing and

willing to commit ourselves to almost any action—to preserve our jobs.

### Faculty Negative Action

TO THE FACULTY there is little positive that can be said. The past weeks have tested us and we have responded—by doing nothing, except holding meetings. We have discussed whether the powers that be should have two weeks to make a meaningful response, not more than two weeks, "presumably" not more than two weeks, and "not more than two weeks presumably;" we have discussed the composition of the General Faculty and whether we should appoint (another) committee to investigate the response of the Administration or appoint a committee to appoint a committee to nominate members; we have debated whether it should be a temporary or permanent committee or as one member (unintendedly?) suggested, a "permanent ad hoc" committee; we have raised a demurrer as to whether the "armed forces" should be called "pigs" or

### '(On the Faculty Council)

*we have given one vote to a man whose primary function in life is to teach young people how to kill human beings.'*

"police" but we have not even passed a resolution strongly protesting the presence of vicious men carrying very lethal weapons to "protect the dignity of the institution."

And of what avail was the resolution passed on Friday, March 7? (Somehow we presume that our passing a resolution will dissipate problems; the tragic absurdity is that we cannot even pass such meaningless resolutions.)

The process and institution of even the Faculty Council is confusing. Behind me, at one of the meetings, was a man, dressed in a military uniform, who voiced displeasure at every single discussion supporting the workers and criticizing the Administration. He kept suggesting that said speakers should leave or that they do not belong here. Imagine—we have given one vote to a man whose primary

function in life is to teach young people how to kill human beings!

The response of some of you has been beyond belief. One professor in the "humanities" suggested that since he had suffered early in life he did not see why the workers were taking such drastic measures to improve their lot. Another asked why the workers wanted so many things and why they had to have such quick action—"why can't they go slower?" A reliable source reports another member who voiced hostility to the workers and their demands. When asked if he had spoken to them and investigated their conditions he replied negatively but he knew what they really wanted.

### Contemporary Complaints

There is a contemporary complaint about the lack of trust and respect for those over thirty, for teachers by students, and for parents by children. We treat them as objects and expect affection in return. We condemn them for our problems about which we are prepared to do little.

They have much more to lose in this episode than we; for them it means potential disruption of an education, extra years in school, for some with families severe economic hardships, and for some the possibility of being drafted to fight a war they oppose. And yet we are not even willing to support them when they put so much on the line. We would rather put our trust in an administration that has publicly stated its willingness to punish, to the full extent, these students. No wonder they look at us mistrustfully.

There are pressures exerted by the Governor and the legislature. But we have already permitted them the precedent of armed occupying forces on campus, of the surrender of our autonomy, and in the form of suppression of a cause which is so clearly justified and humane. When will they choose next to act? How far back do we go? Why does not someone from the University tell the people exactly what has happened? "If I am not for myself, who will be for me?"

I have no strategic solution. May I simply request that in deciding what to do we act with the intent of saving our souls, not our jobs.

## Mike Cozza on

## The Next Editor



The next editor of the Daily Tar Heel will be chosen in the campus elections next Tuesday. There are currently three candidates for the position: Grainger Barrett, Brian Cumming and Todd Cohen. Barrett is the founder of the Hayakawa Society; Cumming and Cohen are former DTH staff writers.

Few people stop to think about it, but the DTH editor is probably the most influential student in the university. He oversees a complex operation which consumes close to \$150,000 each year and puts out a product which touches almost every student on campus. He should not be chosen carelessly.

Of the three candidates, Grainger Barrett is probably the best known. He gained state-wide recognition as head of the Hayakawas, even though the group has done almost nothing under his leadership. Barrett is an effective spokesman for his political principles.

If political principles were the only requisite for choosing an editor, and if you agreed with him, he would be your logical choice.

But it takes more than political principles to put out a newspaper every day. It takes a knowledge of the business office, the news room, and the printing shop. Under these criteria, Barrett seems unqualified for the position.

Although he is endorsed by the Publications Board, Barrett has very little journalistic experience (he wrote one column for the Carolina Chronicle); he is not a journalism student; and he would have trouble putting together a staff. Several members of this year's DTH staff say they would just not work for him because he is not a journalist.

The second candidate, Brian Cumming, was the first to enter the race. Cumming has written for several publications, and he comes from a journalistic family. He would seem to be better prospect than Barrett.

But Cumming was unable to get the Publications Board endorsement, and has since been unable to rally support among the DTH staff. He is running a hard

campaign, but he has done a couple of things to cause several of us to wonder about his tactics.

For instance: He asked DTH staff members to sign the petition to get his name on the ballot. Many of us did, because we felt that anybody should have the opportunity to run for office. We made it perfectly clear, however, that our names were not an endorsement of his candidacy.

Cumming then set up a table in Y-Court to seek additional signatures. He put a big sign on the table advertising the staff members (including this columnist) who had signed, plainly implying that he had our endorsement.

When Cumming formally announced his candidacy earlier this week, he leveled a strong blast at the Tar Heel for "slanted, disorganized, emotional and selective" news coverage. This clearly implied his agreement with critics who have accused the paper of giving unfair coverage to certain political groups, such as SSOC.

Cumming neglected to mention that he was the reporter assigned to cover SSOC for much of the first semester.

The third candidate, Todd Cohen, is a good writer. He has the Pub Board endorsement and the technical competence needed to put out a daily paper.

Cohen's chief campaign issue has been professionalism in news coverage. His most valuable asset is almost unanimous staff support, and he also has the support of many former DTH staffers who did not work for the paper this year because of bitterness remaining from the last year's campaign.

Cohen has been very careful to avoid that kind of bitterness this year. If he is elected, he will be able to put together a staff of the most competent journalists on campus, something that Wayne Hurder never accomplished.

For these reasons, and for whatever help it may be to his candidacy, this column is my endorsement of Todd Cohen for Tar Heel Editor.

## Strike Inevitable, Best Move At Time

A general strike of students, faculty, and graduate instructors has been called for by leaders of the striking food service workers. This gradual escalation of the struggle, coming at a time when many persons were becoming gradually optimistic about the prospects of a settlement soon, should stir a bitter controversy both in Chapel Hill and outside.

However, for anyone who looks at the general direction that the events of the past month have taken, the conclusion must be that a strike was inevitable and probably the best thing at the current time.

There are two questions that must be asked: one, whether the supporters of the workers are needed to take action to prod the Administration into acting; and two, whether a strike is the best action to take.

The answer to the first is yes. Unfortunately, the many rumors that have been floating around about a settlement being just on the horizon are delusions. Many crucial problems need to be resolved. For instance, the appointment of black supervisors, conditions of employment under a private firm next year, establishment of a grievance procedure, and the often talked about \$1.80 minimum wage.

THE \$1.80 minimum per hour is the most discussed item because people consider it probably the hardest item to fulfill. In the past week there has been much talk about getting that \$1.80. Much of this talk has led many people to believe that a settlement would be reached soon and the workers would get \$1.80.

However, it now appears that while most state officials and University officials concede that the workers should get \$1.80 there is much doubt about where it will come from. What we are now seeing is some infighting among various state agencies as they try to show that they are not responsible for this lag in the negotiations but that other agencies are responsible.

For instance, most people think the University cannot foot the bill of \$138,698 to provide a minimum wage for non-academic employees for the rest of the fiscal year. That, however, is wrong. The University at Chapel Hill can find the money to raise the wages to \$1.80, it's just a matter of juggling the budget around to find the money. Unfortunately, up to now, the Administration has felt that it shouldn't take from other programs to help the workers. It feels that the workers should not receive such high priority in their financial affairs. Instead, they would rather

see some other agency such as the State Personnel Board, pay for the wage hike.

TO HELP in this agency in-fighting the Chancellor comes out with statements such as this one Tuesday, in which he implies that he is willing to raise the minimum but that it is all up to the State Personnel Board.

This is not so. It is to make the Administration realize the need to give more emphasis to the workers grievances, to go so far as to juggle their current budget allotments, that the supporters of the workers must take some action to nudge the Administration to taking such steps. The \$1.80 isn't the only barrier left to a settlement. However, it is the very attitude of the Administration that keeps them from doing something about this that keeps them from taking more definite action on several other key things.

The second problem is that of the tactics that the workers' supporters are being called on to use for the next three days.

A strike, for some reason has had connotations. Why, we don't know. We think, as Preston Dobbins said Wednesday, that there are some things more important than going to classes.

A strike is the next logical non-violent step that the supporters of the workers can take to help the food service employees. They have exhausted their numerous other alternatives, from picketing to vigils to letter writing to visiting legislators. These have helped. They have brought many persons in the state around to agreeing that the workers have just grievances. However, they have still not helped the workers get enough action on their grievances so they can return to their jobs with more than promises.

A WELL RUN strike, in which picketers surround buildings but do not interfere with those students who insist on attending classes, can be a great boon to the workers.

We hope that every student will realize the need to do more for the workers than just attend a concert or boycott Lenoir. We hope that any student that does strike will assemble in Polk Place to express his support of the workers. We hope that those faculty members or teaching assistants who continue to teach will at least meet their classes in Polk Place and thereby show their support for the workers.

And, we hope that the University will realize that it has to give greater priority to the workers' grievances than it has.

## Why No Justice At UNC

From Winston-Salem Journal

When students demonstrate and tempers rise across the state, the issues that brought on the demonstrations are quickly lost from sight.

So it was at Duke University a year ago. So it is at Chapel Hill today.

At Duke last spring, hundreds of students joined in a "Vigil" on the campus in sympathy with the Negro workers who cleaned their rooms.

Something like this same scandalous situation has come to light through the strike of the cafeteria workers at Chapel Hill and the attention drawn to it by the student "vigil."

Some of the Negro workers, it turns out, have been deprived for months of pay to which they were

entitled under the law. In some instances this back pay amounts to as much as \$2,000. Just as serious, the Negroes have been subjected for years to insults and indignities from their white supervisors—insults and indignities which no private employer would have permitted to occur within his establishment.

The University has belatedly moved to put an end to this disgraceful situation by making up the back pay, requiring its supervisors to exercise common courtesy toward the Negro employes and removing the director of the food services.

When Robert Scott was running for governor last fall, he promised that he would uphold "law and order—and justice." He has been quick to slap law and order on Chapel Hill. Justice has had to take a more leisurely course.

## Letters To The Editor

To the Editor:

Mr. Pete Ivey, both in the news release last week and in a letter to the editor of the current issue of the Chapel Hill Weekly, has labelled Mr. Lawrence Kessler, a severe critic of Ivey, as a part-time instructor in history and a graduate student. In fact, Mr. Kessler is a full-time faculty member of the history department and has not been a graduate student at UNC.

Two reasons suggest themselves for this mistake. Mr. Ivey may have simply made a mistake, which comments on how well he does his job, since if anyone should have the facts straight, Mr. Ivey should. A second possibility is that this was done deliberately, because calling Mr. Kessler a graduate student automatically tends to mitigate at least the force of his criticism of Ivey's performance in his office. In either case, Ivey's continued references to Kessler's status as a "part-time

instructor" should be corrected.

Sincerely yours,  
Allen R. Newman  
Graduate student

## Ticket Blunder Mighty Devastating

To the Editor:

The Sunday DTH advertised the registering for tickets to the NCAA Finals at Louisville, Ky., between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. I was delayed by a meeting and was unable to get to the Ticket Office until about 4:55—admittedly close to 5 o'clock but not 5:00. The Ticket Office door was closed in the face of a group of about 5 people, me included.

It was not 5:00. Each of our watches showed a couple of minutes left until 5:00. We knocked on the door and at first there was no answer. Continued knocking aroused a croaked yell of "We're closed. It's after 5 o'clock." We students looked at our watches and compared readings—it was about 4:57.

We frantically replied, "It's not 5:00. There are still a few minutes left!" She yelled back in tones akin to those that Prillaman must have used to his workers. "It's past 5:00." At this moment, the bin with all the names to be drawn was brought out of another door and carried down to the gym floor. The other shafted students left in disgust.

Mad, I called WCHL and got an accurate time tick and found that my watch was 1 1/2 minutes fast, making the ticket lady even more wrong. Because of her despicable and stupid mistake, because she was in such a big hurry to get home, I may have lost my chance to go to Louisville. But the heartless girl probably doesn't care.

Sincerely,  
Robert McGaw



"See You After Class At The Boycott."

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 at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester. We regret that we can accept only prepaid subscriptions. Classified ads are \$1.00 per day prepaid. Display rate is \$1.25 per column inch. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel, N.C.