

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Chairman

J. D. Wilkinson Executive Editor
Bobby Howell Managing Editor
Mike Conn Acting News Editor
Harvey Elliott Arts Editor
Steve Enfield Associate Editor
Art Chensky Sports Editor
Arlene Jacobson Copy Editor
Mike Conn Editorials
John Kelly Editorials

Bill Statton Business Manager
Kermit Buckner, Jr. Advertising Manager
Pete Mahan Night Editor this issue

NSA Affiliation: The Real Opposition Is Reactionary Politics

By MIKE COZZA

Today's referendum on the National Student Association is not the first time UNC students have voted on NSA affiliation.

A similar referendum was conducted in November of 1964.

The big issue then was communism. Many students, caught up in the Goldwater conservatism of the day, thought the NSA was "soft on communism."

The UNC student body re-affirmed its faith in NSA's record, however, with a 54.6 percent vote to stay in the organization.

The \$3,500 we pour into NSA each year," Beard said.

Rather than moving to reduce the amount of money given to NSA-related activities, however, Beard and his conservative cohorts petitioned for a referendum on disaffiliation.

They have since conducted an anti-NSA campaign based primarily on the economic issue. And although they admit opposition to NSA's political activities, they maintain that politics is not a factor in their opposition.

This columnist maintains that politics is a major factor in their opposition. They know, as well as anybody that:

-NSA has been in the forefront of fights to abolish university speaker bans and "gap laws."

-NSA is applying lobby pressure in Congress to lower the voting age to 18.

-NSA has been in a leader in academic reform, and in research leading to the experimental college concept.

-NSA co-ordinates activities and

information for reform of women's rules, "double jeopardy" in student courts, freshmen orientation, course and teacher evaluation, and racial dialogue.

Beard and his conservative cohorts know that much of the progress in these areas at UNC is directly attributable to efforts co-ordinated by NSA.

They know that UNC was one of NSA's principal founders, and that we have always played a strong leadership role in its administration and policy-making.

UNC students such as Al Lowenstein, Mike Lawler, Dave Kiel, Ted O'Toole, Eric Van Loon and Charles Jeffress have held national offices in NSA.

The current president of NSA is Bob Powell, who was Student Body President here two years ago. Academic reform, the experimental college and the residence college system were products of his administration. He was among the very first to oppose the N.C. Speaker Ban.

To pull out of NSA now would be a repudiation of Bob Powell. It would be interpreted as a significant step away from NSA's progressive record of fighting for student rights. It would be a repudiation of the national prestige and recognition we have gained through our NSA leadership.

The people who are opposed to NSA know all of this full well. Their economic argument is little more than a front for their political opposition.

They have charged that UNC gets nothing from NSA. What they are really

afraid of is that UNC gets plenty from the organization—plenty of progressive ideas and forward-looking programs, the kind of programs Beard and the Hayakawa Society opposes.

The underlying cause among many who oppose NSA is reactionary politics. UNC students should not be taken in by that reaction.

Students who favor of constructive change at UNC should recognize NSA's contribution to our campus and vote today to keep our affiliation.

If it is felt the optional expenses connected with our membership are too high, something else can be done about that.

On War Letter

To the editor:
Miss Oliver's letter is remarkable, not merely for its resemblance to one of Goldwater's more apocalyptic speeches, but also for its illogicality and monumental naivete. The unquestioning acceptance of the virtue and benevolence of America (after all, it is "trying to do the Right Thing") is unjustified in a world containing the horrors of Vietnam. Miss Oliver upbraids Mr. Wilkinson for having contracted that "common young liberal American disease called guilt," since to feel guilt is somehow a failure to acknowledge that "America is so far the 'best' country...that has ever been effected" (a sentiment that may be a trifle premature). Of course, America has its little flaws—guilty liberals, racism, rotting cities, ten million hungry people, Judge Phipps, etc.—but these are momentary aberrations that businesses like the Hershey Company will remedy "as a charitable act."

"Additionally, America 'exploits' little countries no more than any other economic giant." The point, Miss Oliver is that America is still exploitative. "Nor is it easy to see how giving millions of dollars of aid to these countries can be called exploitation." It is when one recognizes that these aid agreements are tied to the purchase of American goods that are not competitive on the open market. Furthermore, as a report from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (1956) states: (Technical assistance) is one of a number of means available to the U.S. to carry out its foreign policy and to promote its national interests abroad." It is the promotion of these national (i.e., business) interests which is the primary motive force behind America's foreign policy, not the self-righteous attempt "to make the world safe for democracy." If, indeed, America is trying to make the world safe for democracy why did the CIA overthrow the democratically elected government of Arbenz of Guatemala in 1954. Perhaps it was to make the world safe for the United Fruit Company's exploitation of Guatemalan cheap labor.

Finally, Miss Oliver's phobic anti-communism leads her to gross misinterpretations of history (a charge she in her abysmal ignorance unjustly levels against Mr. Wilkinson). "The analogy of Russian missiles in Cuba and our missiles in Europe is not valid because of the BASIS DIFFERENCE IN OUR PHILOSOPHIES." This is pure bullshit. Russia has no monopoly on stupidity and immorality. "We are involved in the war in Vietnam today because of an agreement that we signed long ago and are now honoring." Is Miss Oliver referring to the SEATO Collective Defense Treaty and Protocol? It would be more germane to mention the Geneva Agreements which the U.S. refused to sign since it has no intention of permitting free elections in Vietnam. And then there is the war itself. "Industry and the military may be responsible in some small part of the continuation of the war." There are those who think Miss Oliver may be slightly understating the situation. But look at the bright side. By doing the "Right Thing" America has produced phalanxes of sufficiently lobotomized junior military officers for the corporate wars (as Miss Oliver points out in one of his more sparkling non sequiturs). So what if America is a little imperialistic and a little totalitarian, and so what if a few dead Americans litter the ground in Vietnam? We still have guns and drums and flags and Old Glory is still up there above the polluted plain. As Miss Oliver says, "let's keep things in their proper perspective."

W. P. Grove
Dept. of Sociology

Vote 'Yes'; Vote 'No'

Two referendums concerning student rights will be presented to the student body today. One deals with the student judiciary of this University, the other with this University's affiliation with the National Student Association.

The first referendum is on a proposed amendment to the Student Constitution. The proposal is a response to charges by the Black Student Movement that the Honor Council does not fairly represent black students here.

The amendment, if passed, would allow the president of the student body, to appoint up to three members of a defendant's race to the council if requested by the defendant. It would also allow Student Legislature to pass a law setting up specific "at-large" districts in which members of the council would be elected.

In effect, the proposed amendment, if passed, would provide "fairer" representation for black students in the student judiciary.

On April 19, this newspaper urged students to vote "yes" on both sections of the aforementioned referendum. We stressed that a "yes" vote would not solve the problem of injustice on this campus, but that it would provide a temporary insurance that one of the factions in the University would receive a fairer share of justice. We feel that by alleviating some of the inequities inherent in our present judicial system, we might better approach the basic problem, which is justice.

We again urge students to vote "yes" on the judicial referendum. But we emphasize the temporary nature which should be given the amendment.

The proposal is a subtle endorsement of discrimination in

reverse, but in spite of that failing, we feel its passage today will provide some means of approaching the present failings of the student judiciary.

The second referendum proposes that UNC dissolve its affiliation with the National Student Association.

Opponents of affiliation with NSA suggest the cost of membership is "not really commensurate with the benefits." It is felt that the approximately \$3000 appropriated annually by Student Legislature for membership is money which cuts into the budgets of other campus organizations and which could be better used for those groups.

UNC has been a member of NSA for 22 years. In that time, NSA has been a strong advocate of student rights and has served as catalyst in such crucial areas as educational reform.

NSA resources, unavailable to non-member schools, have aided students here in such reform moves as the Experimental College, the Pass-Fail system, course and teacher evaluation, the fight for liberalization of women's rules, and the initial struggle for visitation.

Perhaps of greater importance is the fact that NSA actively represents the rights, needs, and interests of two million American students on the national, as well as local, level.

The argument against affiliation with NSA is perhaps valid in that all the students of this University are not actively involved in the activities involved with that affiliation. But the services which result from membership far surpass that minor failing.

We urge all students to vote "no" on the referendum asking disaffiliation with NSA.

Legislature Misses Twice

"Contrary to previous hopes, the speaker ban issue is not dead," read a story in Sunday's DTH.

Rep. J.F. Mohn's revised version of the 1963 speaker ban law is now in the House Committee on Higher Education. The '63 law was declared unconstitutional by the U.S. District Court in the Dickson v. Sitterson case primarily because it was "vague."

"A UNC administrator," according to the DTH story, "considered the Mohn bill so vague that it would be difficult to follow."

We agree with that anonymous administrator. The bill is "so vague that men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application," and that is the wording of the statute which the '63 law violated.

If this law passes, Chancellor Sitterson will be charged with the responsibility of interpreting a vague law, and his failure to follow the outlined procedure may subject him to prosecution for a misdemeanor.

We feel the Chancellor has enough to do without worrying about having to judge every speaker by a set of externally imposed, vague standards.

More importantly, we disdain the general idea of having someone outside the University decide who shall be allowed to speak on the campus. The University must be allowed to govern itself without outside interference.

We further believe students should be allowed to decide for themselves to whom they shall listen. Students have the prerogative to refuse to listen to

anyone and should not be refused the right to hear anyone they wish. Like any citizen in this country, students have the right of free speech. This implies the right to hear.

The equal time law which governs broadcasting is an example of guaranteeing the right to hear both sides. The speaker ban law, by not allowing certain types of speakers, would deny students that right.

Certainly the General Assembly will not pass a law that so disenfranchises students. We hope they refuse to even consider it on the floor.

It is contrary to our desires that the speaker ban issue is not dead, and we hope the General Assembly will kill the issue once and for all.

As if it were not enough for some legislators to limit speakers, there is now a proposed bill which would limit who could live in dormitories.

Students can get kicked out of a dormitory for various severe offenses like destruction of dorm property or intentional violation of dorm rules. If a proposed law passes in the General Assembly students can get booted out of a dorm for keeping a messy room.

There are a few places on this campus that a student can call his own, few places where he can do more or less what he wants (but less than more). His dorm room is one. Until now, he has had only to get along with his roommate and abide by the stringent rules of the University.

We hope the rules governing dormitories will be decreased so as to give students a place they can call their own.

The issue in today's referendum, if you listen to the people who oppose NSA, is not conservative politics. It is an economic question.

Joe Beard, chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Hayakawa Society, set the tone for the fight in Student Legislature several months ago. "We get absolutely nothing in return for

Education: Producing The Cogs

By KIRK OTEY

For those students who attended, the open meeting of the Merzbacher Committee Wednesday night was an "educational experience." There came to light the real reason for faculty resistance to educational innovation at this university.

The faculty members of the committee are apparently firm disciples of the philosophy that the university should be primarily concerned with mass-producing the "educated man."

The "educated man" concept is probably the oldest school of thought in the philosophy of higher education. It originated with the Jesuit schools of the Renaissance, where the sons of the aristocracy were given the trivium and the quadrivium, involving logic, philosophy, math, and music, all the skills required to lead a decadent life.

This system survived the Industrial Revolution in the sanctuary of the elitist British universities, which were the models for American higher education. In the early 20th century, American universities made a compromise between the classical education and the demand for new technology. The classical educators had two years to transform raw freshmen into "educated men," after which they were channeled into the specialties required to advance the American industrial state. This is the same basic system which this university uses, specifically the General College.

It is a crime and a travesty of the goals

of education that this system still operates, and for two basic reasons. Primarily, the General College system smother's curiosity, which every educator will say is the best possible motivation for learning.

Freshmen are channeled into the General College and told that they have to take certain courses before they are given permission to pursue their individual interests. But by the time they have struggled through the required courses most of the curiosity and quest for truth has been effectively killed.

So the "educated man" majors in the specialty which will enable him to become an apathetic cog in American society. He abdicates his duty and responsibility to his fellow man and, shows loyalty to the system by supporting American imperialism at home and abroad.

Secondly, this system constitutes a crime against the students' basic right to make the decisions concerning his education. This basic paternalism is only directed to students, who are supposedly more intelligent than those of our class who have already taken their places as cogs in society. The student can only mature by making his own decisions and being responsible for their consequences.

If we are to make the basic changes necessary to save our sick society from its self-destruction, we must be able to secure an education relevant to society's problems. To further this goal the abolition of the General College is an absolute necessity.

Killing The First Amendment

By JAN DAVIDSON

I don't choose to be counted with those unpatriotic students who will view the all-new, improved 1969 Speaker Ban Law proposal as an evil thing. It does credit to the legislator who proposed it, Rep. J.F. Mohn (D-Onslow), for having

such foresight, hindsight and insight to propose such a clear, intelligent guide for university administrators. If this bill is adopted, the riff-raff can be kept off the campus at last.

Mr. Mohn's guidelines state very clearly several reasons which a school administrator may use as justification for refusing to allow a speaker to present his views on campus. I will point out some of the positive effects of the proposed law.

A refusal may be issued if:
-invitation of the speaker is "motivated by a preference for sensationalism and represents a neglect of academic responsibility." (Here, in one fell swoop, Mr. Mohn has saved us from such diverse speakers as Billy Graham, Aretha Franklin, George Wallace and the UNC cheerleaders.)

-there is reasonable ground to believe that the speaker has a record of "revolutionary activity and wishes to use college forums to incite revolutionary activity...or give instructions in the science of guerrilla warfare." (O.K., this is a little late, but if we had this when the University was first founded, we would have been safe at that time from such contemporary degenerates as George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson. Applied to the current scene, this provision of the bill would do away with ROTC, Army Recruiters, CIA Recruiters, the United Fruit Company, the Daughters of the American Revolution, United Daughters of the Confederacy, followers of one Jesus H. Christ, and the members of the P.E. Department who teach judo and karate.)

-probable objective is "spreading and engaging in propaganda and soliciting new members for his organization, and there is no educational objective." (This would, for the most part, get rid of the rest of the recruiters who flow in and out of Gardner Hall.)
-proposed speaker is a person of bad character. (This provision, I suspect, must have been tacked on to take care of anybody who is left untouched by the others. If the bill is enacted, making it illegal for persons of bad character to speak on the university campus, then you and I, my friend, won't be allowed to speak to each other. The time we will save may be better applied to our studies.)

There is obviously a big difference between the new model Speaker Ban Bill and the old one. While the old one seemed to be somewhat vague, the new one is as clear as three-day-old skywriting.

Bryce P. Beard III
J. Michael Jordan
106 Fraternity Ct.

(Editor's note: Mr. Kelly, far from being an "academically dying student" or "a disappointed student who...has failed miserably and realizes he will never receive his sheepskin," is, in actuality, a junior Phi Beta Kappa honor student. Additionally, Mr. Kelly is himself a member of the UNC Fraternity system.)

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: \$3 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 Hill, N.C.