

# The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



**Todd Cohen**  
Editor

**Bobby Nowell** Managing Editor  
**Dennis Benfield** News Editor  
**Tom Gooding** Associate Editor  
**Steve Enfield** Associate Editor  
**Harvey Elliott** Arts Editor  
**Art Chansky** Sports Editor

**Ron Johnson** Business Manager  
**Frank Ballard** Advertising Manager

**Dave Clark** Night Editor this issue

John Agar

## Administration Violated Trustees'

Now that we're getting the unnecessary machinery set up, we ought to start swinging the Trustees' Disruption Policies around. After all, what's the good of having them if you can't use them? And the first candidates for the Hearings Committee might be the University Administration—specifically, the men who forced Howard Lee out of the University.

The charge, under the first section of the Policies, is willfully disrupting the

normal operations and functions of the University by violence, force, and coercion. The charge is anatomized below.

First, let it be noted that the prologue to the regulations states that it is the University's policy to uphold academic freedom and due process. In fact, it's no exaggeration to say that academic freedom and the spirit of fairness in due process are the informing spirits of

education. In delaying Lee's appointment because of remarks attributed to him, the University administration was clearly violating not just academic freedom but the free speech clauses of the Constitution. That there were never any public charges made against Lee, that he was arraigned and convicted secretly, without being able to participate in such hearing as there was—that in short there was no due process has been apparent since the beginning of the controversy.

As for violence: most people are unconvinced of violence unless they see sticks flying and blood. Men who hand down decisions, even extra-legal ones, surely cannot be violent. Nonetheless, there is "force" and "coercion" in every policy or law enforcement decision.

The Administration "held up" Lee's appointment for the purpose of intimidating him, of forcing him out of the University. The delay was nothing if not a coercion used as a weapon.

The proof is that even if we, as students, were to demonstrate against the extra-legality of the Administration's actions, our efforts would likely come to nothing. In fact, any effort the student body makes to assure Lee of his rights is certain to be ineffective. This is a measure of the Administration's "force" and "violence," which is far more potent and irresistible even than a student riot.

themselves with patrolling South Building? It was clear who was at fault.

The question we must ask is, how many times in his stay at this University will a student suffer or have to rebel because of an administrator's bullheadedness, prejudice, obsolete morality, ineptitude, or simple misapprehension of the situation? It is the same question non-academic workers and faculty members must also ask.

It's unfortunate that the Trustees have seen fit officially to relieve University administrators of responsibility for their blunders. It's out of tune with the times. This age more and more demands moral responsibility, from the policy maker to the "cog" in that policy. As students and as human beings, we no longer speak the language of men who do not have to answer for their actions—except to a semi-secret coterie of Trustees.

As things stand now, there is bound to be trouble; yet there need not be. Administrators are eminently practical men; and, being part of the University, they cannot fully escape the surge of democracy flowing through its lower echelons. All it would take is the magnanimity to admit error and the courage to begin shouldering the burden of responsibility in a free society. The Trustees' regulations can be revised and liberalized to apply to all equally.

But perhaps, after 180 years of "Constitutional government," this is still asking too much.

### Make A Deal

To The Editor:

I'll make a deal with the students who want to withdraw financial support from the Tar Heel. If they shouldn't have to support the campus newspaper then I shouldn't have to subsidize the Yackety Yack or football and basketball; and profits from the Student Stores shouldn't be applied to athletic scholarships.

And, by the way, Todd Cohen was elected by the student body, which means that the majority of the student body decided what kind of newspaper they wanted.

Jim Koppers  
524 James

There's one hitch. Administrators are not covered by the Policies. They have seldom been covered by any effective policies regarding their conduct of University affairs.

A recent article in the DTH reported: "Concerning his decision [last year] to send the Highway Patrol onto the UNC-Chapel Hill campus, Scott explained the decision by pointing to what he felt was the failure of the UNC-CH administration to act quickly enough to remedy the situation..." Well, then, why didn't the Patrolmen content



"And Now, If There Are No Further Questions, I Will Continue With My Lecture."

Rick Allen

## Grass Laws: Classic Absurdity

I suppose everyone is a little sick of hearing the pros and cons of marijuana by now, but the fact remains that one can still be sent to prison for up to five years for what is at best a dubious "crime".

Ideally, man should be content with his own consciousness. But he has been slowly disemboweling himself for centuries with various liquids, plants, and chemicals. It is only with a sense of sheer folly and virginal optimism that one can even conceive of man ceasing to get his jollies by tampering with his mind.

Prohibition showed adequately enough that it is not a right of the government to legislate against people getting drunk. Why should grass be any different?

The classic arguments begin with the absurdity that we "don't know enough about the drug and it could be very dangerous". Grass has been smoked or eaten in various forms for hundreds of years. It has not been proven that it can give you lung cancer, turn you into an alcoholic, or alter your chromosomes. It is not physically addictive.

At this point, someone leaps to his feet and answers that it can be psychologically addictive. Of course it can. For this reason, it may be better to get drunk. Instead of feeling giddy and peaceful, you may get into a blind rage. Instead of waking up with a clear head, you may wake up feeling like someone danced the boogaloo on your head. And

you may think a little less of drinking again. Your "high" may not have been so great. If you are weak-willed, you may well overindulge in anything. That's why some people are chain-smokers, alcoholics or compulsive eaters. It is not the right of the government to forbid man his indulgences.

Next comes the point that grass often leads to use of harmful drugs. This may be true. But it is the very illegality of pot that forces many smokers into the company of pushers. I would rather be able to buy a nickel bag legally in a tobacco store, say, than deal with some creep who has a stash of heroin in his back pocket.

Parents are upset because their junior high school kids are smoking grass. I don't blame them. It's a shame that kids feel the need to turn on with anything at all. But my friends and I were fifteen when we got drunk for the first time and we were no exceptions. It is the sheer illegality of the thing that makes it so attractive.

Many of the drinking generation contend that a few drinks help them to unwind. Yes, they do, and a few cocktails never made anyone a drunkard. But neither does a couple of tokes on a joint stone you out of your mind. Drinking and smoking pot are not the same by any means, but the point is that grass doesn't automatically turn you into a freak any more than drinking makes you a lush.

What the legislators have to realize is that pot is taking over from alcohol. Neither is especially commendable. A kid walking around in a state of bovine nirvana is as sad as a grown man falling over and retching in the street. But let's not send the innocent to prison anymore. Let people do what they want to themselves.



## The Visitation Sickness

A floor fight is expected at the Student Legislature meeting Thursday night concerning the new visitation policy. Granville legislator Alan Hirsch was one who predicted a fight, warning he would accept "nothing less than a 24 hour-a-day, seven day-a-week policy."

This is an interesting development in the visitation controversy, one which has raged for some time now. After the recent issuance of the policy by the University administration, there still seem to be students who want more. Now how does one account for those students? Apparently some students here contend students should be granted the same rights as people in the Real World. They seem to feel students ought to be able to decide for themselves when and where and under what conditions they will and may visit with whomsoever they choose.

And for some reason, a University which usurps the freedom of choice, and defines social regulations, does a disservice to those free-thinking students. The University stands in the way of progress.

Ah, progress. The University here has had its share of progress. It allowed for the creation of a student-faculty committee to investigate the visitation question. And after a trial run of the visitation policy last spring, it has determined that students in effect may decide questions of regulating visitation. However, the University continues to feel that it may dictate how often students may visit with each other in their own rooms.

The University's presumption that it must assume for students the responsibility their parents

formerly claimed is indeed unfortunate. That presumption is the epitome of unfortunateness. It ignores reality, the reality of the world out there. It passes judgement on students as lesser beings, as beings who must be handled with kid gloves. It eliminates the possibility that students are mature, or independent, or responsible.

The University's position is condescending, patronizing, and tasting of an ignorance of the problems and realities of this generation, this world.

What is this world? It is us. It is people who are merely searching for something, for themselves, and that search has, in reality, no rules, because there are no rules in reality.

And some of us people don't really think it is right for others to tell us how to live. Oh sure, we have laws, but the laws are supposed to protect us from being hurt by others. It is not supposed to keep us from making individual decisions which affect our individual lives.

The University here seems to fear public opinion, the opinion of the state legislature in Raleigh, the opinion of the Trustees, the opinion of alumni. And if approving a wide-open visitation policy would upset any of those people, well, then, it might not be such a good idea to approve such a policy.

If the Student Legislature wants to be sure of having visitation, it might pass the proposed policy Thursday night. But if that body is more concerned with asserting its right as a body of human beings in this so-called democratic society, it might do some thinking about the matter.

## How To Win The War?

An open meeting will be held Wednesday at 8 p.m. in Gerrard Hall to discuss the moratorium on classes which is planned here for October 15 in protest of the Vietnam war. That moratorium will be part of nationwide strike planned to include labor and business, as well as student, sympathizers.

The meeting Wednesday night should offer an introduction, an informative session, of what will be happening in October, and how to get involved.

That meeting might prove helpful to those who want the help. But the real question, the question of the effectiveness of such an effort in opposition to the war, is more difficult.

What is war, anyway? What is the point in our going over there and dying? If we disagree with the effort, does it really matter, do we really have any say in whether we fight?

The individuals planning the moratorium feel President Nixon has failed miserably with his token solutions to end the war. They seem to believe a loud voice in denouncement of the war, and of Mr. Nixon's handling of it, will cause the President to change his mind.

That is hopeful thinking, to say the least. Lyndon Johnson lost his office because of the war, yet Mr. Nixon did not get the picture. Eugene McCarthy claimed a large student following, yet he failed to win the Democratic Nomination in 1968.

Mr. Nixon seems to think token appeasement of the popular demand for an end to the war will

cost him no popularity.

Perhaps he thinks lowering draft calls for a couple of months will satisfy the disaffected youth of this country.

Maybe he is right in that thinking. We hope not. We hope the day has not come when the political system of this country is so distraught that the will of the people goes unanswered.

What can a student do, if he is against the Vietnam effort? Assuming, of course, that he still has faith in our democratic processes.

The doubting student might go to the meeting in Gerrard Hall Wednesday night. He might ask questions about the planned moratorium from the people involved and see what they have to say about peaceful dissent and non-violent protest. Has it worked before? The doubting student might well ask.

If we dump another "Johnson", will we only get another "Nixon"? One might well ask.

We would guess Mr. Nixon is aware of the criticism of the United States' effort in Vietnam. We are also rather wary at this point of the capacity of the political system to viably incorporate peaceful dissent into its decision-making processes.

However critical we are of the political system, though, we nevertheless retain some small measure of hope that continuing efforts on the part of sincere, dissenting minorities, might be to some avail.

The October 15 moratorium could at least prove a measuring rod for the effectiveness of this kind of dissent.

Ken Ripley

## A Class Analysis Of University Lines

I am sure that the University has a suitable motto of which they are proud. While personally I have never heard it, having missed as much of Orientation last year as I could, I am sure that it must be nice.

But having stood in more lines this year than is considered decent, I'm also sure that the Navy sailors must have a better motto: "Hurr Up and Wait."

Of course, there are many types of lines. For instance, there are movie lines, restaurant lines, drop-add lines, registration lines, picket lines, Lenoir and Chase lines, infirmary lines (from standing in Lenoir and Chase lines as far as I can see), long lines, short lines, fast lines, slow lines, lines crooked, straight, and dotted.

But the next worst line ever conceived is the one in which we wait to order textbooks. The only one worse is standing in line to pay for the books we've ordered in the other line.

The only effective way I have found to shorten your stay in line is to subtly whisper to the person next to you in a voice loud enough to be overheard by everyone, "I have claustrophobia in places like this. I rip books to shreds in panic."

Slightly less effective and more hazardous to your health is to walk around the Book Ex in white shirt and tie, without coat, posing as an employee. Then, if you are talented enough or have had any employee training, you can order the line to shift around several times and confuse everyone so badly that the line

simply splinters. At that point, you can stride quickly to the head of the line and check out.

There are two dangers to this system. First, you could get apprehended by the regular employees who are nastily jealous. Second, you face destruction by those in the line you splinter if you do not move quickly enough—they are jealous, too.

The safest, if not the best, approach is to stand and suffer. Which isn't too painful, really, if you get to know the people around you. In fact, it can be quite amusing.

A game I enjoy is trying to guess a person's status in the University by the way they respond to the question, "What do you want to do this year?"

There are invariably all four classes surrounding you in line. This is not certain, of course, but the probability is high.

I could tell the freshman at a glance. Not only did he look like an anemic little brother, but he was struggling under the load of Hexter's massive classic, assorted English readers, and various other odds and ends. Besides, his eyes were glazed from a party the night before. He answered my question with a nervous start.

"If I study hard enough I hope to get through the semester. I want to be a doctor, and that means work. Except for the times I go home to see my girl (she's still a senior in high school) and family, I've got to settle down and work."

After I thanked him on behalf of the Administration for his noble efforts, I

tried to single out the sophomore of the group.

I heard her about five people down. She was calling out to old friends across the building while trying to look like a sophisticated veteran. It took me a few minutes to get her attention. She had to be sure I wasn't a freshman.

"This year I'm going to have more fun and be more involved," she said. "I was a cow last year, studying and partying all the time. This year I am going to join the SDS, work for women's reforms, General College reforms, and the poor in Carboro. I've joined five organizations already, participated in three causes, and bought four radical posters."

In the presence of so much involvement I retreated and looked around for the junior. I didn't think I could find one for a while, but finally I noticed a boy with his head burrowed into a book.

He looked up when I approached him and gave me a friendly grin. "My goal is simple," he said, "Having mastered Sartre, Camus, Carmichael, James Joyce, and Dean Cansler, I just want to be a senior and get out of here."

For the next hour, I found no seniors. The line was slowly creeping to the check-out counter and I was getting desperate. My feet hurt.

When I was four people away from freedom, I noticed a dappily dressed

young student with a genuine cool look that comes only from feeling "in," regardless of whether or not you are, in fact, "in."

"Are you a senior?" I asked hesitantly. "Of course," he replied, barely moving his lips, his face impassive. He didn't want to notice me.

"And what do you want to do?" I continued stubbornly.

He gave me a withering look of pity and scorn.

"Buy a book, what else."

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.

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