The Daily Tar Keel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen Editor

Bobby Nowell Dennis Benfield Tom Gooding Steve Enfield Mary Burch Art Chansky

Managing Editor News Editor Associate Editor Associate Editor Arts Editor Sports Editor

Ron Johnson Frank Ballard

Business Manager Advertising Manager

Dave Clark

Night Editor this issue

Proud Americans ...

Americans are proud. According to a report Thursday by the Associated Press, "America is being draped in flags and bunting in a surge of patriotism that has flagmakers flying high."

Yes, Americans are proud. And they have a lot to be proud of.

For a starter, there's the war in Vietnam, in which, we recall, over 50,000 Americans have died. That's something to be proud of.

Perhaps we could be proud of our stance in Vietnam, were it flawless. Flawless in the sense of being the best stance we could take. But it doesn't appear to be so.

The American mistake in Vietnam was pointed out Thursday by two significantly related events.

The first was Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield's statement urging President Nixon to seriously consider an immediate cease fire by U.S. forces and proposing that the United States step up troop withdrawals from Vietnam to put pressure on Saigon to accept a coalition government to prepare for new elections.

The second event was the rumor circulating here Thursday that Chancellor Sitterson would speak at the October 15 moratorium to express his personal opposition to Nixon's Vietnam policy.

The two events are clearly related, for both signify the profound disapproval of the war and the way Mr. Nixon has handled, and continues to handle,

Americans continue to die in this thing which we call The War, and America continues to demonstrate its willingness to let Saigon call the shots.

It seems to be the time for Mr. Nixon to begin calling the shots. It also might be in order for him to start conforming the American policy in Vietnam to our alleged objective, that of allowing the South Vietnamese to determine for themselves what kind of government they want.

But ideals and realities do not appear to conform in the American way of doing things. Which makes us wonder why Americans are so proud of their country.

Perhaps Americans are proud of their ideal of democracy, which is not such a bad ideal. But constitutions and laws are meaningless if they are preserved in glass cases and fail to be manifested in the everyday workings of a society, a society for which they were created.

The majesty of our ideals is fast becoming a tragic commentary on our way of life.

Those among us with the urge to fly high the American flag might start doing something for the reality which is the United States, for the hunger, the poverty, the hate, the tragic lack of equity, and maybe even the war, before they start proclaiming the glory of our proud, but absent, ideals.

But the loud proud patriots don't seem to want to admit we are failing fast. They seem to pre-judge quite a bit of what goes on, seem to know ahead of time what is good and what is bad.

Patriotism, it seems, is good; dissent and intelligent, well-grounded criticism is bad.

And the times aren't really a-changing, are they, Mr. Nixon?

... Local Pride, Maybe

It was gratifying to learn Thursday that Chancellor Sitterson will speak at the October 15 moratorium here to protest President Nixon's war policy.

It is uncertain, though, why Mr. Sitterson took his seemingly inconsistent stance last week on the matter of faculty participation in the moratorium.

September 25, the chancellors of the six branches of the Consolidated University maintained that according to he Trustees' disruption policy of July 7. "inciting or organizing attempts to prevent student attendance at classes" is punishable by trial.

According to he Trustees, the interpretation of the policy is left to the discretion of each chancellor.

When the six chancellors issued their statement, Mr. Sitterson issued a personal statement to the Tar Heel, which read in full:

"I am pleased that University students are going to give serious and thoughtful attention to the

problem of the Vietnam War, presently a matter of deep concern to every American. This thoughtful and critical examination of the issue is in the best tradition of the University. It is my view that students and indeed all University personnel can address themselves to this vital question without neglect of their ongoing academic responsibilities. The influence on national policy is likely to be the In a joint statement on greater for its being responsibly exercised."

> Under the statement of the six chancellors, students were, in effect, permitted to honor the To The Editor proposed class boycott; faculty members were not given such permission.

Which is somewhat inconsistent, considering the wide-spread faculty opposition to the war, as well, of course, as Mr. Sitterson's own personal feelings.

We would hope Mr. Sitterson might, in conformity with his own feelings, use the discretion which is legally his to allow faculty members to participate in the October 15 moratorium.

Rick Allen

Nixon Perpetuates The 'Credibility Gap'

It would appear that the 1960's will go down in history as the decade of the "credibility gap". A whole nation is coming to its knees to plead for the leader who keeps his promises and tells the truth.

The War in Vietnam has destroyed the lives of thousands, the faith of a whole generation, the countryside of an agricultural land and the world leadership of the United States. Now it threatens to destroy Richard Nixon.

Nixon promised eight long months ago that he had a plan to end the war. We haven't seen it yet. Last week he stated that protest against the war would have no effect on his decisions.

A president cannot turn his back on the people. We, the citizens of the United States have called for an end to the war. But what has he done?

He has recalled a limited numbers of troops. This reduction has not decreased in the slightest our military commitment in Vietnam. It is a mere show, a sop to the doves and a matter of political bargaining.

He has lowered the draft call for November and December. But the total number of men drafted this year will still be as high as last year.

He has called for a bombing halt that lasted a mere 36 hours. This is hardly what you could call a major show of peaceful intentions.

He has stated that our only demand is "free" elections in South Vietnam. But free elections mean something entirely different to Hanoi than they mean to us, A "free" election in Southeast Asia is a victory for the government in power because they count the ballots.

Imagine if you can the British helping the Confederacy during our own Civil War. "We will hold elections in

John Agar

Richmond," they say, "and honor the results even if they mean rejoining the Union government." The North would not have accepted this anymore than Hanoi will.

And then, why should they? All Hanoi has to do is read the front page of the New York Times to know that we cannot fight this war much longer. They will keep fighting until we pull out, even if we do show "outward unity".

It is abject folly for Nixon to prolong the agony. We must accept the political black eye and get the soldiers out.

Even if you don't agree that the war is morally wrong, it is obviously a political blunder. But what of this united front Nixon wants to present to Hanoi? It is really a cynical attempt at having his cake and eating it too. He would like to buy more time, to appease the hawks and conservatives by saving U.S. face, while keeping everyone else off his back.

This is why the carrots of a reduced draft call, a restriction to nineteen-year-olds and "maybe" a mercenary army are being dangled in front of us.

We will not be bought off. Too many people are beginning to see the light. The sooner we get out, the better.

People are coming to understand that the regime of Thieu and Ky is corrupt. People are learning that the peasants of Vietnam may be better off under communism, that to them "better dead than red" is a meaningless slogan that is costing them their lives.

It is better for us to admit our fatal mistake and restrict our interference to our own sphere of influence. While we are blowing our cool and losing our lives in a land thousands of miles away, we have ignored the interests of our neighbors in South America.

While we have allowed the image of America to be dragged through the rice paddies of Vietnam, the harried democracies of our own hemisphere are

weakening.

Our energies must be directed toward the troubled people in our own land. If we must have a foreign policy, let us do more for South America than send Rockefeller on a bogus "good-will" mission.

President Nixon, we implore you to wake up to your responsibilities, not in '72, not at the end of 1970, but now. Your time has run out.



Chancellor 'Bumps' Along With Law

... the University did not feel the bumps had been accorded a "fair

-Chapel Hill Weekly

Exactly how the bumps became a cause celebre on campus still is not clear. What we do know is largely pieced together from reports of informants and rumors. There remain many holes in the

Letters To The Editor

I am writing this letter in answer to a

letter to you from one Miss Holladay

Worth. I would like to support Mr. Gross'

view. However, I feel that I must restrict

myself since my "Yack" has only 544

pages. (Miss, Worth claims that hers has

I would like to call Miss

Worth's attention to the top picture on

page 56 (or is it 96 since hers has 40 more

pages?) and inform her that the keg of

Schlitz tends to have intoxicating

qualities, but Hell, nobody gets drunk at

a beer blast. I would also like her to note

the bottom picture on page 57. (or was

that 97?) I think we can assume that Miss

Worth has never been to a beer chugging

contest. How could anyone get drunk

She also states that "... most people

turn to the sweetheart section first. They

enjoy looking at the pictures of these

very lovely young ladies." This, I am sure,

is done with no less in mind than one

who turns to the foldout in "Playboy"

If Miss Worth will Kindly pay Mr.

Gross' dime, stamp his I.D., and give him

a "Yack", I am sure that Mr. Gross and I

can have a good time burning ours

Student Offers

Criticism Of DTH

After reading the Daily Tar Heel for

about two weeks and reading about the

objections raised earlier to the paper by

your conservative critics, I would like to

offer a personal criticism of the facet of

your newspaper. I call attention to the

standard of writing found on the editorial

page. I am not singling out any person in

particular, nor any particular examples of

what seems to be consistently tedious and

painful writing, produced with ali the

subtlety, finesse, and diversity of a

jackhammer. Nor is it a matter of

agreement or disagreement over campus

issues or politics. I am only asking that

you and your staff write like people who

do, in fact, have the advantage of a

university education, and therefore, the

Doug Hill

2411 Granville South

chugging 8 to 10 beers?

584 pages).

violating the Trustees' Disruption Rules, "blocking normal . . . vehicular traffic" on the campus, he knew he was in for

For one thing, when he sought to get a bump or two to investigate the charge on

Student Wants To Burn Yack

responsibility of writing like a university

educated person. Good writing requires

only two things: something worthwhile

to say and the ability to make people

want to read it. The editor and staff of

the DTH are in a unique position,

however. The Tar Heel is read every day

by thousands of students who do so, not

because the writing in it is so good, but

because it's the only way they have of

knowing what is happening in the

University. Regardless of whether you

have anything to say, Mr. Editor, and

regardless of how well or poorly you and

your staff say it, you are going to be read.

But somehow you seem to flaunt this to

us whenever you are criticized. You

bemoan threats to editorial freedom.

saying, "I was elected; I have a

responsibility to the students and free

speech." And while warning us of the

fearful dangers freedom faces here, you

wag your ink-stained finger in our faces

and piously remind us, "I'm the only

DTH editor you've got." Well, Mr. Editor,

you aren't the first elected person to

react to criticism that way, but if you

claim the distinction of the editorship

you should also handle yourself in such a

way as to deserve your distinction. And

one way I think you can do this is by

realizing that when you do have

something to say, your readers do not

need it written in gimmicky expressions,

righteously indignant (and agonizingly

tedious) sarcasm, or whining howls of

"sincere" protest. If there is injustice

involved in an issue, the average student

can and should be informed of it without

all the preaching and the civics lessons

and the senior cynicism and the hot air in

general that often accompanies it. You're

not the only one, Mr. Editor, who can tell

when the bull's left something smelly on

"Sincerely,"

Bill Andrews

self-respecting bump would comply. The president of the student body refused to recommend any bumps, and the editor of When the Chancellor was informed the daily paper wrote that neither the that bumps along Cameron Avenue were Chancellor nor the Trustees had "the

slightest respect for us, either as students or as bumps."

When the Chancellor finally did dig up some bumps to serve on the Committee, the paper accused him of driving the

the University Hearings Committee, no

student body to depression and despair "He's no bump!" the editor stormed, but later retracted the dig, because everyone knew the Chancellor was. The editor continued: "The

Chancellor and the Trustees have repeatedly failed to accord us treatment as bumps. When will they come down from their eminences, when will they realize that we are made of the same stuff as they are?-that we eat, breathe, eat-that we are all born and that someday we are going to die. And when we do, it will be the end of us as bumps-period. Death is the Great Leveler, and he comes for all of us. No one escapes him! In fact, I think I just saw him pass the window-he's looking in

at me-he's going to the door-he's in the The Chancellor was unmoved. "This kind of talk," he said, "doesn't amount to a hill 'o beans. And even if it did . . . His voice trailed off. Talking was beneath

As the day of the hearing approached, information concerning the investigation was hushed up. The most prominent bumps below the Chancellor refused to comment. The Chancellor remained

Nevertheless, there were leaks, and the most significant was that the bumps had been ordered to Cameron Avenue by the Chancellor himself. Now, information on this point is scanty at best, especially because of the secrecy with which administration business is transacted. But

what seems to have happened is this: Someone leaked the rumor even to the Chancellor, who checked and found it was true; he had indeed ordered the bumps into the street. This, at least, explains why the investigation was suddenly halted and never resumed, and why there was never any official elucidation of the administration action, except for the remark quoted above from the Chapel Hill Weekly.

There are other theories, of course, but none of them accounts for events, as we understand them, half so well. Many of them are highly improbable.

The Chancellor, naturally, never commented on the matter beyond the rather cryptic remark that he "got his bumps in that affair." In private, though, he is reported to have asked, "If the Green Berets can do it, why can't we?"

"Anyhow," he added, "I was out of town at the time."

The Daily Tar Heel is published

Offices are at the Student Union

by the University of North Carolina

(1) Mr. Al Thomas's accusations of

September 27 concerning my columns written one and one half years ago are pusillanimous, frivolous, and without foundation. (2) Ad hominem arguments in no way weaken our position which is (3) no student should have to pay for a newspaper he does not want. (4) Why are Todd Cohen and his courageous crusaders afraid to admit in print that they favor forcing students to support their

> Your servant, Tom Benton

may come to the DTH office and read it.

Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods. Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news-933-1011; business, circulation, advertising 933-1163. Address: Carolina Union, Chapel

> Hill, N.C. 27514. Subscription rates: \$10 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.

White Denied Entrance To BSM Social Function

To The Editor:

his hands.

I am a transfer student at UNC-CH. As such. I attempted to attend a Black Student Movement function announced in the orientation pamphlet for 13 September 1969. I was under the impression that there would be a business meeting on that date, however, I was

Upon arriving early, to what I thought

was the business meeting, I was told by two negroes (sic), who seemed to be in charge, that I should not stay for the event because it was for negro freshmen and transfer students. I was still under the impression that there would be a meeting and so questioned my informants as to why I could not remain. I was told that I should understand why whites weren't welcome. At this point I finally realized that there was to be a social event instead of a business meeting and I immediately departed the area.

My not being allowed to attend the BSM social event did not offend me in the least, as I had only intended to attend a business meeting. The negro reaction to my appearance at their party was at least an honest one and for that I am grateful. However I would like to know why people, other than negro, are denied admission to an announced portion of orientation? It is my understanding that the BSM is subsidized by UNC-CH, if this is true then it would seem that any UNC student could participate in BSM

As my purpose here at UNC is education and not extra-curricular activities, I am not sure of the purpose of this letter, other than to point out some ambiguous attitudes on this campus.

> Sincerely yours, Ronald R. Benson

Benton Replies To Accusations

To the Editor:

publication?

Editors Note: If Mr. Benton has forgotten the contents of his column he