

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
Mary Burch Arts Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Ron Johnson Business Manager
Frank Ballard Advertising Manager

Dave Clark Night Editor this issue

Al Thomas

Moratorium Needs Business Support

The Vietnam War Moratorium set for October 15 could be something short of successful here at UNC.

Months of preparation by peace activists, editorials supporting the moratorium and the enthusiasm of student participants could be forced to achieve only very limited goals.

The critical point here as well as everywhere in the country lies in the participation, or non-participation, of members of the business and labor communities.

The principle reason for the moratorium, according to its leaders, is to bring pressure on the President to commit himself more convincingly to a rapid end of the war and to speed-up withdrawals from Vietnam.

The power of student influence was tested in 1968 in several campaigns for president and congressional seats. That influence proved most formidable.

Nevertheless, students alone will probably find it difficult to force Nixon to end the war immediately.

Without the active support of the business and labor communities the entire effort could be little more effective than "Time-Out" Day in the fall of 1968.

Most leaders of the moratorium here seem to realize the importance of the business community (for Chapel Hill, the labor community seems a bit difficult to find).

This in itself could save the October 15 protest, at least potentially.

Ben Blakewood, a senior from Greensboro who is on the steering committee for the moratorium, said "the support of the Chapel Hill business community is vital to the overall success of the moratorium here."

Blakewood noted, however, that students are needed to help organize the campaign in the business community.

He said response has been good in downtown areas covered but many businessmen will be missed because there are too few student helpers.

The vast majority of students here seem to oppose the Vietnam War. There are many that do not, but legislators and others in positions of power will not be surprised by 1,000 students attending speeches and seminars against the war.

What will be surprising and leave the deepest impression on the adult politics is solid support for the moratorium from the business community.

The politicians have disregarded students wants and demands for a very long time but would be hesitant in opposing men and women with influence, money and position in the community.

This, and not how many students cram into a building or stand on the grass to hear a speaker will ultimately decide the value of the Vietnam War Moratorium.

A large student turnout will undoubtedly have some effect. Even without business or labor, there is a chance the point of the moratorium may be driven home to Nixon.

But for any assurance of success, the business community will have to be included. And for right now, student

volunteers to help on Franklin St. are not very plentiful.

Letters to the editor should be typed and double-spaced. Letters should be typed on fifty-space lines if possible. All letters must be signed.

All letters to the editor are welcomed by the editorial staff, regardless of the opinions and ideas presented within them.

Letters should be addressed to the associate editor, care of the Daily Tar Heel.

A Question Of Involvement

The Student Legislature approved Thursday night a bill to hold a student referendum on the matter of "double-jeopardy."

At present, there is a "double-jeopardy" amendment in the Student Constitution, approved by the student body last spring, which guarantees students tried in civil courts the right not to be tried in student courts for the same offense.

The new bill would allow students to be tried in student courts "so as to affect (their) academic record" only when their actions had "seriously disturbed the academic process of the University community."

The Student Legislature would determine exactly what offenses would "seriously" disturb the community.

The passage of the bill Thursday was a positive move in the light of the present controversy over the Trustees' disruption policy and list of procedures to implement that policy, released last month.

In those two papers, the Trustees set down the policy and the procedures to implement it. No one from this University community was involved in the decisions which went into those two documents.

After the Trustees' release, the University Judicial Reform Committee, comprising students, faculty, and administrators, released its own list of procedures which it had worked on since last spring.

That list of procedures is more credible than the trustees; from our standpoint, for it represents the feelings of members of this community, rather than of such an absentee group as the Trustees appear to be.

What both lists of procedures propose is that students take part in the process of adjudicating University disruptors. Under the present constitutional amendment, the boards which would handle disruption cases, and on which students would sit, would constitute student courts and thus would be illegal.

It is important that students be given the right to participate in implementing the disruption policy. It is therefore necessary for the student body to amend the constitution to allow such participation.

Should the "double-jeopardy" proposal pass, two positive results would occur.

For one, students would be guaranteed representation in the judicial process for trying disruptors, no matter which list of procedures, the Trustees' or that of the University Judicial Reform Committee, were approved by the full Board of Trustees at its October meeting.

And secondly, Student Body President Alan Albright would have the grounds on which to stand in presenting the Reform Committee's report as an alternative to the Trustees' report.

We commend the Student Legislature for its passage of the "double-jeopardy" bill. We further ask students to consider the proposal carefully, bearing in mind the question of student participation in the University's judicial processes.

At the same time, we urge the Student Legislature to begin to determine exactly what will be considered serious disruption of the academic process of the University, a determination which is for that body to make.

Mr. Sitterson Shows Faith

Chancellor Sitterson said Friday he would attend a peace convocation scheduled during the October 15 Vietnam War Moratorium and "may make some brief comments" at that time.

He also said he hoped "all public officials are influenced by any thoughtful expression of its citizenry."

Despite President Nixon's statement last week that "under no circumstances will I be affected by" the Vietnam Moratorium, it is encouraging to see Mr. Sitterson embrace the hope that public dissent can be a constructive force in influencing our political system.

Judging from our present stance in Vietnam, it would not seem as if Mr. Nixon and his administration had learned much from the American people who disagree with the Vietnam policy. Nor does it

seem as if Mr. Nixon had learned much from the experience of Lyndon Johnson.

The President's statement last week reinforces such doubt.

But what is encouraging is the sentiment of such people as Mr. Sitterson who still have faith. The countless students and others who plan to boycott all official business on October 15 seem to hold the same faith. The faith that by showing disagreement with our involvement in Vietnam, they might somehow be able to affect the President.

We are somewhat reinforced by these optimists. We hope Mr. Nixon will listen closely to the disaffected on October 15, as well, we hope, as he might on any given day.

We also look forward to hearing Mr. Sitterson voice his personal feelings concerning the war.

Good Bumps Were Good

The speed bumps on Cameron Avenue were removed Friday by the University after the town Board of Aldermen demanded their "immediate removal."

Now that the bumps are gone and the town has had its legal way, we urge the University to follow up its feeling, as demonstrated by the original construction of the bumps, that they were beneficial to pedestrian safety.

Cameron Avenue runs through the center of this campus, and as such, it is more part of the campus

than the town's highway system.

It would be a constructive move for the street to be invalidated and transformed into a central mall for the campus.

Such a move would go beyond the effectiveness of merely installing speed bumps on the street.

We urge the University administration to investigate the possibility of such action, which would greatly benefit the members of the University community, while not causing much difficulty for the town.

Mark Rodin

'Student Responsibility'

I am happy to announce that Student Government has finally come up with a more than adequate solution to the bugging problem of "Double Jeopardy." As you already know, "Double Jeopardy" is the unfortunate situation in which a student finds himself placed when he commits a serious criminal act which violates the principles of those members living in an academic community. It results in a student being tried by two separate judicial bodies, thus suffering humiliation and punishment twice for his bad behavior.

The new proposal, which was jointly written by John McDowell, who is Alan Albright's presidential assistant for judicial affairs, and Chairman of Student Government's Committee on Judicial Affairs, and Steve LaTour, Chairman of the Legislative Services Commission, is by far the best piece of legislation that has ever been written by any two students on this campus. In fact it is by far the best piece of legislation that this writer has ever seen. These two gentlemen deserve a "well done" in my opinion.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of this proposal because it guarantees the students their constitutional rights to fair and due process before the law, while at the same time, letting the university community know that the students of this institution will not tolerate someone who commits crimes against human welfare on this campus.

The proposal, if accepted by the Student Legislature, and the members of the student body, includes one other benefit in addition to the one outlined above. It will pave the way for successful talks with both trustees and administration officials towards giving the students an equal voice in running the affairs of this university, and it will be a sign of faith and good will towards these ultraconservative bodies. This is something that students on this campus have been trying to get for years.

This policy states that "No student tried by civil authorities or subject to pending prosecution shall be tried by students so as to affect his academic record except when his actions seriously disturb the academic processes of the University. All actions which may be considered to disturb these processes must occur on the Chapel Hill campus. The student Attorney General and the student Courts shall interpret this policy as provided for by the Student Legislature."

Rafael Perez, Student Body Vice President had one provision for Student

Legislature interpretation inserted in order to protect student welfare. By so doing he has insured a student against being deliberately "burned" by any member of the student judiciary. Also excluded at the request, (and insistence), of Perez, was a list of illustrative examples of violations. This too was done to protect the welfare of the student body.

I urge all students to support and vote for this proposal, if it is approved by the Student Legislature. If you do indeed give it your support we will have entered into a new era of student responsibility.

John Agar

Coeds' Day To Hang Loose

Why is this year on the UNC campus different from all other years? Is it the fact that there are more radicals, a more liberal, student attitude, or a better football team?

Many people around the Pine Room are saying the answer to the above question is plain and simple. They say, in the conversations I'm able to overhear, that there are prettier girls on the UNC campus and more of them than ever before.

I've heard young Carolina gentlemen say this so much in the first few weeks of school that I decided it was time to do an expose', so to speak. Many of the campus girl watchers are of the opinion that there are simply more girls on campus this year.

Well, I set out to find out if there are more girl students this year. Believe me, it's not an easy thing to do. I made about six phone calls: to the Admissions office, the records office, the Provost's office, the Registrar's office, the Dean of Women's Office, and the Orientation Commission office. But nobody could tell me if there were more girls entering this year than before. I guess nobody in those important offices really cares if there are any more girls around this year, and they surely don't if these new girls are any prettier than ones in other years. But I care very much and I know some of my loyal readers do too.

So we don't know if there are more girls on campus this year. We only know that some astute observers think that there are and that there are more pretty girls especially. I think all I can do now as

a commentator on the important issues of the day is to try to offer some reasons why UNC men are more aware of Carolina Coeds than ever before.

Is it the fashions? Is it the make up? Is it their friendly personalities? There is no simple answer in this latest battle in the War of the Sexes.

The latest fashions may be a clue. This year the weaker sex is wearing shorter skirts, tighter pants, and instead of painting themselves up with make-up they seem to have that lean and hungry look.

The girls seem to be more outgoing this year. They don't sit around in their dorm rooms anymore waiting for that inevitable phone call. This year UNC girls are not afraid to go out on campus by themselves. Maybe this shows that the Woman's Liberation Movement has been effective.

Our Carolina girls seem to be more natural this year and don't seem to be going to such great lengths, literally, to make themselves look just right. Girls are showing their real selves this year. If they feel like going around in blue jeans, they do it. Maybe this is part of the new uninhibited generation. Whatever it is, not too many men around here seem to mind.

Also, women this year are saying and doing exactly what they think. It's as though some of the old Southern traditions concerning the way girls "ought" to be are breaking down. Nobody minds this either.

I really do think girls are more

attractive to UNC men this year simply because they are being themselves. They are sort of "coming into their own" as a sex. Men have been individuals for years, dressing and saying what they feel. But finally our Southern American college girl has started doing this too. Instead of Tar Heel men seeing so many girls who look alike around here, we are beginning to see many different types... all sizes and all shapes.

Well, maybe I've uncovered the basis of the big change on the UNC campus this year. But before I finish this little commentary I'd like to talk about one of the superficial physical changes about Carolina women this year.

That change is plainly stated. Some of our progressive women are no longer wearing bras. Believe me, that's a big change for this place.

Some of my assistants and I got together and decided it would be worthwhile to see if this last factor I mentioned has any merit. So we have decided to calla BAN THE BRA DAY on the UNC campus. We have decided that it should be held at a time when everybody will be out on campus spending time with many other UNC students.

We could think of no better time for our special occasion than University Day, this October 12th. So besides being a day of Traditional recognition, October 12th will be a day for contemplating the new, liberated, Carolina Coed. The slogan for this day will be "Hang Loose."

Letters To The Editor

University's Action Shows Hypocrisy

To the Editor:

The bumps are still there and the construction is still going on. So the question is: how can the officials of this University uphold the standard that there are to be no infringements of existing regulations (as in the case of campus disruptions, or failure to carry out assigned duties on October 15, etc.) when they themselves will not abide by the lawful authority of town officials? Is this not hypocrisy to act as if they have the right to act as they think best when specifically denying this "right" to others under their authority? (Obviously demonstrators, etc., are acting as they think is best.) Does Law and order apply only to those with whom that group in authority disagree?

This is but one example of many, and perhaps it is insignificant to most of this university community. But the key questions are also evident in other issues on campus, such as the trustee's disruption policy verse the one proposed by representatives of the students, faculty, and administrators. For whom do the guiding principles of our university,

and of our nation, exist? What are those who are left out of this realm to do to achieve what they believe to be right?

Perhaps some university or government official would like to comment on these questions for those of us who are seeking to understand the turbulence of our time and to acquire workable answers towards resolving that turbulence. This is a request, not a "demand"; and it is an opportunity for those in authority to offer concrete, workable suggestions towards resolving some of the problems of the generation that will succeed them.

Sincerely,
Ken Barger

Vietnam Conflict Must End Soon

To The Editor:

Last Thursday Senator Charles Goodell of New York introduced

legislation proposing the end of 1970 as a cut-off date for all funds intended for use in the Vietnam conflict.

It is fairly obvious to everyone that this war has dragged on long enough. Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations have walked the tightrope conceding here to the hawks and there to the doves. As a result our troops are bogged down in a seemingly endless struggle.

Two actions on our part could bring this fruitless struggle to a rapid finish:

First, we could launch an all out military attack to suppress the enemy and then impose martial law in South Vietnam for an indefinite period of time.

Second, we could warn the South Vietnamese of our intention to withdraw within a specified length of time. They would then be forced to assume military responsibility and stabilize their political situation of perish. Surely, the latter course is better for a country not wishing to be labeled colonial or imperialistic.

I hope everyone will participate in the October 15th moratorium to make the

will of the people clear to our reluctant legislators.

Sincerely,
Larry Hall

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: 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.

CONDITIONED REFLEX

THE RELATIVISM OF ACTIVISM IN THE PRAGMATISM OF COMMUNISM IS DUE IN PART TO THE MANNERISM OF THE PARTY MECHANISM TOWARDS TOTALITARIANISM, WHICH AS A EUPHEMISM IS KNOWN AS "BENEVOLENT DESPOTISM," IF YOU WILL EXCUSE MY APHORISM.

THAT SEEMS APPROXIMATELY ABOUT ALMOST WHAT YOU COULD SAY WOULD PERHAP BE APPARENTLY TRUE, I THINK IT'S PROBABLY POSSIBLE TO SAY NEARLY ACCURATELY ON MOST OCCASIONS IN GENERAL.

