

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Bobby Nowell	Managing Editor
Steve Enfield	Assoc. Mgr. Editor
Tom Gooding	Associate Editor
Mary Burch	Arts Editor
Art Chansky	Sports Editor

Ron Johnson	Business Manager
Frank Ballard	Advertising Manager

Dave Clark Night Editor this issue

John Agar

Creating An Issue On Absurdities

In a way the most interesting phenomenon of the semester has been the way Tom Benton & Cohorts have cast about for an issue at once large enough to encompass their dislike of the Tar Heel and yet moderately sensible.

The first attempt, charges of obscenity, slanted news coverage and radicalism on the editorial page was just silly. It should have been embarrassing for its authors, and they were right to disclaim it as fast as they did.

The latest attempt, the protest against the "compulsory" student support of the Tar Heel, is just as absurd. But it's also just specious enough to fool people, especially those who are honestly libertarian. Mr. Benton I do not consider libertarian. Hence, what follows is no attempt to open any sort of dialogue with him—after all, he has all the answers. But I do want to point out, for those who are repelled by the terminology "compulsory support," just what this issue is all about.

Benton's Friday letter to the DTH challenges Todd Cohen and his "courageous crusaders" to admit that they favor "forcing" students to support the Tar Heel. I admit it.

Of course, when we say "forcing," let's bear in mind that the Student Legislature allocates money to the Tar Heel—money which comes from student fees which, theoretically, students levied on themselves.

Apparently, about 15 years ago the UNC student body decided to support Student Government financially through the imposition of a fee, or tax, on the students. Whether or not the decision was a wise one each can judge for himself. Whether or not it's binding is another question: It is, and if Benton doesn't like it, he ought to push for a referendum to abolish the pull.

What riles me about Benton's approach is his crass refusal to make his complaint to the student government. Whether he's right or wrong, whether his dissent is wholesome or not, Benton's decision to bypass student government and go to the chancellor puts him and his issue beyond the pale of serious consideration. UNC's students have seen enough of their rights and prerogatives eaten away by the University administration just in these few weeks of the new year without asking for more.

But beyond his disregard of the students he so zealously wants to protect, Benton's basic issue is a put-on. And he knows it.

The Tar Heel is supported just as all programs in a democratic system are supported. The majority appropriates tax money contributed by the whole constituency. This is exactly how the United States works, Mr. Benton. And don't you just flip when you hear that Joannie Baez won't pay 50 per cent of

her taxes because 50 per cent of the federal budget goes for the military?

A paper distributed at a YPC desk points out that the DTH is a "privileged monopoly... inherently a violation of freedom of the press. Period."

So is the Congressional Record, so are all official publications, so are all company magazines.

The point is that the Tar Heel was established by and for the students, who vote directly for its editor. If the students decide that the Tar Heel has not been keeping up with campus news, there is a new editor to be elected every year, and doubtless there'll be someone to fill the

job.

But rather than being a monopoly, the Tar Heel is a service to the students, just as social security is a service the U.S. government renders its citizens. In either case, the citizen (or student) can supplement this service, he can join a private pension plan or read the News and Observer; but he must still pay his dues, just as he must for the "service" provided by the military.

If Benton and his friends want to argue this point, I'd like first to see it put in the abstract, I'd like to see the position itself, divorced from any one issue. Then I'd like to see Mr. Benton apply it first to

our entire concept of government and last to the Tar Heel.

If he can get through without rendering everything he considers a shambles—prove, that is, that the Tar Heel's mode of support is an exception rather than the rule—then, and only then, will his issue have any relevancy.

In the meantime, if Mr. Benton has any objections to the DTH's policies, and if he is still good enough, I suggest he resume writing his column. His behavior right now smacks very much of the man who "had the courage of his convictions, but no convictions."

Power: The Ultimate Question

In ruling out the acceptability of the "double-jeopardy" amendment, now pending a vote by the student body, the Faculty Committee on Student Discipline and the Dean of Men have once more demonstrated the true role of student self-government in this University.

In a letter sent last week to Student Body President Alan Albright, the Faculty Committee on Student Discipline said the double jeopardy bill, passed by the Student Legislature last Thursday, was unacceptable for three reasons.

The first objection was the use of the word "seriously" to describe those cases of disruption which could be tried in student courts.

The second objection was the limitation to Chapel Hill of those instances of disruption which could be tried.

And the third objection was the bill's clause providing that the student Attorney General and student courts would interpret the policy as provided for by the Student Legislature.

The letter expressed the Committee's hope that President Albright would "postpone irrevocable action until the Committee and the Student Judiciary can work out a policy acceptable under our separate responsibilities."

The letter also made clear the Committee's feelings on who was responsible for the regulation of student conduct.

It is the "joint duty of the Faculty and Chancellor to exercise full and final authority in the regulation of student conduct in all matters of student disruption" in light of the Trustee policy," the letter declared.

Which means a lot of things.

First, Sam Barnes, Chairman of the Committee, and James O. Cansler, Dean of Men, from who's office the letter was mailed, apparently think very little of the sovereignty of the student judiciary or Student Legislature in the context of the institution of student self-government.

The objections of Mr. Barnes and his Committee to the "double-jeopardy" proposal are not insignificant or very credible in themselves. They are significant only in that they symbolize the willingness and apparent easy conscience with which the administration usurps what has traditionally been called the right of student government.

It is not the right or power of the students to decide. Rather it is the "joint duty of the Faculty and Chancellor" to decide.

Which, really, is nothing very surprising to us. Dean Cansler seems to have demonstrated his feelings as to the invalidity of student government before this.

Last week he said two students arrested for possession of marijuana would be tried in student courts, regardless of the sentences they received in civil court. Mr. Cansler thus demonstrated his lack of recognition for the "double-jeopardy" amendment passed by the student body last spring which guaranteed students tried in civil courts the right not to be tried in student courts for the same offense.

Mr. Cansler really does not amaze us by his blatant lack of respect for student self-government—a right, by the way, which is proudly pointed to and defended by Chancellor Sitterson.

No, Mr. Cansler does not amaze us. What amazes us is that such a man should fill the post of Dean of Men.

And what about the Faculty Committee on Student Discipline, which sent President Albright the letter?

It is also guilty of violating the idea of student self-government. But we shouldn't really become upset over such complications. Not if we realize that students really are, and always have been, very little in control of their own lives here at the University.

The Trustees grant the administration some power. The Administration in turn grants some of that power to the faculty and some to the students.

The students have plenty of power, shaky as it is. They have their own judiciary, which is quite a burden off the Dean of Men's back, who would have to try the cases were there no student judiciary.

And this tacit approval of the right of self-regulation makes the students feel proud of themselves. They are really grown up now. Except they can't really try students all by themselves, not when the case involves something important.

Because in a case like that the administration, Dean Cansler's and the Committee's on Student Discipline, they come along and decide who will try whom, and for what.

And where is student government, where is the proud institution which epitomizes the maturity and responsibility in the students as recognized by the administration? Where?

It's where it has always been. It is in the hands of the administration. The mercy of the administration. An administration which plays politics with the idealism and trust of the students. Students who maybe still believe that they really do have some rights and some power of their own.

But these men such as James O. Cansler, they seem rather uninterested in what the students feel is important. That students should exert some control over their own lives with their own rules and their own system of government.

Student government is too much of nothing. When it is functional for the propagation of the administration's style of life, then it is permitted to continue in its token role of administration lackey.

But when student government stands up on its two feet, stands up straight, or at least tries to, then the administration comes along and lays down the law, gives us the naked truth. That we are nothing. We are students, and one can't get much lower than that.

Ah, life. What a tragedy that we must live with this particular University administration, an administration which seems to be living in the wrong world at the wrong time.

Because this administration's condescending, patronizing attitude towards students is tragic, if we accept students as being more than children, and the administration as being less than perfect.

It's getting to be the time when the members of our student government ought to start seriously questioning their actual power, and whether such a degree of power is worth defending through the mechanism of student government.



Ken Ripley

A Perfect Bracelet, For Her

I did not know her and doubt I ever will. She had come into the office this summer to see another employee, a girl friend of hers.

She wasn't pretty. She was very plainly dressed and had a scraggly, forgotten type of face. Her presence annoyed me. I wanted her to leave, so I wouldn't have to look at her.

She remained, though, talking about an operation she had had recently and about how much she looked forward to a change in weather.

"I baby myself," she offered once, though no one seemed to be really interested in what she did.

A bit of lipstick, a few pieces of

ribbon, and a gaudy bracelet were all that adorned her, and I could see that they were placed on with great deliberation, as if someone had taken great pains to put them on attractively. But they were placed badly, it seemed to me, without taste. At best, they appeared baubles from the dime store. On her, they seemed cheap.

The bracelet was too big for her arm, and it kept slipping up, only for her to have to push it down again. This she did every few minutes. It was depressing.

Then, smiling broadly but, yet, hesitantly, she asked her friend what she thought of the bracelet, explaining that it was new and that she had "spent a good

deal of money" for it. I felt sorry for her friend. She didn't know what to say, either.

"It's just right for you," she managed to stammer out at last, trying her best to give her friend a reassuring smile.

The lady seemed to preen at this approval. "I just love it," she crooned. "It's perfect." Then she left.

Thinking quite the opposite, I gave her a pitying look behind her back as she disappeared into the hall, but as I did so, my eye caught my reflection in the office mirror. I stared at my tie, at what I had thought was a gallant choice of colors and a model of good taste. I remembered the bracelet.

Perhaps, for her, it was perfect.

Rick Allen

The Supreme Court's Circus Routine

The Supreme Court of the United States has long been a symbol of the impartial and honest justice that we feel characterizes our country.

This is not exactly the case. The Supreme Court has been a political institution ever since Thomas Jefferson did battle with John Marshall and his Federalists.

But despite politics, we have always

been able to feel pride in our system. We are assured of fairness, speed, benevolence and presumed innocence in our trials. The Constitution has been errors of a higher-up.

These defendants are merely scapegoats in a show.

The Berets, it appears, have been doing the dirty work of the CIA for years now in Vietnam, murdering agents whenever

necessary. But somebody got the signals crossed on Thai Khac Chuyen. Intelligence has a cellular structure and few if any individuals know much more than what is going on in their own sector. It seems that Thai was discovered as a double agent by one group while he may have been a triple agent, actually working for interpreted in various ways, but at least it has always been honored.

Now, however, the dignity of our courts is threatened by a circus atmosphere, an inquisition, and a tendency toward trial by public opinion. Specifically, the non-trial of the eight Green Berets and the persecution of the eight new-left leaders in Chicago are dragging the ideals of justice into the mud of sensationalism. In each of these cases, what is at stake is not so much the guilt or innocence of the defendants, but that the trials are being used to cover the

us. In any case, his elimination was a blunder and the Berets were forced to cover it up. When the Army decided not to have a court martial, they made it clear that they still thought the Berets were guilty.

Similarly, in Chicago, Mayor Richard Daley needed a patsy for his blunders during the Chicago Convention two summers ago. He had urged police to be tough on civil offenders and they went clearly overboard in what the Walker Report has called a "police riot."

Thus eight leaders of the Yippies, SDS and other leftist groups are blamed for the trouble. The trial is being conducted by a blatantly conservative judge and the defense lawyers are acting immaturely.

It is time to stop this circus routine. In California, Judge Earl Warren, Jr. took his court into a night club to watch living evidence that a naked dancer had offended community standards. Supreme Court appointee Clement Haynsworth will be accepted even though he has indulged himself in a number of conflicts of interest.

The dignity and stability of our judicial system are at stake. We must recognize and stop the abuse.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication 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: Tarolina 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.

Letters To The Editor

Quotes Used As Documentation

To the editor:
Since many students, if not the majority, are skeptical of the charge that *The Daily Tar Heel* predominantly expresses the radical viewpoint and never expresses the conservative and moderate viewpoints I should like to document this criticism as true.

I have selected the months of September through December of last year for observation, taking short quotations from various editorials that I feel reflect the radical position. In no way have I attempted to distort the opinions expressed nor are these examples atypical of the paper's usual position. I give the dates to indicate the continuity of these opinions and I have selected the fall semester, even though the spring issues offer more dramatic examples, because some students feel that irresponsible journalism was justified in last spring's paper due to the Revealed Truths defended therein.

Sept. 20 First of all, I don't like this campus. But the solution's easy. Let's set up an experimental campus... Of course we'll need an experimental administration since no one would be satisfied with Chancellor Sitterson and his gang.

Sept. 26 "We think SSOC offers a good vehicle for effecting change at UNC."

Sept. 29 "Law and Order" Means "Keep Niggers Down"

Oct. 2 Students and those who are

creation of new ones.

Oct. 5 (on the subject of Columbia University) "Unfortunately, the tactic of disruption will remain necessary in this community"

Oct. 11 Students "should try to spend a few hours this weekend helping the boycott" of Durham merchants.

Oct. 12 (to ignore) the request that students clean off their own tables, strikes us as the most effective means for students to show they are disgruntled with the action of Lenoir Hall.

Note the date on that one. This is several months before the Lenoir controversy even started. And this next one, believe it or not, is an "editorial" comment.

Oct. 15 If your ideas of the University is a place for learning then make this so by contributing to (Eldridge) Cleaver. Checks should be made out to the Black Student Movement.

Oct. 19 (Eldridge) "Cleaver would have been beneficial to students... as an example of the New Left and the militant Blacks."

Nov. 1 We hope the Book Exchange will take quick steps to meet these demands of the students; otherwise, students should not hesitate to boycott the Book Ex.

Nov. 14 As for the matter of what the people in the state would think, we believe they should be ignored... Again, we encourage you to take part in today's march to the chancellor's

house.

Nov. 20 Activism Necessary. Riotous student activism is rarely desirable. Nevertheless, the Administration would be thrust into an awkward situation by this move.

Nov. 21 "we consider him (Stokly Carmichael) one of the great men in our country in terms of what he has done or tried to do."

Dec. 4 "That's the way our country is being run nowadays... 'Law and order' precludes the practice of free speech." The last quotation I find ironic.

I point out that during this period *The Daily Tar Heel* expressed opposition to: the school administration, the UNC Bookexchange, the UNC Library, the UNC snack bars, the UNC campus in general, Student Government, the Chicago police, the Chapel Hill police, the Campus police, the U.S. Congress, the U.S. military forces, various industrial firms, various conservative political candidates, and 'Law and Order'.

They expressed support of: SSOC, boycotting Durham merchants, boycotting various UNC services, disrupting service at Lenoir Hall, Eldridge Cleaver, Stokely Carmichael, anarchy and activism when 'morally' justified.

I do not suggest that taking a radical stand on any given issue is a criticism of *The Daily Tar Heel*. I merely question how it can be that a minority viewpoint is the only political viewpoint expressed in a student newspaper in a free and academic environment.

Nash Herndon
31 Old West