

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Bobby Nowell Managing Editor
Laura White News Editor
Tom Gooding Associate Editor
Mary Burch Arts Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Frank Stewart Business Manager
Bob Wilson Advertising Manager

Pete Hatch Night Editor this issue

John Agar

The 60's: A Decade Turned Sour

*Now all my lies are proved untrue
And I must face the men I slew
What tale shall save me here among
Mine angry and defrauded young!*

When the big books about the sixties start coming out—soon, I expect—I wonder what they'll say about the mood of the times. I mean the movement from hope to fear, hatred and despair which has characterized the decade past.

What turned everything sour? What was it that disillusioned the students, corrupted the goal of the black movement from integration to separation, made George Wallace a serious third party candidate for the presidency, and gave us Richard Nixon to lead us into the

seventies ten years after he had been rejected as an anachronism?

It wasn't just the War, however much it intensified the decade's difficulties. It wasn't the threat of nuclear war, or of depression, disease, or famine.

I think John Kennedy started it. Whatever the reader's estimation of the Kennedy clan, mine is probably lower. Yet there's no denying that JFK sold himself to the American people. He sold his youthfulness, his vibrancy, and all that these imply, and the people responded.

After 1960, time started to speed up. Kennedy said, or seemed to be saying, that youth was no less distinguished than old age, and just as responsible. Young

people didn't have to wait till they were 35 and "substantial" before expressing an opinion. Their views were important now; more, they could even be effective.

Assassination took Kennedy out of the picture early. Whether he could have kept everything under control no one can say. But the forces Kennedy unleashed were and remain essentially unsympathetic to the American social system.

The young and the minorities, with nothing to lose, didn't mind redistributing the wealth, freedom, and the ideals of America a little more evenly. Other people did.

America had reached a point where most people really were affluent. No one who had any security was going to risk it for ideals or equality or anything for other people.

The new democrats—mainly students and blacks—were naive enough to believe that they could change things, and quickly. But by the end of the sixties the idealists had become violent or cynical or both, and everyone else had devolved into the silent majority.

Crazy America went dancing into the seventies.

The funniest thing, in a way, is that the time for change may not have been the sixties at all. It may have been the 1930s. The Time may have come and gone a generation and a half before people were ready for it.

And here we are facing the seventies worrying about inflation, violence,

repression, pollution... Each of these problems requires understanding, patience, and money, and who's got any of these?

Does the administration freeze prices in its fight against inflation? No, it would rather cut new housing starts to nothing, amid a nationwide housing shortage, and push a million or two men out of work by manipulating the economy into a mild recession.

The President has said that this decade may be mankind's last chance against pollution. Maybe. But do you think the administration is going to start pressuring industries to create costly anti-pollution systems?

And as for violence, repression, racial division, what can we expect from the expert politicians now leading the country? They are at work building a political coalition based on fear, hatred, and economic and social class distinctions.

America, as always, remains the land of possibility. But the probabilities are getting smaller and smaller.

The conflict of the sixties was frustration. It was the story of people finally getting the leisure time, the intellectual stimulus—the who knows what?—to realize that the America everyone rolls around in his mouth had taken a wrong turn a long time ago, and wasn't coming back.

The American Dream had gone sour, and we couldn't wake up.

Long Arms Of The Law

The recent firing by the Dean of Men's office of a residence advisor (RA) brings to the surface the question of what role the resident advisor is supposed to perform.

This University operates under an honor code, and the basic tenet of that code is one of self-discipline. When a student takes an examination, for example, the instructor leaves the room. Similarly, we might expect students to be able to live in dormitories without having a proctor there whose purpose is that of a disciplinarian.

But the analogy does not seem to hold, at least as far as the Dean of Men's office is concerned. The resident advisor is not merely to be a friend to the dorm citizen; he is not merely to be an "advisor." Rather, he is supposed to be a disciplinarian, and if he is not, then he will be fired.

At least that is the impression we get from the present case of John Daughtry, an RA in the Project Hinton program at James, who was fired Dec. 17 for failing to enforce the visitation policy.

Resident advisors should not be policemen, for such a role would be contrary to both the idea of an honor code, and the fact that RA's are students as well as "advisors."

It is unfortunate Mr. Daughtry was fired because he chose to act with what he felt was integrity to his position.

Student Body President Alan Albright has called for a study into

the role of student advisors as disciplinarians, part of a larger study on student affairs and what is necessary to meet the needs of students. The study is to be completed early next semester.

This is a welcome note to the present disharmony concerning the resident advisor system. Hopefully the study could come to intelligent and rational terms about the advisor system.

Unfortunately, however, studies do not tend to change things. The Kerner Commission report did not eliminate racism in this society. This study is not likely to change the inconsistencies in the resident advisor program.

What might bring about some kind of effective change for the better would be for the students who are actually a part of the program to demonstrate concrete support of Mr. Daughtry and his view that resident advisors are not supposed to be the long arm of the law. They might especially do this if they happen to feel the same way as Mr. Daughtry, and we would hope they do.

The best way of accomplishing that end might be to demand the rehiring of Mr. Daughtry and the guarantee of the Dean of Men that such travesties will no longer occur. If the demands are not met, the RA's would all resign.

That is, of course, if they all feel they should not be undercover agents, but, rather, students interested in living in a community with, and helping, other students.

The Humanity Of UNC Women

The Association of Women Students before Christmas unanimously accepted a number of proposals for restructuring women's social regulations. The proposals now sit on the desk of Dean of Women Katherine Carmichael and await her approval.

The proposals tend in the direction of realizing that women here are people and that they deserve the rights of people who live out there in the Real World. But the connection between the University and the Real World is never quite made.

For instance, one regulation (all the recommendations would go into effect next fall if approved) would extend self-limiting hours to all upperclassmen, and to freshmen with parental permission. Why "with parental permission?" Are freshmen women unworthy of the rights of human beings?

Further, there would be a transition policy for the spring under which sophomores and freshmen would have self-limiting hours, subject to parental permission. Why the need for a period of transition? Do these women have to be tested to see if they are human enough to be called "human beings?" And now sophomores are less than human, too.

On this same matter, however, the AWS proposals did recognize some humanity in the women here. The 2.0 quality point average would not be a requirement for self-limiting hours (only parental permission would serve that function, and only after the trial period).

Another positive proposal is that of decentralizing much of the decision-making on other social regulations to the individual dormitories. This, if approved, would be a step in the right direction—the right direction, of course, being that which leads the University to recognize the humanity of its students.

This question of humanity is rather important. It is important because, when we come right down to it, humanity is all we really have. Our humanity is our last resort. But when our humanity is superseded by the institution, any institution, and its need for order and discipline, however arbitrary, then some of our humanity is lost.

And what happens then is that we lose some part of that thing which is our greatest possession and possibly our greatest asset.

So in the name of humanity, we urge Miss Carmichael to approve the proposals, even to perfect them.

DTH Funds

An open meeting to discuss the funding of the *Daily Tar Heel* will be held tonight in the Union at 8. All students have been invited to attend.

It might be well worth it for any student with some real feelings, pro or con, about the newspaper to go to the meeting and to make himself heard. The issue of required student fees is a critical one and it is the one on which the role of the *Tar Heel* is balanced.

And the opinion of human beings seems pretty much to be a good thing.

Ken Ripley

Memories Of Past Drift Through Mind

Isn't it a funny feeling how days go by so slowly, but years zip by so quickly? Ten years went through my life at breakneck speed, yet I thought 1969 would never end. I can remember different days in 1960 so clearly, as if all that had happened was a dream. Sometimes I wonder if the past has any meaning, it is so easily collected and put aside.

And yet, I have to admit to myself that the past does have meaning, because it represents all that has happened to me, all that I was or could have been. Although the past is fickle and intangible, with memories floating in and out, the past has a great effect on me today.

It seems sometimes like I spend my entire life acting out the consequences of my past. Yesterday's events, feelings, actions can haunt and plague the present. Sometimes what I have done has such a powerful, painful effect on me that I am actually afraid to handle what I can do. The past acts as a check on the future, with the present providing continuity. Important than having to discard it on New Year's Eve, waiting out the last seconds of December 31 as the clock's second hand swings around to 12.

I thought the little ball in Times Square would never fall from its perch. I can't describe the strange tension that built up in me as the ball descended and 1969 slipped away. I wanted the year to end, but I was afraid to let it go. Somehow I felt as if the year had ended

before I could fill it appropriately. I felt the year had died uncompleted, and I felt guilty.

This is where the past has meaning, it seems to me, because it reminds us not only of what we have done, but of what we have left to do.

Of course, every year remains uncompleted; there is always something left undone. We can't help but aspire to higher goals than we can reach. Looking at 1970, I can't help but feel this human characteristic is both man's glory and his curse.

I was feeling this burden of filling my past as best I could for myself and others as I flew across country to return to school.

During the six-hour flight, I was wedged in my tourist-class seat next to a lady who looked like anyone's grandmother. As the hours slipped away in time zone changes, our talk turned to what had been on my mind since New Year's Eve.

She had solved the same problem in herself years ago, and her advice to me was simple.

"I just worry about the future," she commented, "and I let the past take care of itself."

As the new year grinds out each day "in its petty pace," if I make any resolutions, it would be that. I can't relive the past; mistakes, but if I can, I can concentrate today on making as few mistakes as possible.



Letters To The Editor

Honor Code Became Onesided

To The Editor:

As an out-of-state freshman here at UNC I have been quite pleased with most aspects of the University thus far. However, I have been developing a rather sceptical attitude about the "Honor Code."

This has the potential to be the ultimate expression of faith in the students of UNC, but the words seem to be empty in reality. According to the pledge that freshmen are required to sign at the beginning of the year, the Code is somewhat of an agreement between the University and the students.

It seems that this agreement has

Letters to the editor must be typed on a fifty-space line and double-spaced. 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*.

become rather onesided. What the administration seems to want is a rather extensive spy system.

An honor code, if it is one of good faith, should benefit both the University and the students. About the only benefit to the students which would be appropriate would be the trust of the administration. Do we now have that trust? Many professors, it must be said, do show a trust and concern for their students in the form of giving take-home exams and other expressions of trust. But the Honor Code has to do with the administration as well. Such things as self-limiting hours for all students would be such an expression of trust; but apparently neither the spirit nor the expressions are there.

So let's be honest about the Honor Code. By its very definition it implies that the students possess that honor or it is meaningless. It is time that the administration put its faith in our honor.

Joel Dvoskin

Nixon Won't Adopt Southern Strategy

To The Editor:

Some years ago, in a time perhaps more real, though certainly not less just,

Robert E. Lee said:

"After four years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell the brave survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to the result from no distrust of them. But feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that must have attended the continuance of the contest, I determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen..."

"With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration of myself, I bid you all an affectionate farewell."

We have been in Vietnam longer than four years, and as Richard Rovere has said, "Oh, it is to weep." But I doubt that the man who has given us Checkers and Spiro Agnew has the courage and compassion to adopt the Southern strategy of Lee.

John O. Terry

Mark Rodin

'No Limitation On Press'

Not many years ago, some "friends" of freedom and truth in the state of North Carolina banded together, and with the uncompromising aid of a select group of their state lawmakers, enacted a Speaker Ban Law prohibiting certain well-known orators from coming to the campuses of state supported colleges and universities.

Three years ago this Speaker Ban Law was ruled unconstitutional by a Federal District Court. That was the death blow to any Speaker Ban Law in this country.

However, this urge to prohibit certain speakers from giving speeches on the U.N.C. campus was not something which sprang up overnight. It had been in existence for many years prior to enactment of the Speaker Ban Law, and the sentiment still is alive today among some persons living in the state.

Some 38 years ago, a man who is now serving as an Associate Editor for the *New York Times*, was on the Editorial Board of the *Daily Tar Heel*. His name is E.C. Daniel.

Mr. Daniel wrote an editorial entitled "No Limitations On Free Speech" for the April 19, 1932 edition of the *D.T.H.* It is worth reprinting below. Read it well.

"Provincialism and conservatism in North Carolina have voiced their first protest against the recent appearance of Norman Thomas on this campus. Without mentioning the Socialist leader's name, General Mecklenburg, a pseudonymous open-letter-writer of the *Charlotte Observer*, addresses President Graham on the subject.

He suggests that the University agencies 'refrain from persistence in practices known to be sharply antagonistic to a large and substantial element of the people who must be depended upon in large measure for support of the institution.' He declares, referring unmistakably to Norman Thomas, that doctrines and ideals, social and political, which have been propagated on this campus, are 'known

to be bitterly opposed by an overwhelming majority of the men and women of the state.'

The University has no intention of antagonizing this 'large and substantial element of the people,' but it can not, as a democratic institution, show any special consideration to this element.

As for the 'overwhelming majority of men and women of the state,' to which the General refers, it is to be doubted that ten of this majority, which he assures us is opposed to the doctrines and ideals of Norman Thomas, could intelligently explain the Socialist platform.

Perhaps the General might be interested to know that 'an overwhelming majority' of the students at the University are also opposed to Norman Thomas' views. However, hundreds of them are open-minded and liberal enough to hear him without hide-bound prejudice, in order that they may judge his program fairly before condemning it.

In concluding his letter to the president, General Mecklenburg says, 'You will readily agree, of course, that maintenance of the principle of freedom of speech and thought does not require that Adolf Hitler, Mahatma Gandhi, or Joseph Stalin shall be invited to address the students.' The General is right: There is no requirement attached to freedom of speech; absence of requirement is the premise from which that hypothesis proceeds. The General will 'readily agree, of course, that maintenance of the principle of freedom of speech and thought' does require that no limitations whatsoever shall be placed upon this right.

As for Hitler, Gandhi and Stalin, what a crowd of hearers these three men would attract if they were invited to the University! Without doubt, the General himself would be on hand. Anyway, he'd miss a lot if he didn't come."

The programs of Norman Thomas, of course, were incorporated in Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal" a few years later.

This all proves that no matter how much things or ideas change, some of them still remain the same. In this age of great intellectual, social and economic progress the University is still being criticized for inviting speakers who offend the still existing provincialism and conservatism in this state.

It would do well for those advocates of speaker limitations to remember that our constitution guarantees freedom of speech and thought to all of us. This includes people such as Lester Maddox, George Wallace and Strom Thurmond. All these men have spoken on this campus and have received courteous attention from those students who have gone to hear their lectures.

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: \$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.