

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Editor

Harry Bryan Managing Editor
Laura White News Editor
Bobby Nowell Associate Editor
Mary Burd Arts Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Bob Wilson Business Manager
Frank Stewart Advertising Manager

Sandra Saunders Night Editor this issue

To Retain Food Service, Community Must Respond

The administration has left little hope that the food service will be continued after the SAGA pull-out in May. That pessimism is in keeping with the University's financial figures which suggest the operation is a major liability.

However, the possibility has been left open by Vice-Chancellor Eagles that with a substantial student response to a poll on the food service, the University might be convinced that there would be support for a continued food operation.

Such a poll does have the potential of measuring the feelings of the on-campus students concerning the need for the continuation of the dining service. And despite the possible technical drawbacks of the poll the administration is working on a strong student response, in either direction, could help the University determine what to do.

The poll does contain certain inadequacies because it does not attempt to seek the opinions of all members of the University community who might well patronize the service if it were continued. It will, at last report, poll only on-campus students. The great number of off-campus students, as well as faculty members, administrators, and non-academic employees who might eat on campus are not going

to be included.

That, we feel, is a mistake.

We also believe the drafting of the questionnaire ought to be undertaken by not only the Business Office, but by some of the principal parties to the matter, as well as individuals who might be trained in drawing up such polls.

H. M. Blalock, Jr., a professor of sociology, has written us saying that although "numerous member of our department are specialists in research methods (and) several are BOTH specialists in research methods and race and ethnic relations... as far as I am aware, no such assistance has EVER been requested of us."

Simply, the University can make use of more of its faculties to help it make its decision of the food service. A great many people are going to be affected if the service is discontinued. It might be worthwhile for the University to open its doors to those people. It also might want to use the services of some of the social technicians which are available.

By the same token, the members of the community who are genuinely interested in the outcome of the controversy might make known their feelings. Enough unsolicited response and demonstration of concern might aid the administration in its endeavors.

Dangerous Politics

Vice President Agnew's politics would be funny if he was not so serious and thus dangerous as a politician. Agnew is certainly astute in his ability to say the right thing at the right time to the right people. But that he uses his political stature to breed emotionalism in American politics an emotionalism based on extreme prejudice—that is perhaps more important for its threatening nature than for its political adeptness.

One of Agnew's principal complaints about the Chicago conspiracy trial has been that the defendants, "a handful of oddballs... deliberately set out to politicize a simple criminal proceeding and to disrupt the most basic protection of our society—the dignity of our courts."

The Vice President must be well aware that he is doing exactly what he dislikes in others. Regardless of

the tactics of the Chicago Eight, the fact that men like Agnew and Sen. Stennis have politically used the Chicago trial is quite clear.

Agnew has not just limited his politicization of America to the Chicago trial. He will attack just about anyone who is part of a vocal minority, or part of a group which chooses to criticize the Nixon administration.

Agnew's attacks on the press and television news media, his blasts at draft-evaders, and at all radical, or even liberal, youth groups in general does not do much to clear him of his own guilt in the politicization of simple events to disrupt our society and our way of looking at things.

The Vice President is stirring up the people. But he is appealing to their fear and their emotions, as if reason and honesty did not exist, or were not the kinds of things that win votes.

Thanks, Charlie Scott

Duke Indoor Stadium will be the scene this afternoon of the final regular-season basketball game for Duke and North Carolina. It will also host the conclusion of the regular season career of one of this school's great if not greatest basketball players of all time.

Since we cannot project the Tar Heels' performance in post-season tournament play, we would like to tip our hat now to Charlie Scott, Carolina's All-American.

The first black athlete on scholarship at UNC, Scott was a standout from the moment he took the floor as a freshman. Now, nearly four years later, he needs only 105 points to become the school's top all-time scorer.

He has survived the physical and verbal abuse heaped upon him in the Tar Heels' trips around the country, as the team's only black player for two seasons. But his successes on the court (two-time All-American and a certain A-A this year) and off (honors student) have opened the way for other black people to attend Carolina. Not only black athletes.

And this may be Charlie Scott's greatest contribution to the institution with the blue and white colors: just as Joe Louis, an athlete, was in the Thirties and Forties, Charlie Scott has been an inspiration to blacks.

His success has shown them that the struggle for human equality is worthwhile.

Ben Singletary

Execution Example Is No Deterrent To Crime

*This is a man.
He is a poor creature.
You are not to kill him.
This is a man.
He has had a hard time upon the earth.
You are not to kill him.*

—Kenneth Patchen

On the 26th day of next April, Shelton Colby will leave his cell in block 14 of San Quentin's maximum security unit and walk approximately 85 steps into a small bare room, where he will be strapped into a grotesquely wired chair and shortly thereafter have electricity shot through his body until he ceases to live.

The medical report will attribute Colby's death to cardiac arrest incurred through severe electrical shock. The "Colby, Shelton T." file in the warden's office will be officially stamped "closed" and the ballad singers will mutter something about his "paying the price of crime." And what all this means is that on April 26, the people of this nation will have legally murdered one Shelton Colby, U.S. public enemy.

Yes, I know that no one's been legally executed in the United States for over five years. But I still think the question of legal execution is one of extreme importance. Because whether it's evoked or not, there's still a law in over 45 states that gives a judge the right to tell a convicted man when and by what method he is going to die.

There is still a law that says the court has the right to take a life—a law that makes no mention of the possibility that a reprieve might be coming. And to a man sentenced to die, I doubt there's much

consolation in the fact that nobody else has been executed recently. Because he's the guy that's sweating it out in a cell, wondering about how it feels to be electrocuted and how he will hold up emotionally when they come to take him away.

It's really kind of funny, in a not-so-funny way, but in no era of history has it ever been proven that execution is a definite deterrent to crime; that making an example of one poor life can successfully save the life of another. And yet we continue to kill people in the name of justice, only our killing is different from that of the murderer because we do it for society and it's fast and painless and besides, how could we call ourselves Christians and Americans if we really saw ourselves as murderers? And what is rehabilitation anyway and how can we possibly afford it because we just finished paying for the new electric chair and new gas chamber down at the state prison?

You know, the House of Lords in England recently voted to abolish the death penalty after a speech by Lord Gardiner. "I think," he said, "that human beings who are not infallible ought not to choose a form of punishment which is irreparable. I don't think it right to employ other people to do a thing which you would in no circumstances do yourself." And that, my friend, is a powerful argument.

It's a real shame they don't require each judge and jury who condemns a man to death to watch his execution. Then people would realize what men like Colby go through to get their name in the "our-line UPI obituary. They would know how it feels to watch a man gag for air as the gas capsules explode around him in

the room where he is tied.

They would know what a man looks like in his death convulsions when 40,000 volts of electricity are shooting through his body. But then, it usually only takes about 10 seconds and it can't hurt the guy too bad in that short time, can it?

You know, the Indians even gave the men they sentenced to death a fighting chance. They let a man run for his life instead of tying him to a chair. Only those people were barbaric and we are civilized so we do it better and, anyway, scientists tell us they can't feel a thing after the first few seconds.

Since the olden days of yore or some such barbaric time, man has seen fit to punish the crimes of his peers according to their severity. He has lived by a creed of exacting an eye for an eye and a life for a life and absolved himself of blame or guilt because his Bible has a passage somewhere that say "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

But the book says several other things also like "bless those that persecute you" and "forgive thine enemies" and there's even a "thou shalt not" that ends in "kill." Period. God didn't modify his statement to read "Thou shalt not kill except when..." No, man came along and undertook that campaign and came up with quite a list of times that killing would be acceptable to God.

And regardless of whether or not you believe in God or care less about what the Bible says, you have to realize sooner or later that man is not going to put an end to murder and capital crime by making

examples of those who commit such acts.

Murder will only be eliminated when all men truly believe that killing is wrong and evil and not to be engaged in. And such convictions can only come about through rehabilitative teaching and training and not through working overtime for God in deciding who's to live and who's to die, and killing in the name of justice and right.

So this is for all the Shelton Colby's marking off the days till they die on some calendar or wall in some iron cage in a godforsaken prison. And for an 18-year-old girl in Raleigh named Marie Hill who was sentenced to die in the state gas chamber on December 27 while most of us were still singing Christmas carols and have visions of sugar plums dance around in our heads.

Of course, Miss Hill received a stay of execution from Governor Scott. Good Ole Uncle Bob. Always looking out for his children, He wasn't going to let them kill a young girl. Not good Ole Uncle Bob. This social humanitarian decided to give her a break. Now she only has to look forward to life in prison. Some break.

Now if you people don't mind, I'd like to dedicate the rest of this column to all the Colby's of the world who are still waiting on a death row somewhere out there in T.V. land: "Hello there, Mr. Colby. I just wanted you to know that when you die on April 26, it is for the betterment of mankind and the elimination of evil that we are killing you. You are our example of what happens to naughty little boys and girls.

Frances L. Miller

Sex Discrimination Persists In Hiring

Contrary to what many people believe and what many companies, universities, etc. would like us to believe, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act did not end sex discrimination in jobs.

If it changed anything at all, it only made the discrimination more subtle. Rather than simply being told that they can't be hired because of their sex, women are now told other such excuses as that coming to and from work on late shift hours would be dangerous, that they don't weigh enough, or that they simply aren't suited for the job.

Thus women are kept in low paying jobs, if they are hired at all, and the median income for women working full-time is \$4,000 per year while that of men is \$7,000. Often the excuse for such differential pay is that women work for "pin money." That pin money is usually rent, food, and clothing since most women work out of necessity, and since 10% of families today are headed by women. One half of the families headed by women are below the poverty level in income.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has said that it is illegal to discriminate by sex for the following reasons:

- 1) Some members of a given sex are unable or unwilling to do the job.
- 2) Preference of customers, co-workers, or employers.
- 3) The job has been traditionally restricted.
- 4) The job involves heavy physical labor, manual dexterity, late night hours, overtime, work in isolated locations or unpleasant surroundings.
- 5) The job involves travel or travel with the opposite sex.
- 6) Physical facilities are unavailable.

unless the expenses of installing them would be "prohibitive."

7) The job requires personal characteristics not exclusive to either sex such as tact, charm, or aggressiveness.

So how can companies continue such discrimination when it seems that almost every excuse is illegal? For one thing, most women are not aware that such excuses are illegal. So the first step in ending job discrimination is informing women of their rights. But as has been proven at UNC, women do not even have the right to inform other women of their rights.

A few weeks ago, members of Female Liberation were handing out fact sheets about job discrimination and women's rights outside the office of the General Electric recruiter. (One of the major issues in the recent strike against General Electric was the wage differential for women.) One woman at a time stood outside the door of the recruiter's office and handed fact sheets to the women who passed by. At about 12:30 (apparently the first time the woman was noticed), the women handing out the leaflets was confronted by the head of the placement office, the chief of Campus Police, and a copy of the disruptions policy; she was told to leave immediately or be arrested. Faced with the choice, she left. She was not allowed to read the disruptions policy, nor was she told exactly what part of it she had violated. Careful study of the policy later revealed that the only possible violation was "creating a nuisance." Can one person standing quietly in a hall handing out leaflets create a nuisance? Apparently so, if she is informing women of their rights for equal hiring—a policy which is violated not only by most of the companies allowed to recruit on the University campus, but also by the University itself.

The University calls upon the Disruptions Policy, that bastion of equality and justice, to insure that male-domination and male privileges are not challenged.

Readers Forum

Letters to the editor must be typed and double-spaced, not exceeding 300 words. The letter writer must indicate his willingness for his opinion to be expressed in print. All printed letters must carry the name and address of the writer(s).

Letters should be addressed to the Associate Editor, care of The Daily Tar Heel, Student Union.

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.

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



Letter to the Editor

Food Service Failure 'Frightening'

To The Editor:

University officials are shirking their responsibility to the students and openly admitting their lack of management ability in their refusal to resume operation of the U.N.C. food service.

This University needs a food service. If the patronage is low, why can't the University scale down its operation and only try to feed the number of students who will actually use the service? Contrary to the University's apparent assumption—every part of this University doesn't have to be large to be good.

Even if the food service operation cannot make a profit due to uncontrollable elements—what makes the feeding of the students any less worthy of subsidization than other campus systems which are well subsidized?

Effective operation of the food service cannot be impossible. There are many very successful food service operations in N.C. who by comparison, certainly don't enjoy a "captive audience" of thousands of prospective patrons isolated in an area the size of the U.N.C. campus.

It seems that the University needs to ask itself which is more

important—providing life's essentials of food, shelter, etc., or providing purely academic and entertainment services?

If the University continues its pattern of turning over the operation of its less exciting services to private enterprise, the future will see many average N.C. families unable to send their sons and daughters to U.N.C. If the food service is abolished on the U.N.C. campus, it will only be a short time before each student will realize that there are no longer any price controls on the private food service establishments in Chapel Hill. When private enterprise in Chapel Hill finds that it no longer has any competition from the University (the state) in the area of food service (and ultimately other areas) its price structure will become completely out of reach of the less financially able student.

Exactly what are the physically handicapped and non-driving freshmen dormitory residents going to do—walk two miles round trip three times a day to acquire their meals?

The University's proposed solution of allowing the worker's cooperative to operate the system is somewhat ridiculous on its face. If a powerful

organization such as the University and one of the nation's most successful food service management organizations have failed; how can the University seriously believe that a group of workers, many of whom have to be inexperienced since they have spent the majority of their time being "on-strike" and out of work in the past two years will be able to effectively manage the operation?

After pending several years in food service management, it is most frightening for me to observe that a massive, all-powerful, state-dominating giant like the Consolidated University of North Carolina with all of its vast physical and human resources cannot manage something as simple as feeding a meal to a few thousand students each day. If it cannot successfully accomplish this, how in the world is the University managing such a complex and difficult process as the education of 16,000 students and the administration of the thousands of faculty and staff, as well as the millions of dollars and acres of real estate which comprise this University campus?

Bill Durham
Law School