

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 Burch Arts Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Bob Wilson Business Manager
Frank Stewart Advertising Manager

Peter Hatch Night Editor this issue

Chicago Trial Set Tone For Reactionary Politics

The injustice of Judge Hoffman's trial in Chicago is spreading, so that his efforts and function in that trial were not in vain. The stiff, unprecedented contempt sentences which he imposed on the defense and their counsel has bred similar acts of prejudice in the land.

Governor Reagan of California has asked the state attorney general there to investigate whether William Kunstler, attorney for the Chicago Seven, had crossed state lines to incite a riot when he spoke at the University of California at Santa Barbara Wednesday. At that time Kunstler addressed more than 5000 students and exhorted them to make the defendants at the Chicago trial a symbol.

"I think we have to show the so-called establishment a voice that's strong and clear and then they'll have to judge their future course accordingly," Kunstler said.

For that statement, Reagan is going to have Kunstler investigated as to his motive. It is not difficult to analyze the situation. The Chicago trial was a tool used by the defendants to publicize a political point of view. That they were successful was due primarily to the inability of Judge Hoffman to blind himself as an objective, blind representative of justice.

The defense was in no way vague or shy about its motives. Hoffman was just as obvious as the defense, although he sought to mask his actions and motives by using the law. In effect, his handling of the trial was just as political as the action of the defendants.

Now Reagan has taken up the reactionary cause, joining the ranks of Hoffman, Vice President Agnew, Sen. Stennis, and the like. Agnew has made a name for himself by jumping on every event which can be milked for its value to the

reactionary cause, and milking it. He condemned anti-war protestors, he condemned draft evaders, he condemns "the whole damn lot" of disaffected youth. Simply, he condemns what the reactionary, silent, mediocre masses of America want him to condemn.

Stennis also used the Chicago trial for political meal. He went even further than Agnew chose to go. Stennis wants a constitutional amendment to say that under certain acts a person would forfeit his right to a trial.

And now Reagan has taken up the cause, Kunstler, a symbol of the victims of injustice, offered the Santa Barbara audience a quiet but serious plea to try to do something about political repression. His reward is that California's reactionary governor wants to have him investigated for crossing state lines to incite a riot.

The Hoffman-Agnew-Stennis-etc Doctrine of using law and government to write a new kind of politics into our society is becoming a political and social success. The mass of prejudiced Americans is responding well to the bigotry of these political leaders. The American ideal of justice and law, however, is going down the drain.

This trend into the gutter is going to continue for as long as people like Hoffman and Agnew and the rest are permitted to remain in positions of power. And mere dissent does not help educate the great mass of Americans who are convinced that the Hofmanesque politician is a great man. That mass has to be educated.

But the educating process does not happen all by itself. The only thing that moves is that which is moved. Humans can do things only if they act. Immobility is generally a weak political means of achieving a desired political end. Enough said.

Slowly, But Progressively, Visitation Policy Changes

The new visitation bill passed this week by the Student Legislature is a step in the right direction. It is about time the individual dormitories and houses should have the right to determine their own policy, regardless of the *in loco parentis* attitude posed for so long by the University.

The University presumes too much when it takes upon itself the role of moral protector of the students. The fact the Dean Cansler has come so far as he has in three years is a sign of some kind of success on the part of progressive and realistic thinking students.

In the fall of 1967, Cansler expressed his determination to prohibit co-educational visiting let alone housing. Now, at least, he permits some visiting, and in the case of Project Hinton this year, and Morrison next year, housing.

However, that the University is meeting the students a small part of the way is not enough. The *in loco parentis* attitude still exists to a great degree. Students are permitted to visit in one another's rooms, but the hours are limited and such petty regulations as the "Open Door Rule" still exist.

The new legislature bill seeks to do away with some of these conservative feelings of the University. Needless to say, the administration is probably going to put up some kind of a fight to water down the proposal.

That, for one thing, is ironic, because the proposal itself is not as liberal as it could be. The ideal situation would be to permit students, as opposed to dormitories, to decide what kind of visitation policy would exist. Why, for instance, should one student be denied his privileges if the rest of the dorm is opposed to them? A student's room should be his own castle, not that of the dormitory as a whole.

But apparently the legislature decided such a progressive policy of giving the individual the right of self-determination was too much to ask for, or to expect from the University.

In any event, we urge Student Body President Albright to sign this bill. And we hope that those responsible individuals in the administration see clear to approving the policy as approved by the Student Legislature.

Tom Hedges

What Has Vietnam Taught Us About Warfare?

Odd things have happened on the way to wherever the Vietnam war may be going.

More Americans than at any other war time have come to question the validity of this one. They have taken a look at the record, watched events unfold, seen changes, challenged this war's purposes, doubted the need, protested the price and raised an issue new to American wars: Maybe there are bad as well as good ones.

Maybe it behooves a citizen to make a judgment of his own on this with what he hears from larger groups. Maybe even a dissent in conscience is compatible with loyalty and love for one's own tribe.

Another moral issue rarely felt in past wars struck home in the grim, inconclusive Green Beret case. When military forces quietly eliminate a spy caught spying on them as well as on the enemy is this a routine, legal act of war? Or is it murder—a crime for which someone must answer in court?

Recently another little-publicized event in the annals of war has shaken patriotic multitudes. Americans in uniform committed massacre upon civilians of a primitive village—old people, men, women, children—in the kind of atrocity conceivable only, up to now, on the part of an "inhuman" enemy.

Again, new stings of conscience. Not,

"is this wrong?" (of course it is), but, "is it natural to war no matter who or when, an easy upshot of the stormy emotions and the dehumanized system that blinds men into armies at war?"

Black statistics on hundreds of thousands of deaths in previous wars have failed to discredit war. The 40,000-plus fatalities among Americans in this one stir regret, but few new insights. Not even six million deaths among the Jews beset by Hitler's Nazis taught the world a lasting lesson about war.

But now, in the flow of a long, unsatisfying, jolting war in jungles far from home, questions, doubts, debates arise—a kind of moral re-inspection. It is painful and depressing, but the promise in it may at last deliver attitudes and insights other wars have failed to spread.

How? —By building on the action of a President of the United States in unequivocally renouncing any future use of a vicious tool of war—bacteria and germs—no matter what an enemy may do with these.

—By nurturing the confidence that small steps, one by one, by pairs of rivals or by blocs, can cover incredible distances. This was what the disarmament talks in Helsinki, on the limiting of means for nuclear catastrophe, were really all

about. —By stressing how shadowy a line there is between the morally clean killing of a nation's enemies in normal warfare and the killing of strangers in a situation known as murder.

—By deepening the knowledge that a tribal conscience on this business from the people's total judgment still belongs among their guidelines. But that tribal conscience cannot contradict the private consciences of many individuals, or it will lie and mislead and defraud.

—By reminding each of us that as an individual, each has a right to repel an assailant, but not to kill him needlessly. We yield up our personal power to a higher authority, to the protective services of our society through law.

—By firming up a parallel to this among nations: Each has a right to repel an assailant, but not beyond certain limits. A strength within the human race itself may sensibly assume the sovereignty to keep any nation from crossing the line into murder, to keep human beings alive.

—By reminding people that rudimental organization called the United Nations—weak, imperfect, limited, groping and bungling—has put the world on a track to such a concept, where seeds of hope are still susceptible to growth.

—By putting more meat on the bones

of thought that world peace through law is a worthy ideal, one not yet in reach but still worth reaching for. Because the old alternatives—now more than ever—smell of failure and doom.

Improbable, yes. But hardly more improbable than what the situations of Vietnam, Laos, the eight Berets and Song My village would have seemed three years ago.

Impractical, perhaps. But hardly more impractical in terms of human values, goals or rationality than net reward, have even been, win or lose, from any war yet known to man.

Overly simplistic as a recipe for peace? Maybe so, but hardly more simplistic than the rule that when a nation has a grievance with another, with no judge to cool it, taking, wrecking, killing and enslaving are the right way out.

Odd things are happening, indeed, enroute to the end of the Vietnam war.

But down around the bend somewhere, understandings may deepen that the individual can gain the most in peace, security and freedom if the tribe assigns its war potential to a larger circle of the human race. And then the oddest thing of all may be why such a simple understanding took so long to go to work.

Ken Ripley

Soul Food: Need For Christian Unity

I'm told that today Christian unity is becoming the "thing to do." The newspaper keep reminding me of the church's proposed union. "World" councils abound, passing their resolutions and arguing over form. Ecumenicalism is the rallying cry of today.



I seriously question if such "unifying" movements really serve the purpose of unity; somehow, changing a bureaucratic structure from a lot of separate, disorganized, doctrinally

confused, and increasingly irrelevant church institutions into one institution will help matters much. The basic sickness in the church—from doctrinal haziness to institutional strangulation—still remains.

And so does the need for Christian unity. There seems to be something wrong with Christian unity when an organization can sponsor a meeting on Christian unity, not invite several of the church centers, be turned down by one center, and schedule the meeting in conflict with another Christian organization. It wasn't the kids' fault, I know; there were problems. But it still happened. And a good talk on unity was limited to only two of the Christian groups on campus.

It's easy to understand why there isn't much cohesive unity among Christians. Christians, like so many of us, happen to be human, too. And the Church (meaning all Christians) has been confronted and torn by several major issues, including: Christian involvement, denominational jealousy, doctrinal differences, and the shifting interpretations and emphasis on morality.

The argument over Christian involvement has generally dealt with the split between advocates of the "social gospel" and a more fundamentalist gospel. Denominational jealousy has usually been a matter of pride and contempt mixed with outright jealousy of the "success" of one group over another. Doctrinally, the church has been split among the new theologians and, again, a more fundamentalist traditional interpretation. The New Morality continues to be debated.

I don't have enough room this year to handle all of the major problems infecting Christianity today, though I hope to be able to tackle some of them later. But the basic question still comes down to a matter of what Christian unity is, and how can we come together as "the body of Christ."

The Bible emphasizes time and again the need and nature of Christian unity.

"For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, so it is with Christ," Paul writes in Romans. "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all were made to drink of one Spirit."

The Bible says that God sent Christ "as a plan for the fullness of time, to unit all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth."

Somehow, as I look at the different churches and their denominationalism, as I see other Christians exist in discord with each other, as I look at my relationships with other Christians and my attitudes toward other viewpoints, I tend to think we Christians have blown unity.

Many Christians have neglected to exist in "unity" with God, and the biggest way it shows is that we've

certainly neglected unity on earth. The rapid decline of religion in America and the unfortunate discrediting of much Christian witness has been due, perhaps rightfully so, to the way people have responded to the horrible disunity among Christians.

Jesus said, "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are disciples, if you have love for one another."

Some disciples we've been. But on the organizational and, more importantly, on the personal level, unity is possible among Christians. John Weigle, who spoke on Christian unity on campus recently, suggested several attitude changes that really make sense.

First, he pointed out that Christians need to de-emphasize "program." Christians are too attracted to activities, to presentations, to shows. "Jesus never said, 'You've gotta have a program,'" Weigle said. "The big thing for Christians is simply 'being.'"

Secondly, we've got to quit this business of "labelling." Out of labelling comes denominationalism. The groups Christians belong to are not all that special. It's all too easy, if the group is

good, to worship the group rather than God.

I was out talking with people the other day about Christianity. I asked one old lady what her definition of a Christian was. "A Baptist," she answered. Labelling.

The tendency of some Christians to exclude themselves from other individuals or groups is also bad. To be united, Christians at the very least have to be involved with each other.

Finally, Christians need to work on a very human emphasis on self and jealousy. As long as Christians put themselves above others, they will neither be able to act in love for others nor unite with others. And there's no need to be jealous. Christians, as Weigle points out, are not competing for God's love and attention. God is certainly big enough for all. Though maybe our concept of God is too small.

Christian unity is a challenge today, and its one I'd like to see the Christians on campus accept. Considering the disunity of modern Christianity—not to mention "Churchianity"—it's going to be a long, hard, uphill battle.

But it would be nice to know who the brothers are on campus—and to be one with them.

Letters to the Editor

Even Fewer In Dorms, Without Food Service?

To the editor:

A small observation from a student currently living in one of the high-rise dorms on the South Campus: if the University decides to discontinue the food operations in Chase and Lenoir, I will find it most inconvenient to live on South Campus next year. The advantage of having my source of nourishment within striking distance of my living quarters will worth the extra expense of, say, Granville Towers.

I can't believe that I'm the only student in this position; I think that even a student with a car will find the above reasoning foreeful. So if the University is having trouble keeping the dorms full, the

elimination of food service on campus will, I feel sure, only increase that trouble.

Since the University is so anxious to take polls of student reaction to the loss of a food service, perhaps it might consider polling the students on South Campus in terms of their plans for living arrangements vis-a-vis the food service. "Moral obligations" aside, the results of such a poll might demonstrate the economic inadvisability of not bothering to replace SAGA when it leaves.

Paul Bamford
358 Craigie Hall

Writer Blasts

To the editor:
In a recent 'Letters to the Editor'

column a certain writer castigated the DTH for lambasting Mr. Pete Ivey, UNC's Press Releaser. The letter was signed T. Oliver Smegma.

Such filth does not belong in a newspaper. Moreover, it is indicative of minds steeped in the slime of slipshod morality. If letters such as the above mentioned one continue to be printed there is no doubt in anyone's mind that our America the Beautiful will be degraded into utter ruination by the crass immorality or should I say amorality that is prevalent among such as the communist, radical "student" body at the University of Chapel Hill. With God's help we may once again march out of the muck and mess to assume our rightful place as the world's greatest power.

In good conscience,
Jim Blaimer
Hiltonhead Court

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.

