

# The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen  
Editor

Bobby Nowell Associate Editor  
Harry Bryan Managing Editor  
Bill Miller News Editor  
Bob Chapman Assoc. Managing Editor  
Mary Burch Arts Editor  
Art Chansky Sports Editor

Bob Wilson Business Manager  
Frank Stewart Advertising Manager  
Sandra Saunders Night Editor This Issue

## Unanimous Faculty Council Means Little Around Here

The Faculty Council passed unanimously Friday a resolution that the University "should provide or arrange for a continuing food service on campus." That the approval was unanimous is significant. There were not merely a few council members who believe discontinuance of the campus food service will be detrimental to the University.

But we also have to remember the way things work here. The faculty, or even the Faculty Council, is just as powerless to make decisions as the students, or the non-academic employees. The administration makes the decisions.

It seems as if a different kind of decision-making structure is needed. Such a structure might incorporate the faculty, and the students, and the non-academic workers.

That's just an idea. It's not new. It's also not very likely to happen. A weak attempt to create a group with such membership (also comprising trustees and alumni) was put forward last fall and eventually was realized in the Consultative Forum, a group which has no power, and no real responsibility.

The forum is set up to communicate, the implication being that if it proved successful as a means of communication, it could become a decision-making structure.

But a number of things make that unlikely. First, the forum has had only one meeting thus far and has not really accomplished much. The group is holding its second meeting today, and the possibility exists that something positive might be accomplished.

James Gaskin, the new chairman of the forum's steering committee, has set for today's meeting the topic of the problem of racial accommodation in the University. He has prepared all the members by sending them literature on the matter, including such documents as the HEW letter to the University.

Gaskin is trying to get the forum on its feet, but he faces difficult odds. For one thing, the members of the forum do not necessarily represent their various

constituencies. They were appointed, not elected. (The Faculty Council, on the other hand, is an elective body.) For another thing, the group meets periodically every few weeks, and that does not make for a group keenly attuned to the problems of the campus. Finally, the forum has no power. Even if Gaskin can pull the forum out of its quagmire, there is no real guarantee that it will be effective in bringing about change.

The reason the forum has no real future as a structure for making decisions within the University is that the power in the University (held by the trustees and the administration) is not likely to be relinquished. Power, we must remember, is a highly guarded possession.

The University has no history or tradition of dividing power among the various communities which comprise the University. What the administration does do is bestow token busy work on the students, for instance, which is supposed to keep the students satisfied. Students handle orientation, students run the court system, students are involved in Student Government. And none of those students has any real power to do anything which might bring about change.

The non-academic employees can do nothing about continuing the food service or anything else. Neither can the Faculty Council, or the students. All those groups can pass resolutions and make suggestions, but in the final analysis the administration and the trustees wear the guns.

So as far as the Faculty Council's food service resolution, which passed unanimously, or the Consultative Forum, which is going to discuss today the problem of racial accommodation in the University; or all those students who are running for office in the Student Government—so far as they are concerned, there is very, very little which they can do about moving this University. Things are going to move when the administrators decide so, and not until then.

## American Witch Hunters Find New Game In Laos

President Nixon sought Friday to dispel the growing fear that Laos is going to become another Vietnam. The U.S. has "no plans for introducing ground combat forces into Laos," he said.

But he also said something else: "We desire nothing more in Laos than to see a return to the Geneva Agreements and withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops, leaving the Laotian people to settle their own differences in a peaceful manner."

What exactly does that mean? It seems to mean, for one thing, or to imply, that unless the North Vietnamese troops are withdrawn, the U.S. is going to have to do something about insuring the Laotians that they are going to be able to settle their own differences. And how is the U.S. going to do that?

The U.S. has 1,040 Americans in Laos, 320 of which are engaged in military advisory or military training roles. In addition, according to our policy of

"protective reaction," American planes can bomb Laotian targets. Thus far, according to a White House official, the Air Force has suffered about 400 casualties in the fighting in Laos, including about 200 killed and an equal number captured or missing.

Contrary to Nixon's assurances, the U.S. has lost men in Laos, has men there, and will continue its policy of aggression there until Laos is free of the communists and thus free to resolve its own problems.

That is the Vietnam rhetoric all over again and it is just as dangerous. The Nixon administration's policy is based on anti-communism and the complementary domino theory and that is not the kind of policy which is going to do the Americans or the Laotians any kind of good. Unless of course, Nixon's world wide hunt is to have a greater priority than the whole American domestic crisis in all its ominous aspects.

Bobby Nowell

## 'People-Watching—Or Stereotype-Scanning?'

One of the best forms of entertainment on a beautiful day (like last Sunday) is to go people-watching.

It's not a strenuous exercise—you merely find yourself a good vantage point (like the steps of Lenoir), put your hands behind your head, let the warm tongue of the sun slide along your body, and watch.

People-watching is a lot more fun in a busy, methodical atmosphere, like that offered by New York Port Authority major train or plane terminal. But you can do it just as well here in uncrowded, unhurried Chapel Hill.

People-watching is a good mental exercise, too, because it can reveal some unexpected truths about other people—as well as yourself.

Here you are. Sun sure feels good. Steps are hard, but you'll soon forget its edge in your ribs. Now for the people.

Here comes a guy decked out in a red alpaca sweater (monogrammed). That's the first thing you notice. Next, khaki trousers frayed at the cuff, no socks, and alligator-wingtip tasseled loafers. Light blue shirt, top button open. Beautifully managed Johnny Carson haircut, modest sideburns. Walks jauntily, glancing from side to side.

A good-looking cat, all right. A fratty-bagger—your first impression. All he needs is a beer in his hand and the Tams playing, right?

But is that fair? What's that book under his arm? Soul on Ice, By Eldridge Cleaver? And Kuenen's Strawberry Statement? And Abbie Hoffman's Revolution for the Hell of It?

To satisfy your curiosity, you follow him with your eyes to the parking lot—where you fully expect him to mount a gold Vet. But surprise, it's only an old Volvo. And on the rear bumper is a slightly faded sticker: "Work for Peace, Oct. 15."

And the American flag decal in his window indicates this individual isn't about to relinquish the Stars and Stripes to the "love-it-or-leave-it" superpatriots.

You watch him drive away, shame-faced that you have fallen prey to the "instant-character-assessment-via-stereotype" syndrome. You promise yourself it won't happen again.

Appearances are deceiving. Now here comes a hip-lookin' fella, truckin' on down the sidewalk, long blond hair and rumpled shirttail flapping in the gentle breeze. Sandals on his feet, and his clothes look slept in. About three

days growth of beard spotted about his smiling, hollow-cheeked visage. No books and, seemingly, no cares.

A real easy-rider. Probably smokes dope, reads Ramparts and Rolling Stone, digs rock and blues music, an amateur authority on the Chicago Seven trial, and a student of Marxist-Lennist theory. Yeah. Underneath that complacent facade, a rock-ribbed revolutionary.

But wait, why should you think those things? You remember the other night on Dick Cavett's show there was a member of the conservative "Young Americans for Freedom" who looked like a fair-haired Jerry Rubin?

You've again succumbed to the stereotype.

The director of the UNC News Bureau sends out a "news release" on the campus newspaper, stating that "many of its members are long-haired and bearded." Immediately the good folks down in Wilson's Mills, N.C., exclaim, "See. I knew that paper was nothing but hippies

and communists!"

Are you any less guilty of jumping to conclusions than these residents of the "boondocks?"

You can't judge a book by its cover. There are others.

The black couple, sporting symmetrical Afros like badges—you peg them for militants, but maybe they just like that "look" and don't belong to any activist groups.

The stocky chap with the crew cut, belly bulging against a blue work shirt with "Joe" in a little red circle over the pocket. May he's not the dumb dropout who instinctively hates you for your college education or the way you look—it could be that he has a degree of his own and marched in the moratorium Oct. 15.

The chick with the tossing streaked tresses, gaily striped garments, and bouncy walk—does she worry most about finding a husband as you seem to think, or could she be one of the most vehement members of Female Lib?

The elderly gent dressed in his Sunday suit, grey smudge of mustache and slightly stooped—is he your imagined venerable old professor with liberal ideas, or perhaps is he one of the Trustees who propagated the Disruption Policy?

You see, you really have no right to make these assumptions about people who are strangers—you have never talked to them. But now, you ask yourself, do you certainly discover what these people are all about? Certainly you can't walk up to them and say, "Hey man, I want to know you!"

So you will continue making character assessments from appearances. A grit will look like your stereo-type grit, a hippie will look like all the other hippies, and you'll certainly have no trouble separating the militant blacks from the other Knee-grows.

But appearances are deceiving. If you don't think so, look in a mirror some time.



John Agar

## University Has Been As Vicious As SAGA

enhancement of human self-awareness.

These are our teachers, these the custodians of the best part of human experience. They are the preservers and transmitters of all the knowledge and sagacity the human race has accumulated since it began to know itself.

Believe it. Try this. "They are SAGA's accomplices."

The truth is, I don't know what they are. I can evaluate their separate acts or refusals to act well enough, and these mostly are disconnected from the business of education. Our administration is obsessed with petty politicking, even when it serves no real purpose, and with jealousy, zealously guarding their little prerogatives.

But what they are as people, I hesitate to say. Not that I doubt my judgment but I'm reluctant to bring in a verdict which can only leave me more disillusioned and despairing than I am now.

Then there's the SAGA problem.

SAGA's tried everything short of the blackjack to make its workers go quietly to the slaughter house. There were lay-offs, promises there would be no layoffs, changes in the management, cajolery and threats, summary firings, strike-breaking, and now (this is original) the "bumpings."

SAGA is not the only problem which has confronted the University this year. There have been furors about Mayor Lee, David Blevins, double jeopardy, and a host of less important issues. On all of these the University has managed consistently to come out looking inept, selfish, or simply petty.

But for sheer hideousness, SAGA tops all. We've spent close to a year now watching SAGA strive to put people out of work. We've seen the succession of broken promises and disappointed expectations. We've seen the strikes, violence, and hatred SAGA's policies have engendered. Now SAGA's leaving, and there is no expression quite strong

enough to capture one's relief at the prospect.

But in all this, the worst is that SAGA has operated all along in the University's backyard, under the University's auspices. And through it all, UNC's administration has been—neutral; impartial; disinterested; an interested spectator. So they've said.

What the University's friendly neutrality and non-interference has meant to SAGA needs no going into. That the University has been as callous and, basically, as vicious as SAGA—this we know, too.

So what do you say, finally, about your University, your education, the cream of your society? You ask, What are these people? Do they have any ideals? If they do, how do they reconcile this kind of behavior to themselves?

Me—I'm at the point where I'm puzzled, where I have to be puzzled, where I'm afraid not to be puzzled. I don't want to have to answer these questions for myself.

Sitterson—Friday—we need you, we really do. Now, while there are still people to listen—where are you? Speak!

Agar: Dr. Jones, you recently deplored the lack of communication in last Spring's strike. Has communication improved since then?

Jones: Yes, I think so. Agar: How do you account, then, for the contradictory information which has been emanating from SAGA?

Jones: I really don't know anything about this, so I'm afraid I can't help you. This is a SAGA matter.

August 7, 1969

Letters to the Editor

## Daughtry Candidacy Is Defended

To the Editor:

In your Thursday issue, you placed an endorsement for an independent presidential candidate on the bottom half of the fifth page. This endorsement was granted by an on-campus, non-political group.

We note with great displeasure that the party candidates' endorsements received preferential publicity—front page placement with larger type, despite the fact that the campus political parties are notorious for inept statements of the type satirized in Mr. Daughtry's endorsement and for their inept management of student government in the past and present. Though you may have found the tone of the article offensive, we feel that many students recognized this as serious, purposeful satire. Daughtry's treatment of the in-group party and patronage systems was valid, direct, and delightfully pointed. He has added a much needed perspective to an otherwise typically dull campaign.

Although we are not in agreement with all of Mr. Daughtry's views, it is clear to us that he sees student government as it really is, a rather laughable, childish, and extravagant forget

financed by the student body.

We hope you will do whatever is journalistically proper in cases in which discrimination, either inadvertent or advertant, has occurred. In gratitude for your compliance with this request for fairness, we remain:

Evelyn Trop—Economics

Henry Plummer—Int'l Studies  
Michael Richards—Gen. College  
Thomas K. Austin—Law II  
Arlene Wanderer—Psychology  
David A. Rigby—English  
Thomas Atkins—English  
Don Samson—English

## Reader Wants To See Independent President

To the Editor:

How long has it been since an independent candidate was given the opportunity to serve as President of the Student Body? For too many years party politicians have steamrolled over campus to fill the post. The result? Sometimes active, achieving presidents; sometimes hacks and administrative flunkies, but always stagnating political party system. But if an independent wins this election, all three parties will be forced to revamp their structure. They will have to involve

students, not just manipulate them. An independent win could put enthusiasm and credibility back into student government and campus politics. He would not be obligated to appoint every other party hack to an office or position. In short, it seems clear that election of an independent candidate to President of the Student Body would be a shot in the arm for UNC.

Carole J. Mitchell  
No Address

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.