

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Tom Gooding, Editor

Trustees And Students Should Hold Meetings

We wish to commend Student Body President Tommy Bello for initiating action that has now resulted in a communication link between the students of this University and the Board of Trustees.

We also wish to thank North Carolina Governor Bob Scott for considering the request from Bello and taking positive action on it.

Bello wrote the governor on April 7 and expressed a desire to establish communication between the trustees and the University students.

We feel that Bello was completely accurate when he said "In the past couple of years, several

New Legislators Must Represent The Student Body

A new session of Student Legislature begins tonight when Student Body Vice President Bill Blue swears in the newly elected legislators.

We offer our condolences to these 50 students for all the micky mouse trivia they will be forced to tolerate during the upcoming year.

However, we also wish to remind the legislators and all students that this body will vote on all legislative action concerning students throughout the upcoming year.

They will be required to take a stand on many important issues from court reform to visitation.

We respectfully remind these legislators that they were elected to represent the best interests of the student body—not the administration.

We hope they will not abandon this goal.

Handbook A Good Idea Except For Financing

Our only complaint with the handbook is its method of financing.

The editors of the handbook cannot be faulted for not including advertising: they didn't want to destroy the "artistic" value of the book with ads.

They have also expressed concern with the problems that result from handling advertising.

Thus, we must apologize to them for saying they hadn't considered advertising as a possible method of financing. They had just dismissed the concept rather flippantly.

However, our main complaint rests with the legislators who failed to consider this method of financing and thus may have cost the students several thousand dollars.

We would like to offer one suggestion to the members of the new Legislature: hire an advertising salesman for the handbook, and pay him a 5 percent commission on all revenue he can obtain.

We remind the legislators, that while the handbook is a worthwhile idea, if handled properly, it is still a luxury.

And the student body should not have to foot the entire bill for a \$3,100 luxury.

The Carolina Handbook is rapidly becoming a controversial issue following Student Legislature's move to appropriate \$3,100 to the book.

The handbook will include a compilation of all student organizations and activities on this campus. The co-editors of the

"crisis" situations have resulted because of a failure of communication between students and trustees.

The incidents involving the food strike of last year which resulted with State Highway Patrolmen stationed on campus is one glaring example of what a lack of communication can cause.

Frankly, we doubt if there will be many occasions when the UNC student leaders will have an opportunity to agree with the members of the Board of Trustees.

However, we agree with Bello that "Even if we do not agree in all matters, I still see value in each side expressing its opinion and discussing the situation."

"Such discussion could eliminate any misunderstanding and confusion that might otherwise result."

The students comprise the bulk of the membership of the University community and the Board of Trustees control that community.

Unfortunately, this will be the first regularly planned contact between these two factions of the University.

Any major issue involving students on this campus is directly controlled by the Board of Trustees. For this reason it is essential that students contact members of the Board of Trustees and inform them about what is happening on this campus.

The fact that Governor Scott recognized this need is a beginning toward correcting some of the misunderstanding that has developed in the past few years.

We hold certain reservations as to the final effectiveness of these meetings but welcome them as an improvement to the present system.

handbook have expressed a belief that by providing information on the opportunities on campus, incoming classes will become more active.

There are numerous activities on this campus that students can and should participate in, and it is quite possible that the level of participation could be greatly increased through an informational handbook.

We hope the staff and editors of the handbook can accomplish their purpose and we feel that should they be successful the handbook should be continued.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.

Harry Bryan News Editor

Rick Gray Associate Ed.

Laura White Associate Ed.

Chris Cobbs Sports Editor

Mary Burch Arts Editor

Mike McGowan Photo Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.

Sandra Saunders Night Editor

Learning The Art Of 'Letting Go'

ken riple

She had looked at herself, and found she didn't love him any more. So she told him, as nicely as she could, that their relationship was at an end.

But he couldn't understand. He continued to hang on for a month, refusing to accept that she had changed. Wallowing in self-pity, his efforts to "bring things back the way they were" made life miserable for both of them.

When he realized their relationship was irrevocably over, he began to hate her. And now his memories of their relationship are bitter and cold.

It's really a tragedy the way we fool ourselves, like my friend did. Trying to hold onto something that is no longer real, we often lose what we have had. Good times, beautiful memories, shared

experiences can turn to ashes and sour in the bitterness of their ending.

But couples break up every day, and how to confront this often painful, sometimes shattering "splitting up" can be a very real problem.

It's not really sad that couples drift apart, because it may be the most natural thing imaginable for two people, still maturing and growing, to find themselves growing away from each other. And when people change, when the original relationship ceases to sustain the old vitality and depth, people can fall "out" of romantic love.

For those who have drifted apart, or who find themselves attracted elsewhere, breaking up is often essential. Commitments can become imprisoning if

they are not willfully assumed, and genuinely real past feelings can be ruined if two people struggle to live out a false relationship.

And living out such a false relationship is probably the worst possible alternative. A couple who are no longer mutually attracted, who no longer share the same interests and that essential "one-ness" of deep relationships, only manage to cheat each other of possibly other deep experiences if they are not willing to "let go."

Ideally, of course, when a couple grows or splits apart, the decision is mutual. The commitment is dissolved, the two each go their own way, and bitterness is reduced to a minimum. Practically, however, it doesn't work that

way. Fickleness, "unrequited" love, unequal growth all conspire to have one or the other "want out" of the relationship.

And this is where one of the biggest problems of break up is felt—in its acceptance by the one who is still involved. Much is asked of this person—to give the other his or her freedom. But it has to be done.

A girl once told me, "Love is being able to let go." I was hurt at the time, very much so, but she was right. If our love is real, and not selfish, it will not demand love where there is none. It may make, but will not require commitments.

It is a real test of love to say "good-bye" when you don't really want to.

But not all the painful responsibility lies on the person who is being set aside. Another serious aspect of breaking up is the way in which we do so—the responsibility of the person who wants to break up. Unfortunately, not everyone is as thoughtful as the person who gently "talks it out."

This week, a very beautiful girl, in all ways, was crying, crushed and hurt, on my shoulder. Her boyfriend of a year had asked for a meeting, bluntly told her he was through, and said she wasn't "worth" anything to him.

It takes a lot of arrogance to tell someone they aren't worth anything. And a lot of gall.

Another frequent way of ending a relationship is to simply disappear. I wonder how many girls have been left that way by the boy who didn't know how to call it quits. This way may be the easiest and the quickest, but it strikes me as blatantly cowardly.

Worse, it seems to me to be totally selfish and disrespectful of basic human consideration to "discard" someone without at least an explanation.

Guys have no monopoly on cruelty, of course, and girls are just as capable of "putting down" someone as boys are. One girl told a friend of mine one afternoon, as a way of discouraging future visits, that she didn't want to go out because she preferred to read some poetry. Her unfavorable comparison made its point. Shattered, he never went back.

People who care and are involved with others are usually very vulnerable. But couples continue to break up, relationships change, and people are daily confronted with the act of growing apart. And it hurts, and it hurts really bad—boy or girl. Here we most need sensitivity, compassion, and complete honesty with each other.

It would be great if people could neatly and mutually grow apart, changing their commitments with no bitterness and regret while still remaining friends. It would be nice if we could all learn the art of "letting go." But not everyone is able to so easily "call quits," and hurt and pain are often inevitable and natural reactions.

It's a hard thing, this breaking up. Do we really need to make it harder than it is?



Rick Allen

Nixon Went Off Base On TV

Unfortunately, it is not too often that one can get a chuckle out of the six o'clock news, but it happened last week.

At about 1:15 p.m. last Wednesday, our President became the first in the twentieth century to have two consecutive nominees for the Supreme Court turned down by the Senate.

On Thursday night's news, Nixon informed the nation that the U.S. Senate refused to confirm a Southern jurist who was a strict constructionist. It was vintage Nixon. His brow was low, his eyes were shifty, and he looked mean.

For those of us who remember our president's concession speech after he lost the 1962 election, it was like an instant replay ("You won't have Dick Nixon to kick around anymore...").

Nixon widened his credibility gap right there before our very eyes. Thanks largely to good coverage by the media, almost everyone in this country was aware that G. Harrold Carswell was at best a mediocre jurist and a not-altogether-reformed racist. Even had he come from the Northernmost city in the United States, he would not have been qualified for a seat on the highest court. To blame Carswell's defeat on his being Southern was ludicrous.

Nixon went even farther off base with another claim. According to our president, the Senate has no right to reject a Supreme Court nominee simply because they feel a wiser choice could have been made. Nixon argued that the only grounds for rejection should be clear cut instances of indiscretion.

However, the Constitution includes the phrase "advice and consent" to describe the Senate's duty in the nomination of justices. Clearly, the Senate has every right to turn down a nominee they feel is not properly qualified.

There is yet another interesting angle in Nixon's failure. The president's longtime friend and present Attorney General, John Mitchell, was responsible for suggesting both Carswell and Clement Haynsworth.

In both cases, Mitchell failed to conduct an adequate investigation into the qualifications of the judges. This failure has twice embarrassed the President.

It is possible that Mitchell's blunders will somewhat lessen his influence with

the President. Nothing would please us more, because Mitchell has consistently shown himself to be a reactionary and a near fascist.

For example, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark was reluctant to use the dubious new Riot Control Law in connection with the Chicago riots at the 1968 Democratic Convention. Mitchell, on the other hand, was eager to try the Chicago Seven for crossing state lines to incite a riot. What ensued from that trial is now history.

Mitchell is largely responsible for the

feeling among the young in this country that the government is out to get them.

If Mitchell's influence were to be played down, it is entirely possible that Nixon might come to understand that people's thoughts cannot be controlled.

A new Attorney General might understand that an overt act is all that should be punished, not words.

But even if John Mitchell continues to have the President's ear, it is reassuring to know that the Senate will have the courage to oppose the nomination of an incompetent judge to the Supreme Court.

Letters To The Editor

(Hirsch Can't Count Past The Number '2')

To the Editor:

I am not indifferent to Mr. Hirsch's exposé of his conversion from a pro-to-anti-war vision. The truth of his opinion that "either you take a stand against the war or you take a stand for it" ("There is no in between," he observes) is as valid as the brute fact of two feet, two arms, two eyes.

The opinion is unshakable, grounded as it is on the mathematical reality of one and two, and the psychological experience of hindsight and foresight. I should perhaps list "insight," but that would be counting to three.

And for Mr. Hirsch, well, three doesn't count right now, even if it isn't in between.

Liberalism yours,
Francis A. Berces
601-C Hibbard St.

Off-Campus Student Wants Improved DTH Circulation

To the Editor:

I'd very much appreciate your publishing a brief article on the amount of campus circulation of the DTH. I would appreciate even more an explanation of the rationale behind where, and in what amounts the DTH is distributed. I don't object in the least to compulsory funding of the DTH, nor to your editorial policy; however I object very strenuously to not being able to get a copy of the paper.

I live off-campus and hence don't get one at my dorm, nor can I get one when I go to class since you don't distribute them to classroom buildings. My average time for getting to campus is about 9:15 AM, not an unreasonable time to expect to still be able to get a copy of the paper. Almost without exception, both the Y-Court and the Scuttlebutt are cleaned out by this time. Whenever I do get to one of these places before they're emptied, what I usually see is

departmental secretaries picking up the papers by the handful to redistribute to their respective offices.

Also, I've seen stacks of the DTH thrown out (literally) at the main entrance of the hospital where they are picked up, again frequently in large quantities, by nurses (not students), orderlies, technicians, and casual passersby, not to mention an occasional student. You also deliver some to as unlikely a place as Jeff's Newstand, where the townfolk are welcome to them as well as any student who happens to wander by.

No doubt hundreds of other students, graduate and undergraduate, who live off-campus, undergo the same difficulty as myself in trying to find a paper each day. I would very much appreciate your acknowledgement of the problem in the paper and your efforts to render the circulation of the paper a bit more equitable.

M. Lee Kirsch
C-5 University Gardens

Writer Calls For Less Coverage Of Conservatives

To the Editor:

I'm sick and tired of all of the coverage that the right wing elements on this campus have been getting. To read The Daily Tar Heel, one would think that everybody on this campus has short hair, eats apple pie at the Rat every night and belongs to KA.

Some of my friends and I voted for you because you promised us a paper which would be reliable, and because one of our acquaintances said your politics were right.

We were wrong. You have ignored the leftists on campus and replaced the leftist columns on the editorial page with a bunch of right wingers.

Power to the People,
Reed Stevens
2 Hilton Dr.

Greensboro Coed Resents UNC Student's Comments

To the Editor:

This letter is in regards to a letter by Mr. Garvey which appeared in the DTH Saturday, April 11.

I am a sophomore, female, and at the present time angry with Mr. Garvey. I could care less exactly what he thinks of the way girls on his campus dress. But, since I attend the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (which, I presume, you meant instead of Woman's College in Greensboro), I resent the slanderous statement you made concerning our appearance on this campus.

When the guys on our campus start wearing coats and ties (ironed, etc.), then I will begin to wear the appropriate clothing. If you have noticed, girls tend to dress up more on the weekends because their dates are dressed accordingly.

I am not saying I will not wear a dress to class until I see a boy in a coat and tie. But it would look extremely silly for the boys to look sloppy and the girls dressed neatly at all times.

I enjoy "dressing up," but I also enjoy being rather thrown together at times. So I suggest that you leave your gripes and slanderous remarks to your campus.

Pat Stussie,
UNC-G

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publications Board, daily except Monday, examination periods, vacations, and summer periods.

Offices are at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone Numbers: News, Sports-933-1011; Business, Circulation, Advertising-933-1163.

Subscription rates: \$10 per year, \$5 per semester. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.