

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

Veto Good If Students Present United Front

Tommy Bello vetoed the Student Legislature bill calling for the elimination of funds to several organizations if the administration tries students without their consent.

We supported the bill when it came before Legislature and would be critical of Bello for his veto except for the reasons Bello listed as justification for his action.

The primary reason for the Veto was that Legislature should begin immediately to take a stand on the disruptions policy. I don't feel the most effective stand they can take is to be limited by legislation passed by an old Legislature," Bello said.

We hope the new Legislature will immediately begin an investigation into both the student courts and the disruptions policy and take action on them. We strongly encourage the new Legislature to take a stand that insures that if student courts are to exist they will have judicial autonomy.

"When we do take a stand it should be a joint stand. The judicial, executive and legislative branches should get together and take a stand on this bill," said Bello.

The issue at stake is vital to the students on this campus and we agree with Bello that before any action is taken all factions of Student Government should be in agreement. It is essential that students present a united front to the administration and the Board of Trustees concerning the autonomy of student courts.

Bello has already planned a session between the various branches of Student Government to decide what action should be taken.

"I personally am committed to insuring the autonomy of student courts. I do not feel that cutting off funds to the courts and the attorney general is the best way to insure the accountability of the student judicial process to that body that will ultimately be able to revise the present disruptions policy," Bello said.

The disruptions policy comes up for reconsideration at the July meeting of the Board of Trustees. It is essential that all factions of Student Government have a uniform plan of action to present to the trustees.

Students must take steps to insure the autonomy of the student courts. A unified plan of action is the best method presently available to bring improvements in the status of student courts.

By his veto Bello has assured himself a better bargaining position when he goes before the Board of Trustees. We will just have to wait and see if any "bargain" comes from the board.

However, we hope all factions of Student Government are prepared to take action to abolish student courts if they cannot be autonomous.

Petition Signed By All

The students in Morehead Residence College have achieved an unbelievable feat. They got 100% of the residents, except for one girl, to sign the same petition.

We would have never believed that 100% of any section of this student body would approve any one action.

However, all students in Morehead Residence College have signed a petition which calls for making the Faculty Club part of the facilities of the college.

With such a mandate we feel that the University Space and Planning Committee, which meets Monday to decide the fate of the Faculty Club can only respect the wishes of the residents of Morehead Residence College.

Students Need Lenoir

The campuswide food preference survey, conducted by Vice Chancellor J.C. Eagles, showed substantial support for on-campus eating facilities.

The results of the survey indicated that students who will be here next year plan to get more than 60 percent of their meals on campus.

These findings present quite a paradox in view of the dismal support that on-campus food facilities have received from students in the past two years. In fact the support has been so miserable that two organizations have abandoned operations here in two years.

The explanation presented for this low patronage is the quality of food served. We are assuming that the students who responded favorably to an on-campus food facility were presupposing there would be better food.

The survey also showed that the greatest degree of support was for dorm snack bars. However, Lenoir Hall received a surprisingly high level of support.

In light of the student support we feel the administration should maintain Lenoir Hall as an on-campus food facility and should improve the quality of the food served there. This will provide

students with on-campus food facilities as an alternative to town restaurants.

We also feel that Chase Cafeteria must remain open for South Campus residents.

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.

Pete Hatch Night Editor

Visitation: A Matter Of 'Rights'?

john agar

Years ago, Walter Lippmann offered the following dilemma:

Suppose a columnist working at his desk. Across the way, a woman starts her daily voice exercises, and soon the writer discovers something strange: his concentration, under the influence of music, is turning into a sort of runny liquid. Half an hour from deadline.

He telephones the woman to stop, but she refuses. She says her singing so seldom bothers anyone that she can't consider the fault hers when it does. And isn't it her right to sing in her own home? If her neighbor can't cope with ordinary distractions, he can always move to the country.

Can you settle the dispute without infringing on someone's privacy?

How Lippmann did it, I don't know, never having finished his article. The whole proposition seemed specious.

I mention this "dilemma" because, in many ways, it resembles the visitation question, as student leaders seem to see it.

In either case, there's an apparent confrontation of rival rights which no mediation can resolve; reasoning out the dilemma only leads to confusion and a paralysis in the administration of law.

The fact is, you can get infinite paradoxes if you're willing to assume that the world is populated solely by inveterate, uncompromising idiots, or that we live in a society in which laws, not men, must settle everything. Just deny that rights have gradations of applicability, or that reasonable men can ever decide priorities when rights come in apparent conflict, and you can start multiplying situations.

It's this sort of attitude, I think, which has led student leaders into their present stand on visitation.

They say it should be voted on by those who will be affected by it, pointing out that unless you get majority consent on each floor, you may end up in a situation in which some lone visitor violates the Carolina gentleman's right to

lounge down the halls in his jockey shorts. And then, think of the gent's moral sensibilities when they find out that one of their number has a sleep-in . . . ah . . . ahem . . . friend.

What shows most clearly in their position is that student leaders have no clear-cut conception of what a right is or of what it is certainly not.

In Lippmann's dilemma, for instance, the woman might have been disturbing the peace: evidence, in the form of her neighbors' opinion, was required. But no individual can require unearthly quiet; no one can properly demand that his neighbors cease their normal activities to comply with his hypersensitivity.

Similarly, a man sitting at his typewriter cannot be construed as disturbing the peace, even if his neighbors are convinced that he should be doing something better, and riot over it. It simply is not their right to barge into his privacy.

The visitation question, then, is this: which right predominates—the right to walk the halls in one's underwear, unmolested by the eyes of visitors, or the right to have visitors in the privacy of one's room; the right of your neighbors not to be morally offended by what you do, or your right to live by your own lights.

Campus conservatives, at least, are consistent on this issue. They want to vote on visitation, just as they want to vote on every individual right.

President Bello, on the other hand, tries to steer a middle course. For him, everyone's claim has its own validity, but he opts for a vote on political grounds.

It apparently is a time-honored tradition in student government's dealings

with the administration to assume that, since they must compromise in the end anyhow, they need only ask for half a loaf in the beginning.

This was President Albright's policy on double jeopardy, and the result was that the student body passed an absurd referendum which compromised them without bettering their bargaining position one bit. Bello seems bent on following the same course on visitation. He'll reduce student demands and destroy the legal and philosophical validity of his position, merely to show his flexibility.

But the visitation issue is an unusually clear one. If people must, they can stroll the floors naked—but they have no business trying to regulate anyone's passage on that account. If there is an impropriety, they commit it.

So on the moral issue, no one has the right to make another conform to his moral standards. Not outside the University—and there is no reason to assume the situation is any different within it.

That's why it is so saddening to see student leaders bumble around about this. There is no need to persist in seeing visitation as a tangle of rival claims; there is no need to call on a vote as the least offensive way to settle the issue.

Rights are always offensive—to those who feel a personal interest in running other people's lives. It's time student government acknowledged this—for the purpose of action, not compromise.

And it is time, also, that student government realized that the administration is not the final arbiter on these questions. The courts are—and it's there, not at the bargaining table, that SG should be serving its constituents.



ken ripley

Subversive Rhymes

You don't have to be a young radical any more to be subversive. The Establishment adult world has been subverting the minds of little children for years.

And the method is ingeniously simple and subtle. We've probably all been subverted in some degree without even knowing it.

What could be more innocent than a group of children deciding who is "it"?

What could be more common, affecting nearly every children's game?

Or more deadly. That children choose an "it" is in itself subversive. Highly discriminatory and causing anxiety and fear reactions, being "it" can damage little psyches (much like the present draft lottery does to big ones).

But even more subversive is what the children are taught to say. For example, consider the biggest subverter, "Eeny, meeny, miny, mo. Catch a Tiger by the toe. If he hollers, let him go. Eeny, meeny, miny, mo."

This is dangerous subversion at its worst. Each sentence corrupts the minds of children, just as the Establishment intends.

"Eeny, meeny, min, mo," for instance, instills in children's minds through double repetition the value of thinking small, thus crippling their later world vision.

"Catch a Tiger by the toe" encourages children to be reckless, if not irresponsible. Worse, it sets a dangerously bad example: who grabs a tiger by its toe nowadays? How about subverted radicals who plunge headlong into confrontation with clubs and Mace—it's all because they said the wrong things as children.

"If he hollers, let him go," nastily subversive, permissively encourages a lack of commitment and negative thinking in children—useful values for the Establishment to instill in future critics of the system. They'll discourage faster.

See what I mean? And when the child who is "it" desperately insists on continuing "My Mother wants you to be the very best one," not only is he reinforcing his selfishness and self-centeredness, he is perpetuating the highly discriminatory and competitive attitudes within modern society as well as shattering the ego of some child who can't be "the very best one," too.

Another example of the corrosively subversive things children are taught to say (often by teachers, Cub Scout Den Mothers, and Brownie leaders), is "One potato, two potato, three potato, four. Five potato, six potato, seven potato, more."

First, by emphasizing potatoes, the Establishment is mocking the agrarian and rural society, urbanizing the children by default. Numbering and adding onto the amount of potatoes fosters the value of acquiring wealth—a healthy incentive in capitalism—as well as encourages greed. Greed is more strongly drummed into children (already in a state of anxiety from the "it" process) by the sudden, explosive, and conclusive "More."

Very clever, Establishment. I salute you. I didn't realize subversion was a family game.

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.

Letters To The Editor

Busted 'Hero' Remembers A Night At Fraternity Court

My father couldn't sleep for a week after I was elected President of Pi Lambda Phi last spring. He called to tell me all the problems I was going to have.

"No hassles, Dad. If I don't want problems, I don't have to have them." Fifty-one weeks later: And after worrying about social schedules, alumni activity schedules, athletic schedules, bill payment schedules, pledge project schedules, garbage collection schedules and other miscellaneous schedules, I was ready to glide through my last week as President.

Thursday night, I remember climbing into the bed around one p.m. after posting the schedule for the next week's elections. Lights out. Soft music on the stereo. Eyes closed.

"Gross! Get her!" Something outside sounded like the day the Mets won the world series. I jumped from my bed and ran to the window. About forty PIKAs across the court were screaming with laughter, running around in their underwear, yelling obscenities. Fifty Sigma Nus came onto their porch to see what was happening.

I called down to one of my Pi Lam fratres. "What's going on?"

"PIKAs are having a Pig Night!" And then I saw her. A PIKA was leading her to the Sigma Nu house. Three hundred pounds stuffed into a bright red dress. She was carrying two teddy bears under her arms. A PIKA was pointing a fire extinguisher at her. WOOSH! Four men lined up and dropped trow as she passed. Her face remained impassive. A Sigma Nu went out and took her arm from the PIKA like an Olympic relay racer. Into the Sigma Nu house, she disappeared. Hundreds of fraternity men were rolling in the yard with laughter.

For those of you who didn't see

"Three In the Attic" and haven't the foggiest idea what's going on, let me explain: One of the great advantages to living in fraternities is the outlets they provide for releasing frustrations. You can pitch on the softball team, or drink beer with the guys; and then again there's "Pig Night." Some fraternities hire a "professional" to come in and "release frustrations." The poor frustrated brothers then commence to commit atrocities on this poor lady's body and person. And the next day everybody is happy. The lady has her money. The guys aren't frustrated.

In any event, I got myself dressed, ran down the stairs and outside.

"She's behind the Nu house!"

We all raced around the back of the Sigma Nu house. There she stood—somewhat frightened—furiously clutching her Teddy Bears. More fire extinguishers. More obscenity. More dropped trows.

Finally she found a kindly-faced soul who escorted her out of the bedlam. The Pi Lams walked back toward our house. The Nus and the PIKAs remained in their respective back yards. As we reached our porch, 15 blue flashing lights appeared at the top of fraternity court. The police cars stopped in front of our porch. We were the only ones in sight since the others were still behind their houses.

Two of Chapel Hill's finest walked up. I'll call them Tom and Jerry.

"I want to see the President," said Tom.

"That's me."

Tom looked to the 15 or 20 of my fraternity brothers standing behind me. "If you guys don't shut up . . ." and then he directed his words to me. "I'm going to lock you up!"

There is something about brotherhood that is indescribable. It was this something that, as Tom issued his warning words, gave me a lump in my throat and a chill down my back. There was a brief silence. The temperature dropped ten degrees. Then, from behind me:

"Arrested? All right! Piller's going to jail! 'Pigs! Pigs!'"

The hairs on my arm bristled. "Now wait a minu . . ."

"Pigs! Pigs! All right! Bye Piller! We'll bail you out!"

I bit my lower lip. "Come on guys. Let's get inside!"

But they were laughing and Tom and Jerry weren't and it was too late. "All right," said Tom. "Let's go."

And so, my head hung, they took me away.

"Aren't you going to tell me that anything I say can be held against me?" I asked.

"Anything you say can be held against you," said Tom.

"Tom," I said. "I don't think you handled that very well."

An hour later they released me on my good behavior. I had been charged with an ordinance in Book 6-page 812 as amended, and told to be in court April 22nd. I walked out the police station's door and breathed the free air. Waiting for me were my loyal fraternity brothers. They carried me into fraternity court on their shoulders and others stormed out with posters "WELCOME HOME!", "WHAT A MAN!", "OUR HERO!"

First thing I did when I got inside was to call home and wake up my father. He'd been sleeping soundly.

—Mike Piller

Fraternity Court

Lacrosse, Not Visitation Is Really 'Spring Thing'

To the Editor: As the SG Frexy bellows "visitation" To a very reluctant Administration He claims in a voice that really sings Visitation—not lacrosse—is the new Spring Thing

Yet the Carolina stickers disagree Having just blasted ECU 13-3 And proclaim to all—Tom Bello too Lacrosse's the Spring Thing, no matter what you do

Bob Manekin
Finley Golf Course Road

Writer Protests Budget Cut Of UNC Fine Arts Festival

To the Editor: In the budget recently passed by the Student Legislature, \$1,500 dollars was cut from the Fine Arts Festival. I find this measure a little disturbing. Of course, I'm just a freshman and I'm not really aware of the financial needs of all the campus activities and organizations. Still, don't you think that the legislators could have spared a little money from some of the other appropriations for the sake of the fine arts?

Since I'm not really experienced in these budget matters, I cannot make any lofty judgment about the relative importance of the various organizations. It seems, though, that some of the activities which received a lot of money shouldn't mind a little belt-tightening so that all of us here at Carolina can enjoy a better Fine Arts Festival.

Sincerely,
John Kelly
221 James

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters to the editor, provided they are typed and limited to a maximum of 300 words. All letters must be signed and the address and phone number of the writer must be included.

The paper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Address letters to Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.