

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. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Harry Bryan, Editor

Thursday, April 15, 1971

Legislature wrong in refusing lawyer

Student Legislature dealt the student body a heavy blow Tuesday night in defeating the \$15,000 appropriation for a full-time lawyer.

Instead of allocating the funds to hire a lawyer on a full-time basis, the legislature reduced the budget request to \$9,000 for the hiring of a lawyer on a retainer.

Student Legislature might just as well have cut the \$15,000 out completely rather than reducing the appropriation to \$9,000.

A lawyer on a retainer basis will not be as valuable as a full-time lawyer who would be spending all his time working for the students.

As it stands now, Student Government will be able to have legal counsel whenever it desires until that \$9,000 runs out. But if only half the issues that need to be answered are looked into by a lawyer on a retainer, the \$9,000 will go quickly.

For \$15,000—Only \$6,000 more than was finally appropriated—Student Government could have had a full-time lawyer who would have spent all his time working for the students, rather than just a few weeks out of the year.

Another problem with hiring a lawyer on a retainer basis is that he would not be as familiar with the workings of the UNC Student Government, faculty and administration as a lawyer working full-time with students, faculty members and administrators.

In order to effectively work for the rights of the student body, a

lawyer must have the time to sit down and talk to the students, to listen and try to understand their problems.

A full-time lawyer would have had this extra time. The part-time lawyer will not.

As yet the budget passed by the outgoing Student Legislature has not been signed by Student Body President Joe Stallings. Stallings has until April 28 to either approve it or veto it.

If Stallings does choose to use his veto power, Student Legislature must either override that veto with a two-thirds vote, or it must reconsider the budget.

If he approves the budget, the new legislature would immediately take over and then could possibly reconsider various allocations itself.

However, no matter what Stallings chooses to do, the \$15,000 for a lawyer should be passed. The student body needs and deserves it.

Mini-Union should help S. Campus

For once, students forced to live on South Campus are getting a break.

The Mini-Union, a smaller version of the Student Union, is expected to open soon in Chase Cafeteria.

Included in the Mini-Union will be five pool tables, a snack bar, a color television, pinball machines and a pin-pong table.

If run properly the Mini-Union should benefit students living in James, Morrison, Ehringhaus and Craige dormitories, especially freshmen and upperclassmen without cars.

Ever since the high rise dorms on South Campus were first built, students living in them without cars have been practically stranded with nothing to do.

If a student living in James wanted to shoot a game of pool, grab a hamburger or just "mess around," he had to walk all the way to the Student Union or downtown.

Now his plight has been somewhat alleviated.

And if the Mini-Union proves successful, more changes should be made to help the students on South Campus.

Glenn Brank

Rent-a-protest: final sell-out

Spring in Chapel Hill means blooming dogwoods, green grass, bicycles and bare feet, and protest.

Wednesday was no exception. The People's Peace Treaty Celebration got underway during mid-morning, and by noon McCorkle Place had a pitched tent, a rock band, posters galore and flags waving.

And of course there were seminars and workshops and treaty signings. But the real show was people. A wide assortment were on display—with flowing hair, sunburst tie-dyed t-shirts, well-worn bell bottoms, and sandals.

This, of course, is standard apparel. What set this particular group apart on this particular day was their size—or perhaps it would be more appropriate to say lack of size.

All in all, as Chapel Hill peace demonstrations go, it was rather disappointing. Not even worth the time for a Jesse Helms editorial. A far cry from last spring, when thousands of students walked down a dark Franklin Street, candles in hand, with a massive silence so heavy even the second story bar was quiet for five minutes.

Now only memories remain. Students keep their melted candles and black

armbands stowed away in cardboard boxes with high school yearbooks and last semester's term paper. There are no spring strikes or crises or mass meetings.

As a result, student leaders, news magazines, and administrators have taken to their respective stumps and soap boxes to explain the phenomena. The gist of their volumes of rhetoric amounts to "students are tired of fighting because they have become completely disillusioned with the political system."

(An immediate postscript for an administration/student explanation is "we stood up against student disorder/we backed the administration down.")

Thus, both sides have explained the quiet on campus and modestly taken credit for the current situation.

That leaves only one group out. The people who made it all happen. What do they think?

The answer to that, truthfully, can go no farther than the individual himself—you or me. Since the only person I am sure of is me, I can only give my own opinion.

Most importantly, I have noticed all demonstrations have begun to look alike—in fashion, for instance. Give me a

pair of faded jeans, my favorite old denim work shirt and a pair of well-worn comfortable shoes and I am happy.

Not because I am representing a disdain for middle class values. Not to show contempt for capitalism. Just because I feel at ease in such clothing.

Looks-wise, of course, I would be right at home in the People's Celebration. People wear coats and ties to church, and they wear denims to protest.

There there is the matter of dialogue. President Nixon will "make this perfectly clear." Rennie Davis has "right on's" to spare. George Wallace copyrighted every "rights of the individual" phrase several years ago. Jane Fonda will put you "up against the wall."

And so it goes. You can take a single speech by almost anybody and, by cutting it up a little, apply three-quarters of their phraseology to any topic they speak on.

So what we finally wind up with are very repetitious demonstrations—with a similar human factor. There are those who are sincere in their beliefs, and consequently back up every grape, apple and watermelon boycott. This is a hard-core movement, and it is small.

On the perimeter, we find a much more interesting array of characters. They are always the hanger-ons who like to see their pictures in the newspapers or have a crush on their collective chairman. And there are still more who like free rock music, drugs or conversation.

But for the most part, the everyday student is no longer present. He has heard the speeches—over and over again. He has watched the same people spout the same clichés—for any and every cause. And he has gone to the library to study for tomorrow's chemistry test.

Tomorrow's chemistry test is very real. It is also very present and very urgent. The Peace Celebration is not. The human race will be in conflict until it exterminates itself.

It is also man's nature to realize when he is being taken for a ride. The poor, discriminated-upon student revolted with his brothers against the oppressive world. And then he looked around and saw his brothers selling tie-dyed shirts, pre-faded jeans with pre-fringed cuffs, "power to the people" buttons and stickers, lectures for fat fees, sandals...

And an enterprising West Coast businessman is even starting to rent people for protests.

Bob Chapman

Maybe UNC should sell stock

Since the Carolina Symposium last spring, UNC students have concerned themselves with the issue of pollution. To display their distaste for the nation's major polluters, Student Legislature voted in January to purchase two shares of General Motors stock and use the votes to support Campaign GM, a project to seek corporate responsibility in the area of the environment.

The measure passed Legislature by a wide margin. In addition, members sought social responsibility from the University, owner of 5,000 shares of GM stock, by asking support of Campaign GM.

Last year, the University opposed the campaign by voting with General Motors

management. Even after a student referendum showed overwhelming support of Campaign GM by a vote of about 2,400 to 1,100, the University ignored the students' desire to help bring responsibility of large industries.

The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees was delegated the power to make the final decision. The committee heard Gerry Cohen, SL rule committee chairman, and a student from N.C. State University speak in favor of the campaign. Some members of the committee responded favorably, but the body voted again to support the General Motors management.

The Committee members did go so far as to make a token effort by sending a

letter to GM management expressing disapproval of some of its policies.

When the management proxy is sent out Friday by General Motors, Student Government will vote its two shares for Campaign GM. Despite large student support for the campaign, the University will continue to support the GM management.

One way for the University to avoid the issue would be to sell the stock. An Ivy League school, the University of Pennsylvania, recently unloaded its 33,363 shares of GM stock but not, UP officials say, to fight pollution. James M. Skinner, chairman of the Pennsylvania trustees' investment committee, confirmed the sale, saying it was strictly for business reasons. The profit margins,

they reasoned, will be cut by anti-pollution laws being imposed on the industry.

Whether or not the University of Pennsylvania is actually helping ecology, it did realize a tidy profit of \$1,597,270.70.

It is very doubtful the trustees will change their minds and vote for corporate responsibility; it would be like voting against themselves. Most of the trustees are rich, white, middle-aged males who are business executives or attorneys. There is an obvious conflict of interest.

If the trustees cannot see fit to support social responsibility, at least they can follow their natural instincts and gain by selling the General Motors stock.

Letter

Photographer skipped botany, reader says

To the editor:
I am writing in regard to the photograph appearing on page four of the Thursday April 8, 1971, issue of the Daily Tar Heel. Shown in the photo are some tree branches covered with flowers, and in the background, the Bell Tower. Though no expert on identification of trees, I do know that the tree pictured is not a dogwood, as it is named in the caption. Especially in a paper whose staff demonstrates an effort to "call a spade a spade," one would think that just any old blooming tree would not be called a dogwood!

Betty Evenbeck
506 North Street
Chapel Hill, N.C.

The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters to the editor, provided they are typed on a 60-space line 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.

The Daily Tar Heel

79 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.
Lou Bonds News Editor
Rod Waldorf Associate Ed.
Glenn Brank Associate Ed.
Mark Whicker Sports Editor
Ken Ripley Feature Editor
Bob Chapman Natl. News Ed.
John Gellman Photo Editor
Terry Cheek Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.
Janet Bernstein Adv. Mgr.

Ken Daly

Contemporary depression may end in revolution

A few weeks ago, listening to the radio late at night, I heard a report on WCBS from New York which confirmed my pessimism about the job market for college graduates and professionals. Every year in New York about this time they usually have a job-fair where college seniors can meet with prospective employers. This year it's been cancelled. A similar fair for high-school graduates, however, will still be held. In fact, according to the WCBS story, you're better off this year if you DIDN'T go to college. Most of the jobs require only a high-school education, and employers would rather not hire someone who's been "over-educated."

We are in the midst of a two-year downturn in job opportunities for college graduates. Here are some of the dismal facts about the situation. According to a story in The New York Times on March

8, companies have cut down their recruiting visits to college campuses by ten to 50 per cent from last year. Visits were already cut that much last year. Over the last two years, there has been a 40 to 45 per cent cutback in hiring of college seniors—25 per cent this year, 20 per cent the year before. Many of last year's graduates are still without jobs. And we've all heard about, or know personally, experienced people who have been laid-off recently. Dr. Frank S. Endicott, director of the Placement Office at Northwestern, was quoted as saying, "You'd have to go back to the middle-thirties to find such a sharp decline in the jobs available for college graduates." The College Placement Council in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, estimates starting salaries for people with bachelor's degrees are up only three per cent from last year, hardly enough to

keep up with inflation, and down from the five to six per cent yearly jumps during the last decade. In business, marketing, chemistry, mathematics, and physics, average monthly salaries are below last year's. If you're an engineer or a teacher, forget it. After the defeat of SST, the country is full of "superfluous" engineers—not that America doesn't seem to be able to find better uses for human skill than make-work projects like SST. What's even more ludicrous is that the press is now talking of an "over-supply" of teachers! Teachers around the country are up in arms about over-crowded classrooms, to name just one grievance. The authorities' response has been to cut back on the hiring of teachers, and to seek to introduce the so-called contract performance system. Anyone who's worked or lived around the mills of North Carolina will recognize this as the

"speed-up" under another name, in another industry.

Dr. Endicott pointed out the analogy of this situation to that of the thirties. We can learn from that comparison. The response of many workers during the Depression to losing their jobs was to blame themselves. In this country, having a job is very important for one's self-esteem as well as social standing. Losing that job, especially if one subscribes to the ethic of individual achievement through work, means to many people that they are failures, that there is something wrong with them. Very many workers responded to the Depression by seeking individual solutions to their problems, by trying to prove that they were still worth something. In practice, this means competing harder and better against one's fellow workers for fewer and fewer jobs.

It's still going on today. A friend of mine described a scene at a recent American Historical Society convention where over 100 applicants for a single job were paired against each other to debate. Only by eliminating their "professional colleagues" in actual combat could they hope to get the job.

If we can learn one thing from the economic realities many of us are facing, it is we are workers, that if we can't sell our labor (however skilled) for wages we can't make it in this society. While we, or many of us, will probably not have to face the dire consequences that joblessness meant to our parents; while many of us will be less likely to blame ourselves for being out of work, will we take the step which they didn't take? Will we get ourselves together, and as a group work to make a new society which will

not waste human lives and productive capacity in senseless economic fluctuations? Will we see that a society organized for people rather than profits does not have to shut down when the investors' dividends slow up or when we're in between wars?

My hope is that we won't trip out. Our parents struggled, individually, but they struggled. Instead of taking over society, they let FDR save the investors. Will we make the task even easier for the powers-that-be, and LSD be our savior? Even Charles Reich, who wrote "The Greening of America," has written, "I do not see how anyone who seriously undertakes to look at our present society can proceed without first addressing himself (sic) to the problem of advanced monopoly capitalism... with confronting the consequences of capitalism within our individual selves."

