

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

Friday, April 23, 1971

Sitterson concept of fairness unfair

A meeting was held Wednesday between Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson; Dean of Student Affairs C.O. Cathey; Walter Baggett, president of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation; and Claiborne Jones, assistant to the Chancellor.

The purpose of that meeting was to allow representatives of the GPSF and Student Government to state their views on the possibility of the graduate students' split with Student Government.

However, absent from that meeting was Student Body President Joe Stallings.

According to the Chancellor, the reason for Stallings' absence was that Stallings insisted on the presence of Attorney John R. Brooks in representing Student Government, which Sitterson would not allow.

"It wouldn't have been fair to the other people involved for him to have a third party counsel present, when we have not had a chance to have a lawyer present," Sitterson said Thursday.

However, from Sitterson's statements Thursday and from statements made in the past, it has not been the graduate students who have been cheated but the undergraduates.

Both Sitterson and Baggett had attended previous meetings

concerning the issue, but Stallings hadn't. Because of this Stallings asked Brooks who had worked on the Student Government side of the issue during Tommy Bello's administration, to be present Wednesday "to provide a continuity from the last Student Government administration."

The Chancellor, however, wouldn't accept this reasoning. One also wonders why the Chancellor felt it necessary to get his own legal counsel if Brooks was to be present.

If he just wanted fairness at the meeting, it would seem that he would have insisted on the graduate students' having the chance to hire an attorney rather than getting one himself.

It is becoming more and more evident that the Chancellor has already made up his mind on the issue and is favoring the graduate students in the meetings.

If he has made his decision, then the meetings are superfluous in the first place. And if he hasn't—no matter which side is right—he should be fair in his dealing with graduates and undergraduates.

Mike Parnell

Bits and pieces: Kitty's time

Dean of Women Katherine Carmichael sent a memorandum this week to directors of women's residence halls and sororities detailing how the change to Eastern Daylight Time Sunday would be handled.

The residences will close at 2 a.m. Eastern Standard Time rather than 2 a.m. Daylight Time so the women on campus won't get to stay out an extra hour. Campus clocks will be changed after closing hours.

Miss Carmichael ended her memorandum with a gentle reminder to "turn back the clocks as suggested." Unfortunately, the clocks have to be turned up an hour to accommodate the change in time.

Miss Carmichael is notorious for looking back in time.

HERO OF THE WEEK: For the second week in a row actor George Scott wins this award. This week Scott was nominated for an Emmy as television's top actor for the 1970-71 season. Scott has refused to comment to newsmen but friends say he will refuse to accept the Emmy, just as he refused to accept the Oscar as the top movie actor. Attaboy, George.

Russian bachelors are "malicious men in love with themselves," according to an AP wire report Wednesday. The Russian

Brad Stuart

May Day, Treaty hurt peace

The dove descending breaks the air
With flame of incandescent terror
Of which the tongues declare
The one discharge from sin and error.
The only hope, or else despair
Lies in the choice of pyre or pyre—
To be redeemed from fire by fire.
—T.S. Eliot

May 1 will mark the beginning of a demonstration much different in scope, intent and tactics from the demonstration to begin April 24.

The demonstration beginning April 24 is to be of voices and numbers and is in support of Senator Vance Hartke's Resolution 66 for immediate withdrawal from Indochina.

The demonstration beginning May 1 is to be a demonstration of power. During the week following May Day, activists intend to demonstrate "the people" have the power to force implementation of the "People's Peace Treaty" (PPT). Organizers have planned massive disruptions of federal communications,

traffic and utilities. Collaborative action in the Washington ghettos has been planned by black militants.

Activist literature declares, "If the government does not stop the war, we will stop the government."

To understate the obvious: If the government faces serious danger of being "stopped" or thrown into chaos, it will react violently—people will be killed in Washington.

Undoubtedly, the government would rather confine its killing to Indochina. Massacres in the United States, such as at Kent State, are not conducive to effective government.

If endangered, however, the government will act—immediately and indiscriminately. To enable the government to do so is the purpose of federal provisions concerning mass arrests and concentration camps. This is the purpose of armed troops at past demonstrations in Washington, Chicago,

Kent... Their weapons are more than symbolic.

We may hope that no violence or killings will take place in Washington. The planned civil disobedience may be too ineffectual to seriously disrupt the capital, in which case there need be no government retaliation.

But even under normal conditions large cities are very vulnerable, very complex and hence very vulnerable. Only a few hundred concerted disruptors could cause considerable turmoil. This situation would be intolerable to the government. Their troops would move against the activists. While most activists are committed to non-violence in Washington, some undoubtedly would resist violently. At this point, a barrage of stones, a firebomb, a sharpshooter, a single nervous lieutenant could trigger mass slaughter.

Unlike the April 24th demonstration, the May Day civil disobedience is unwise and counterproductive to the peace movement. Although violence in Washington might "bring the war home" it would not bring the peace which this country so desperately needs.

The "People's Peace Treaty" is itself counterproductive. The PPT is a restatement of the Vietcong "Eight Point Platform." By endorsing the PPT, an American is taking sides in the Vietnamese civil war.

It is one thing for an American to protest U.S. support of the tyrannical Thieu-Ky-Khiem regime. It is quite another for an American to sign a treaty

whose implementation would prohibit Thieu, Ky and Khiem from running for election in Vietnam. The relative merits of Vietnamese politicians must be decided by Vietnamese.

The PPT organizers point to the Vietnamese co-signers of the Treaty as representative of the will of the Vietnamese people. Yet the question, "Who represents the Vietnamese people?" has been the central issue of a civil war which has dragged on for years and has destroyed, by some estimates, over a million lives. If Americans had not tried to decide this issue in times past, a good part of this million would be alive today.

Despite these objections, many on this campus support the PPT and a good number will participate in the Washington civil disobedience. Some feel the PPT and Washington disruptions, whatever their flaws and dangers, are bound to be more effective than more of the same type of marches, rallies and demonstrations which the peace movement has used for years.

Indeed, I admit that massive disruptions and killings in the U.S. may "bring the troops home." Such events in Germany as well as failure of discipline in the German armed forces (as is occurring in our military, also) brought Germany more quickly out of World War I. But the civil turmoil in that country hardly brought about peace.

Before making the decision to support the PPT with civil disobedience in Washington, I urge the reader to consider the matter very seriously.

Lives are on the line.

Letter

Arrington misinterpreted vote

To the Editor:

Bob Arrington's column published last week contains numerous errors, and makes an unfair accusation against Joe Stallings.

While it might be true that threats were made to call legislators into account for their absences, if Mr. Arrington had checked the rollbook, he would have found that while three conservative members had exceeded their absences, six liberal members were in a similar situation. All members of SL knew this, and it was decided to ignore all absences for the last three meetings.

If Mr. Stallings had threatened the conservatives, they would have called his bluff since it would gain them three votes. In any case, it is not the president of the student body who resigns members; it is the Clerk of the Legislature

and the body's Rules Committee (of which I am chairman). I don't believe the threat was ever made.

The vote of 28 to three (with eight abstentions) on the issue of reconsidering the student lawyer should be examined again. The vote the previous evening had been 15 to 14, and the conservatives were clearly outnumbered on the second vote. In any case, the issue was to reconsider the vote, that is, to bring it up for discussion again. Mr. Arrington ignored the third and final vote, in which the conservatives voted their consciences and were beaten.

Mr. Arrington has called Joe Stallings "high-handed." Yet he has not presented a shred of evidence that will stand up to support his charge. He should retract it.

Gerry Cohen
B1 Univ. Garden Apts.

HAY, KIN Y'ALL SIND US A WRECKER?
WE GOTTA ACCIDENT OUTCHEA AAWNTH'
FIFTEEN-FIVE-ON-WON BY-PAYUS.
TIN FOER



MAIL, AR WRECKERS AR GON'BE
TAHD UP TODAY TOWIN' OFF THEM CARS
THEY'R PARKED WRONG. BUT WE KIN
GITCHA ONE OVER THAR TH' FURST THANG
IN TH' MORNIN' OVER N'OUT.



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
- March Cheek Night Editor

- Bob Wilson Business Mgr.
- Janet Bernstein Adv. Mgr.

George Blackburn

SG, DTH pursuing materialism, separatism

Weary of the seemingly interminable Peloponnesian War, two Athenians, Euclides (i.e. Hopeful) and Pisthetairos (i.e. Plausible) abandon their city in search of a new state free from the hardships and struggle of war, the civil corruption and endless lawsuits of the dying democracy. The two decide to live among the birds—the undying, the ageless ones, scholars of eternity—and among them begin to build a utopian realm, Cloudcuckooland.

The irony of Aristophanes' comedy "The Birds" is that the two Athenians cannot escape their own character as Athenians. The restless energy and enterprise which leads them to organize the birds and to build Cloudcuckooland is the very restless energy and enterprise, the polupragmosune, which led Athens upon her imperialistic course. Soon the bird empire is at war with the Gods, the realm is beset by inspectors, legislators, hack poets and prophets. The comedy ends when a truce is concluded between the Athenian-bird leaders and the representatives of the gods, a truce sealed by a dinner of roast fowl.

On May 7, 1970 Tommy Bello inaugurated plans for just such an ironic Cloudcuckooland. Mr. Bello addressed the student body on the meaning of the May strike: "We strike to establish a

university that will espouse what this society so desperately needs: mutual love, respect, and understanding... We have slept through the nightmares for too long; today we begin to live the dream. Together and nonviolently, compassionately and intelligently, we strike to begin anew." Earlier in the speech, Mr. Bello betrayed the irony of his position, revealed his own sense of "mutual love, respect, and understanding" by announcing "the politicians that run this country are cold, hard, calculating men, men untouched by reason." This Cloudcuckooland, the "free university," was posited upon the very distrust, disrespect, and misunderstanding that its proponents sought to escape.

In July the Free University was succeeded by Guil Waddell's Independent Student Government. This misbegotten mooncalf (Mognuolo's term) was founded upon the treasurer's belief that "The student body is no longer satisfied to base its self-governing on a delegation of authority from the Chancellor of the University. Instead, it is beginning to assert its basic rights to self-government and its willingness to assume concomitant responsibilities."

Mr. Waddell and his supporters expressed this ideal of self-government and responsible conduct by ramming

through Student Legislature the necessary appropriations and budget cuts while its constituency was absent (rather similar to the accusation often made that trustees pass unpopular measures in the summer behind our backs), by forcibly "resigning" ten legislators, and by declaring subsequent enquiries by the student Supreme Court invalid. Here again would-be reformers attempted to realize their ideals by resorting to the very injustices which their separatist efforts were to avoid.

Cloudcuckooland was explained if not justified by the situation of war and corruption which induced Euclides and Pisthetairos to seek a newer world. Modern escapists, from the conservative Agrarian Poets of the American South to the Marcusean radicals of more recent years, have seen in the American industrialized state a bondage to materialism and massness from which man must free himself if he is to retain his humanity.

So there have arisen various separatist movements—all of them reactionary in tendency—aimed at building new Edens, new Cloudcuckoolands which will be free from the injustices and evils of American society. The Free University, a national phenomenon, is just such an escapist, reactionary movement. It manifests its

desire to return to simple, "spontaneous" human conduct by defending atavistic behavior patterns of dress, mores, and speech. By renouncing modern experience, it dooms itself to soon repeat the very mistakes which have led our culture to commit those mistakes at this point.

Independent Student Government, a more identifiably local concept, is likewise a reversion rather than an advancement. Mr. Waddell's concept differs from Mr. Bello's because Guil does not seem to have been aware that modern purposelessness, our spiritual malaise, is supposedly a reaction to materialism. ISG is founded upon economic enterprises—the Print Shop, refrigerator sales, etc.—and upon the premise that dorm-room carpets, easy chairs, and refrigerators are the real values which the modern student pursues. These ideals—materialism and a bureaucracy efficient in the satisfaction of material wants—in the context of the University, like those more idealistic values of the Free University in the context of the American nation, are to be realized by separating the new institution (ISG, or the Free University) from the presently existing structure (the University, or the nation).

While Joe Stallings flies off the wheel

on the Student Co-op-Student Lawyer tangent striving valiantly (?) to resuscitate the stillborn progeny of Mr. Waddell's misunderstandings, shall we not at least consider the possibility that separatism is not the means by which to realize the values we are seeking? Like Aristophanes, we might recognize that our national distress is not more attributable to an elite military industrial complex (Mr. Bello's "cold, hard, calculating men, men untouched by reason") than it is true that unrest within our Universities is the product of a deranged radical few. Just as the restless Athenian temperament, whose deathless achievements men still admire, also led the city into imperialism, just as that temperament engraved itself upon Euclides and Pisthetairos who though they were opposing their country's aggressiveness, so too there is something in the American temperament, something in which we all participate and in whose manifestations we are all implicated, that has led us to this present point in our history. And this is true not merely for the nation itself but for all those institutions—our universities, our press, our business life—which embody the spirit of American culture. In our history, that temperament has led us to perform great deeds and that same temperament has led us to Vietnam and

internal dissension. We cannot escape it by simply renouncing certain of its effects, condemning certain of its manifestations, or by separating ourselves from it physically. It goes with us in whatever direction we channel the energies in which it will manifest itself again.

It is not change we need, but growth, a more profound understanding of the values to which we must now proceed. That growth cannot take place unless our national institutions become and are allowed to become thoughtful analysts and respected advisors in our culture's life. Most especially, the universities, in which should reside that humanistic perspective necessary to analyze and understand our difficulty, must regain their self-respect and the respectful attention to the people.

How can that be accomplished here in North Carolina if Mr. Stallings and The Daily Tar Heel keep tearing the University down and apart, pursuing their outdated, misconceived ideals of materialism and separatism, their Independent Daily Tar Heel and Independent Student Government, their refrigerators and wall-to-wall cheap carpets, their pettifogging lawyer and "student" (?) Co-op?