

One choice left for editor

The *DTH* editor's campaign of past weeks is perhaps the best example of mudslinging this campus has seen in recent years. There has been an overabundance of publicity gimmicks, rhetoric and slurs against other candidates, and very little educated criticism.

To begin with, we are not going to "endorse" any candidates because endorsement has the connotation of approval. Instead we wish to inform the student body so it can make an intelligent choice.

Neither of the candidates provide students with a choice when it comes to electing a good editor.

Moreover, it is apparent that one of the candidates has run what we consider to be an unethical campaign, where gimmicks replaced information and negativism replaced ideas, not to mention ideals. Cole Campbell has held up know-nothingness as a virtue by openly admitting his lack of journalistic background, not with humility, but with pride.

What exactly has Campbell done? Two days before last week's election he produced an alternative newspaper but said it was not a campaign expenditure. *The DTH Alternative* was about what you would expect from someone who doesn't know how to put out a newspaper. His latest leaflet is a series of blatant untruths and could land him in court for libelous statements against *DTH* News Editor Bill Welch. Campbell also staged a Tar Heel burning in the Pit vaguely reminiscent of Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451*.

We have no doubt that Campbell is a clever and intelligent individual. We had once believed that with training and a good staff he would have been able to put out a decent paper. However, he has resorted to mudslinging tactics and cheap publicity tricks.

He has stated that he would like for the majority of the present *DTH* staff to stay on but we wonder how he expects to put out a "different" paper (as he has emphasized) with the same staff. Moreover, Campbell has gone out of his way to antagonize staff members and thus has alienated the very people who could help him most as editor.

Jim Cooper and Greg Turosak are running as co-editors, an idea in which we still do not place our full confidence. We originally objected to their stand on a financial independence but modified their stand to a more positive degree. They do have journalistic experience. They have staff support. Above all, they have run a straightforward and honest campaign.

Cole Campbell has questioned the loyalty of staff members to the *Tar Heel*. We have questioned his ethics in this election. Our loyalty to the *Tar Heel* means loyalty to the high ideals and principles of journalism practiced by the paper in the past. Because of this we feel that we cannot in any way approve of Cole Campbell for editor.

What's left? Cooper and Turosak. In this case, they are the only alternative.

—S.B.M.

Letters to the editor

Resisters faced ideological conflict

To the editor:

I was interested in Mr. Bob Hupman's opinions in his letter (i.e. amnesty) printed Feb 27, 1974. I am equally interested in the frame of reference from which he forms his opinions. Was his "miserable skin" involved in the conflict (Vietnam) at issue? If it was, he must have somehow survived with his eyes shut not to have better understood the pressures involved in trying to equate what one might suppose to be American ideals with obviously contrary evidence.

I believe Mr. Hupman will find, if he cares to look, that many war zone desertions were a direct result of this ideological conflict—men no longer wished to be blown away for upholding a non-benevolent dictator and fighting a nationalist hero (particularly when they were often not allowed to properly defend themselves).

Those who refused to serve at all were the most foresighted. They realized that real patriotism has nothing to do with trying to quash a nationalist revolution against an exploitative dictatorship in another country.

War zone deserters awakened to this fact late, but left under circumstances infinitely more difficult than simply driving to Canada, in the process of endangering no one as much as themselves.

The Constitution Mr. Hupman waves so grandly is fairly clear about the principle of self-determination. Is refusal to participate in denial of this principle to an entire nation—for our own business reasons—unpatriotic? I think not, although there is plenty of precedent in the subordinations of Cuba, Hawaii, the Philippines, in Dollar Diplomacy. This country's policies are self-serving, not peacemaking or even peace-loving. Henry Kissinger makes deals, not peace. Perhaps those forced to remain abroad would like to return and try once more to change that. A society truly dedicated to free democracy should welcome them unconditionally.

Edwin Stoddard (SP5-USAVN)
Box 185, Rt. 4
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Everything is just a joke

To the editor:

It's all a joke. Running naked from the Bell Tower to South Building.

That's a joke. Student Power to students who have no REAL control over where they live and what they study.

That's a joke. Student government—those puppets who pretend to stand up for and represent the student body, who has no REAL control—has no REAL power.

That's a joke. King Boulton and his reasoning power.

That's a joke. Requirements. Grades. Forcing us to swallow and regurgitate crap and then slapping a grade on it. That's not education.

That's a joke. Saving second floor Winston with protest shirts and letters to the editor and columns and editorials and Residence Hall Association's support and the sympathy of all students.

That's a joke. Impotence. That's a joke. It's all a joke. And I'm not even a jokester.

Charlie Lehman
616 Ehringhaus

Letters

The *Daily Tar Heel* provides the opportunity for expression of opinions by readers through letters to the editor. This newspaper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Letters should be limited to 300 words and must include the name, address and phone number of the writer. Type letters on a 60-space line and address them to Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*, in care of the Student Union.

The Daily Tar Heel

82 Years Of Editorial Freedom

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

Susan Miller, Editor

March 6, 1974

Betsey Jones is choice for RHA

The race for Residence Hall Association this year has seen two candidates with opposite styles of approach to the solution of problems in housing on this campus.

Mike O'Neal, a graduate student running for head of an organization that is for the most part undergraduate, favors a hard-hitting, aggressive approach to the housing department. He has characterized what RHA should be as students versus the administration. The key word here is *versus*, for he believes students, and the RHA as a protagonist for the students in University housing, should fight the administration at all costs for students' rights. The underlying assumption is that the housing administration is not working for students' rights.

We do not believe that an

antagonistic leader can have the best input into housing department decisions. Betsey Jones' approach is that of working *with* instead of *versus* the administration to improve student life on campus. The administration, we believe, will be more willing to work with cooperative leadership than with antagonistic leadership. We also believe this is important because it is the administration that has the power to make housing decisions. Students have the opportunity now to have or not to have input into housing decisions, but neither students as a whole nor the RHA has the power to make those decisions. RHA should cooperate not fight with the housing administration to best represent student interests.

Late Tuesday night O'Neal produced an editorial endorsing himself and insinuating that it was censored by the *Tar Heel*. Earlier Tuesday he told the *DTH* he was not basing his campaign on negativism against Jones or the *DTH*. This flyer is an unfair and misleading campaign tactic.

Jones has been one of the hardest workers of RHA this year and she has built a strong basis for working with the housing department for the students' benefit. We believe she will best represent student interests as president of the Residence Hall Association.

The Daily Tar Heel

Susan Miller
Editor

Cathy Farrell, Managing Editor
Bill Welch, News Editor
David Eskridge, Associate Editor
Nancy Pate, Associate Editor
Kevin McCarthy, Features Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Ernie Pitt, Night Editor

Bunky Flagler

Whatever happened to ethics?

With newsprint ink smeared on my elbows and knees from reading Dick Tracy, I quietly listened, as a child, to my journalist parents' long conversations after the other five kids cleared out from dinner. Newspapering was the usual subject.

From the way they talked about reporting and writing the news I learned certain things. One of those is that a newsman and his paper have a moral responsibility of ethical leadership to the community.

Perhaps objectivity, fairness and

moral duty to the community are a lot of rigmarole to most students.

But don't kid yourself. There are more than words. There is a definite ethical stance from which every newsman or woman must work.

As an ethical newspaperwoman, I attempt to make every story, every headline, every editing change as fair and as accurate as possible.

The race for quality professional leadership for the *Daily Tar Heel* in recent weeks has been a blight upon the integrity of student elections. Quality and professional leadership are greatly needed—but a true professional is one with a definite moral stance.

Cole Campbell has proved himself lacking in moral stance. By publishing a newspaper he claims to be in no way advocating his candidacy, Campbell took, as he called it, "a great risk."

He risked, by publishing his four pages of weak writing style, wandering and irrelevant columns and poor layout, more than just showing that he cannot direct a newspaper.

under the present editorship of the *Daily Tar Heel*. The number of people who ran for editor of the *DTH* this spring indicates the level of dissatisfaction with the newspaper. Despite the purported evidence to the contrary, its readership has declined. Many of those who do read it find it neither rational or fair. I have little or no respect for the opinions of its editor.

There have been a great many issues on which student government has deserved criticism. What it has received from the *DTH*, while certainly qualifying as criticism, has lacked cogency, intelligence and perspective. Much of what the *DTH* editorials say is the concern of no more than a handful of politicians. One person referred to it as the "most expensive interoffice memorandum" they had ever seen.

The question becomes what can be done? How can the *DTH* restore its credibility and influence so that the student body president and others may

better respond to student needs? The job begins with an editor who is rational, fair and forceful. Cole Campbell would make such an editor.

I endorsed no one for president of the student body. No one candidate demonstrated qualities remarkable by comparison with the other candidates, though the outcome has been extremely positive. The *Daily Tar Heel* race is important enough, and Cole Campbell is competent enough, to merit a strong endorsement. The change in direction will be well worth it.



Ford Runge

DTH editor can influence

Despite the attraction that many erstwhile do-gooders have shown for the Student Body presidency, the editorship of the *Daily Tar Heel* remains the most influential and powerful position on campus. In many ways, it carries greater responsibility than any other job. The editor must inform students day-to-day on a wide variety of subjects, not the least of which are the activities of other elected student offices.

It is not unusual that the press should find fault with elected officials. The check of the press on these officials exercises a constructive restraint which keeps people like the student body president accountable to the people he or she serves. This is true when two conditions exist: 1.) when people who read the newspaper believe what it has to say is rational and fair, and 2.) when the elected officials who are called to account respect the newspaper enough to respond to its criticism.

Neither of these conditions exist

He risked violating the spirit of a campaign rule that was created to make campaigns more fair—the limitation on spending.

"I don't see any ethical problem at all," he said in an interview yesterday. "The *DTH Alternative* in no way advocated my candidacy."

Try to tell that to any one who saw one of the 5,000 copies. Strange coincidence that it arrived two days before the election.

Furthermore, Campbell said, it did not cost over the spending law limit of \$200. Try to tell that to any printer in the Triangle area, who estimate its cost from \$300 to \$1,600.

Cole Campbell is either stupid or tricky. We know he's not the former. A tricky editor we don't need.

We cannot in this year or any year stand for anything less than professionalism through excellence and integrity.

In Dick Tracy I read as a kid the bad guy lost. The good guys, two-headed or not, always won.



Staff delivers papers

Today dormitory students found *The Daily Tar Heel* delivered to each room on campus. *DTH* staff members delivered the paper.

On election days in the past years, people have, for political reasons, stolen papers by taking it after it has reached delivery points.

Papers have also been

disappearing over the past couple of days. For instance, Tuesday's *Daily Tar Heel* apparently was received by students in only a little more than half of the dorms on campus.

For these reasons, we have delivered the papers door to door to make sure that students will have the opportunity to read today's issue.