

Judicial Reform

Change is long overdue

If you think Judicial Reform doesn't affect you, you're wrong.

The current student self-governing system (Men's Honor Court, Women's Honor Court and Attorney General's office) is unknown to the large majority of students. They don't learn about it until it's too late.

Every week the DTH could have, and should have, printed the results of student court actions. Every week students are charged with cheating, stealing, plagiarism and car registration violations. The present Honor Court system is badly flawed, as almost anyone on the Attorney General's staff or Honor Courts would agree. It is time for fundamental change.

The "Instrument of Student Judicial Governance" has been long in the making. One of those rare student reforms which has both

survived and been strengthened by a series of student governments, it originated under Student Body President Tommy Bello in 1970. The document contains 40 pages of mature proposals for reform.

• Maintenance of the Honor Code will be more efficient. A large "Undergraduate Court" will combine the functions of the Men's and Women's Honor Court. Half of all court members will be women and over one-quarter will be of a minority race. A "Court Administrator" will take over the hours of telephoning and managerial detail which burden the present system. Judicial districts will be the same as legislative districts for the first time.

• Penalties will better fit the violations. Much more leeway is granted to the Undergraduate Court in deciding punishment. There will

be no more automatic "F" for cheating convictions. A gradation of penalties from expulsion to loss of campus voting privileges will be meted out to guilty students.

• Students will have more say in the self-governing process. The Undergraduate Court is empowered to handle many drug offenses. The "University Hearings Board," which will hear major cases (those involving police testimony or psychological reports), will have two student members out of five.

The Chancellor and the students have already approved the Judicial Reform bill, which would go into effect early next year. The final step in ratification comes Friday with the decision of the Faculty Council. We strongly urge their acceptance of the plan.

J.H.C.

The Daily Tar Heel

82nd Year of Editorial Freedom

All unsigned or initialed editorials are the opinion of the editor or editors. Letters and columns represent the opinions of individuals.

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak, Editors

March 21, 1974

Gerry Cohen

Notes on the primary races

The next three weeks are the last opportunity to register to vote in the May 7 Democratic and Republican primaries in North Carolina.

Beginning today, the Orange County Board of Elections will have special voter registration hours at the Chapel Hill Municipal Building, and next week the registrars will visit Woolen Gym on Monday and Wednesday.

Democratic voters will choose nominees for U.S. Senate, two seats on the Supreme Court, a seat on the Court of Appeals, two state senators, two state representatives, three county commissioners, a district attorney and sheriff.

Republicans will choose nominees for U.S. Senate, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and two state senators.

If you are already registered in another county or state, you still can register in Orange County. Your other registration will be cancelled, leaving you with one voting place.

The May 7 primaries will be the first test in North Carolina of political attitudes after Watergate and will be only the third primary in the nation after Illinois and Texas.

In Orange County, students play an important role in the elections for commissioner, state legislature and sheriff. Of the 30,000 voters in the County, over 6,000 are UNC students, and in the next six weeks, they will be bombarded with information about the various candidates.

The primary election will in many ways affect the future of Orange County, especially in the races for commissioner and sheriff. Issues such as land-use planning, housing, environmental control and welfare administration are important ones which will come up.

In the commissioners race, seven Democrats are seeking three seats on the five-member board. In the state house race, the two incumbents, Trish Stanford Hunt and Ed Holmes are being challenged by Doug Holmes, a UNC business administration grad student who has run against Howard Lee for mayor twice and been whipped both times.

In the state senate battle, five candidates seek the two seats, Chapel Hill attorney Charles Vickery, Asheboro businessman Russell Walker (who was one of three North Carolinians at the 1968 Democratic National Convention to vote for an end to

the war resolution), Chapel Hill investor Carl Smith, Joe Monroe, a young lawyer from Southern Pines, and Benjamin Swaline, former N.C. Symphony conductor.

In the sheriff's race, incumbent Buck Knight faces challenger Bill Ray, a former County Commissioner.

The U.S. Senate race, of course, pits Robert Morgan, N.C.'s Attorney General against former Congressman Nick Galifianakis, who lost to Jesse Helms in 1972, and Henry Hall Wilson, a former businessman.

Republicans have a quiet battle for U.S. Senate, with William Stevens facing token opposition. In the state senate, Chapel Hillian Ed Tenney faces two opponents in a race for two seats.

Obviously, if you aren't registered, you can't vote, and voter registration will end for the primary on April 8.

Those who are already registered in Orange County do not need to re-register, unless they have moved out of their precinct.

To vote in the Democratic primary, you must be registered as a Democrat, and you must be a Republican to vote in the Republican primary. The many students who are now registered "no party" or



'WAS THAT WHO I THINK IT WAS?'

David Wall Older brother's confession

Dear Kevin:

No matter what you may think, though you've read the book and you can stand at the urinal and tell more impressive stories than your friends, you don't know everything there is to know about sex. I don't know everything there is to know either, and

I seriously doubt that many people do. Kevin, you can memorize all of the techniques, positions and rhythms that have ever been described in "adult books" or illustrated in hard-core films and you'll still not know what it takes to have a meaningful relationship with a woman.

The reason is simply that it takes more than a physical attraction and the ability to perform in bed to maintain two individuals through even the simple everyday crises of who's to be the first to shower, or which way to squeeze the tooth-paste tube.

In terms of lasting importance, sex is not at the top of the list when it comes to the things that matter between men and women. Affection, consideration, tenderness, respect and love are all necessary before there can be a relationship with any depth to it at all.

To me, sex is the ultimate expression of these emotions. It is the giving of oneself. But too often it happens that sex is more heavily stressed and becomes dominant before the other emotions have been fully developed.

It's hard to say if this is the fault of the male or the female, but a lot of these situations could be avoided if we males would take the time to distinguish between the pounding in our chests and the pounding in our jeans.

I know it doesn't mean much when I tell you there's a difference between aimless copulation and meaningful sexual relations, and I don't expect you to accept what I say with blind faith. You'll soon realize, as I have, that there is a difference, an important one, but the whole point of my writing you is so that maybe I can give you an insight that I never had when I was your age. In this way, perhaps you'll be able to better handle situations similar to the ones that I blundered through. Situations that I look back on today and say, "Jesus, how could I have done that?" But the worst part is knowing that I'll never be able to go back and set straight the mistakes that I made.

Maybe I can illustrate what I'm trying to say. Dogs, cats, monkeys—hell, Kevin, all animals use intercourse for their own pleasure as well as for procreation. Little emotion, other than the physical enjoyment of the act itself, is involved.

Animals have no hang-ups over premature ejaculation, there is no frustration due to a lack of simultaneous orgasm, and most important... there is no love. For the animals it is nothing more than a relationship motivated by instinct and not by emotion.

The thing that sets man above the animals is that he can reach a higher level than

pleasure. He can experience a sense of completeness; he can attain happiness. Most importantly, he can share that happiness with another. He has the ability to love.

But here's the catch, when man chooses to misuse both sex and the woman involved he has chosen to lower himself to the status of the animals and their form of aimless copulation. Perhaps even to a lower status because man has gone beneath himself. He is merely seeking a physical release at the emotional expense of another individual. This lack of love, or emotional ties to the other person cheapens the most cherished exchange that can be experienced between a man and a woman.



I guess all I'm trying to say is not to get involved on any level simply for the sake of sexual gratification. Try not to confuse love and marriage with sexual excitement and heavy breathing. If a woman displays herself to you like a buffet luncheon then you can rest assured she's served herself to many others before you and any relation you have with her will last only as long as it takes you to get your stomach full. Most meaningful relationships come from tenderness and love, and they are generally the ones that last. Every man/woman relationship eventually has to come to some terms with sex, but it should be a result, not the cause.



letters to the editor

Rebuttal offered on drama review

To the editors:

Recently the Lab Theatre performed the play, *What the Butler Saw*, by Joe Orton, a deceased playwright who has been called the "artist of the outrageous." Betsy Flanagan wrote a very glib and shallow review of the play, and we are writing a rebuttal.

The play does not ask if "the monkeys run the zoo." It does ask, however, if abnormal behavior is not sometimes saner than what our society considers "normal" behavior. It asks whether or not society should condemn people for their differences or their craziness. Dr. Prentice is sane and he keeps his sanity in the play by keeping his sense of humor.

Furthermore, the play embodies sharp satirical comment about the government's intrusion into a person's life, about the legal system (i.e., only the innocent—not the guilty—have to explain their crime), and about some of the traditional techniques of romantic comedy: the last act is definitely a mockery of the mother-father-children-separated-at-birth theme of many comedies. Betsy has also neglected to mention the author's wit, evident in many of his lines.

What the Butler Saw is a bawdy play and probably shocked many viewers with its openness about sex, but Orton is deliberately

re-evaluating the middle class Puritanical mores which teach us to feel ashamed of our bodies and of sex.

Betsy's attempt to salvage her critique—her praise of the set design—does not excuse her naive and tactless comment that "this play should have been buried with the author." We find the play, with its zany plot and its pointed mockery of society, simultaneously funny and thought-provoking, and very much worth producing.

Jean McKinney
Marcia J. Decker
Craig Graduate Center

Angry reader writes on

To the editors:

The letter from Craig Willis and Joni Ingram on March nineteenth infuriated me to no end. It was filled with misinformation, misunderstanding and above all, missing a message.

Willis and Ingram begin by citing the lack of jungle experience in Digg's personal history. According to an accepted source of knowledge, personal means having to do with the character, conduct etc. of a certain individual. Running naked through the jungles is a part of my heritage that I revere. It is this abiding respect and love of our ancestors for what they had to do, that keeps Blacks from participating in your pointless, foolhardy game. This, I believe is what Mr. Diggs meant. Since our heritage influences our character and our conduct, nothing in my opinion, could be more personal.

Tuesday's letter also went on to speak of the Black male "sex symbol" image as being a response to the insecurity of our men in relation to women, especially white women. Willis and Ingram, I hate to inform you, but the idea of the Black male as a sex symbol originated with your people, not mine. Black women have always known and admired the sexiness of their men. As far as white women, I'm sure Diggs couldn't care less. (By the way, why did you separate white women from women as a whole.)

The reference to Superfly as an ideal Black male, sexually I presume, was way off base. Diggs said, "Check out Ron O'Neil as Superfly and Max Julian as the Mack—then it will become perfectly clear why Blacks would rather wear clothes." Both men were "in the know" as far as clothes are concerned and showed Blacks the latest in "styling" your body. It had nothing to do with being ashamed of the body, just "keeping it in style."

I'd like to divert your attention from Tuesday's letter, to propose that only Blacks were streaking. First of all, it would hardly be considered a fad—to be ignored. Streaking then would be considered indecent exposure, demoralizing to the minds of innocent people, "folks gone wild," and any of a dozen other things. Secondly, a campus-wide public streak would never have been permitted; and certainly not when the blocking of public transportation was necessary. Thirdly, instead of police and administration permissiveness and encouragement, the campus would soon have been under the careful watch of our National Guard (ian), and at least one person would be killed—to teach them a lesson. And of course, there'd be lots of arrests, and alumni, students, parents and above all the State would cheer this great University for "Keeping those 'niggers' under control."

Cecilia C. Sanders
209 Craig

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes the expression of all points of view through the letters to the editor. Opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors. 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.

Tim Sims

Nixon facade crumbling

Dan Rather, one of CBS's famous news correspondents, put the facts against the facade on Tuesday night's Presidential news conference (or Presidential PR gimmick, as some said), and was wobbly side-stepped by the President.

The facade was this: Nixon said he had cooperated "completely" with the grand jury and with "various investigative agencies" looking into the Watergate matter.

The facts, as Rather presented them, were these: The President had not only NOT cooperated completely (i.e., he refused to appear before the grand jury as requested, or to answer their written questions under oath; both the special prosecutor and the House Judiciary Committee have been denied information they seek), but he has attempted to define the limits of the House investigation.

The President replied to Rather's facts with another facade—"If the House decides to follow the Constitution, so will I."

But Richard Nixon is running out of facades. This latest one was fraught with horrible implications.

1) Does it mean he will be law-abiding only if others are?
2) Does it mean he hasn't been law-abiding so far, but will be if the House is?
3) Does it mean he's accusing the House of unlawful activity?

Whatever he meant, the dubious fact that HE knew what he meant, as he so grandly states, is not comforting. It is, instead, chilling, as each new development finds him

throwing up more and more desperate word-facades to the American public which may only be correctly interpreted by him.

Dan Rather could have said, "Mr. President, you lied," and he would have been 100% right, if not so diplomatic.

And this is what has happened again and again: The President makes a statement. Factual rebuttal is offered. The President says he meant something else, or that what he said was mistaken because he meant something else.

"Your sins will find you out," seems to be an ancient proverb with a modern example. Two times in the past two weeks, Nixon has been caught in lies which he has sidestepped.

Even James Buckley, the staunchest conservative legislator in the Congress (with intelligence), cannot now support a man in whose governing power the American people have lost confidence.

Why?

The facades are crumbling. Nixon said he ended the war in Vietnam. The war is still raging, financed by your tax dollars. Nixon said there would be no recession, yet as of last week 68% of the American people think we are in one.

Nixon said he never knew anything about hush money until John Dean's mention of it, which he immediately rejected as "wrong." Now he says he allowed it to be "entertained as an option still open."

Nixon said the tapes would prove his innocence. Now he says that they might not,

but that he can explain what he meant.

The American people are growing tired of his explanations, his facades, and his outright lies. And Tuesday night, on national television, Dan Rather caught him in another one.

What can be thought of a man who lies on national television, is confronted with the falsehood, and then sidesteps it by a furious challenge that the House "follow the constitution?"

Doubtless, he will explain this latest remark by another word-facade, telling us what he meant. Will you believe him yet another time? How long will it take that faithful 25% of American conservatism to realize that they are supporting a man who only gives lip service to the principles they believe in?

How long will it take those still-loyal Congressmen to see that they are supporting a thin wall of—at best—doubtful absurdities?

Dragging out Watergate, as Nixon said, does indeed drag down America. And it is Nixon himself who is dragging it out by not resigning when that is precisely what the majority of the American people now want, or by not giving the House committee the evidence they seek.

And if he drags it out long enough, when he finally tumbles down, facade and all, not only will we not have Dick Nixon to kick around anymore, we may not have a republic.

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak
Editors

Kevin McCarthy, Managing Editor
Jean Swallow, Associate Editor
Ken Allen, News Editor
Harriet Sugar, Feature Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Ernie Pitt, Night Editor