

In Our Opinion . . .

Typical And Atypical — A Year Of Action Ahead

It rained yesterday afternoon. It rained and it was a very quiet afternoon.

Yesterday afternoon was a typical, and at the same time atypical, Chapel Hill afternoon.

The rain played the typical role. For the new students, a word of warning. It rains a great deal in Chapel Hill. Thunder showers have been scheduled for several big party weekends this fall. Icy rain drops also may be expected on a great number of winter class days. Then, of course, there should be a fine selection of cloudbursts in time for Jubilee weekend next spring.

The rain was typical. The quiet was atypical.

For, whatever a year at UNC—especially this year—might hold in store quiet doesn't describe it.

Naturally there will be plenty of noise in the next three months over Tar Heel brand football. Then, too, there is the noise that college-age people just seem to make from weekend to weekend.

There's more than a fair share of excitement surrounding the court test of the Speaker Ban Law.

The parking problem is far from being solved. There's some unequity for you.

Student Body President Bob Po-

well, addressing the freshmen and transfer students Tuesday night, made it obvious that he has a few ideas that might well stir up a little fuss over just what a college education should be.

Changes in the Honor System have yet to be solidly formulated. Women's rules are hazy in some places, archaic in others. Here's some action.

The 1976 North Carolina legislature will apparently have to do something with the state's liquor laws after last spring's brown bagging crusade. Not meaning to insinuate that UNC students are directly affected by liquor laws, but this could be a matter of campus interest.

Student Body Vice President Bill Purdy seems determined to hang in there and fight for residence hall improvements. This is not quiet.

Or what about the rumored transportation system from south campus?

And the list goes on, covering nearly every conceivable facet of university life.

It rained yesterday afternoon. It may rain again soon.

It was quiet yesterday afternoon.

It shouldn't be quiet around here too often this year.

State's Amusing Defense

The Chapel Hill Weekly

There is something, a trifle disconcerting, if not wildly hilarious, about the State's reliance on former Communists to help defend the Speaker Ban Law.

The Attorney General's Office has waved the flag, rolled the drums, flared the trumpets, pointed to our boys in Viet Nam, wrung its hands raw over the Communist Threat, sounded the tocsin with numbing monotony, and generally worked itself into a state over the Red Meance.

One of the greatest bastions against the insidious Communist influence, the Attorney General's Office insisted, was North Carolina's Speaker Ban—the law that prohibits Communists and Fifth Amendment pleaders from speaking on State campuses.

The Attorney General's Office

has always maintained that Communists can not be believed, they bend the truth to serve their own evil ends, and they are a clear and present danger to young, impressionable minds.

So, what does the State Attorney General's Office do to try to justify the Speaker Ban: Call upon a soldier freshly returned from Viet Nam? Seek witness from an FBI agent? Take depositions from students who have actually seen and heard Communists in the flesh? Why, of course not.

The State Attorney General's Office decides to take sworn testimony from a couple of former Communists, both of whom have been anathema to the State if they had tried to speak on one of North Carolina's campuses.

To paraphrase Barry Goldwater, extremism in defense of the Speaker Ban is not a vice.

Briefly Editorial

It is not uncommon for The Daily Tar Heel to find itself, from time to time, at a point of disagreement with the administration. This varies in degree from mild misunderstanding to violent printed attack.

And certainly, in the history of the DTH, some of the most excitingly violent battles have been with the Office of the Dean of Men—more specifically with Dean William G. Long.

But, fight as we might, we rather like the good dean. Sometimes, in fact, we approach the point of understanding that the very nature of his job often forces him to play the role of Student Enemy Number One.

We were sorry to learn, when we returned to school, that Dean Long had just undergone surgery in Memorial Hospital. We're happy to hear reports that he is up and around now and should be back into full action soon.

Our best get well wishes for a complete and speedy recovery.

The Daily Tar Heel
74 Years of Editorial Freedom
Fred Thomas, Editor
Tom Clark, Business Manager
Scott Goodfellow, Managing Ed.
Kerry Sipe, Feature Editor
Bill Amlong, News Editor
Ernest Robl, Asst. News Editor
Sandy Treadwell, Sports Editor
Bob Orr, Asst. Sports Editor
Jock Lauterer, Photo Editor
Steve Bennett, Staff Writer
Lytt Stamps, Staff Writer
Lynne Harvel, Staff Writer
Judy Sipe, Staff Writer

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.

'I've Stood In This Line For Three Hours Thinking It Was . . . Sob . . . Drop-Add!'



Professor Defines Role Of Student In University

(Editor's note — The following are excerpts from a paper written by Dr. George J. Stigler, Walgreen Professor of American Institutions at the University of Chicago.)

By GEORGE J. STIGLER

The turbulent movements among American college students are persuading some of us to reconsider the nature of the university, and the rights and duties of students in universities. I offer a few thoughts.

The American university is both a social, residential institution and an intellectual community. These two functions are related in that the housing and feeding and surveillance of students is an unmitigated nuisance in the conduct of the intellectual enterprise. I do not know much about the dormitory life of a university and do not care much except to the extent that it interferes with the intellectual life.

In our own irreverent age, we continue to provide dormitory life because parents hope we will raise their children more properly than they would be raised at home, and because commercial food and housing would not be tax exempt and otherwise subsidized by the state.

I favor an absolute minimum of intervention by the university in this dormitory life. If a student sees knowledge each day from beer, instead of books, give him the grade which his knowledge—whatever the source—earns in the examination. If a female student finds sexual promiscuity attractive, let her have the pleasure and any other byproducts thereof. On university property the university must insist upon obedience to civil law and the observance of the minimum standards of decency of the community, but that is all. Undergraduates should be treated as much like adults as their parents and the society will allow; graduate students should be treated as adults without these provisos.

Before I complete my detour about the dormitory life, an explanation is due for this laissez-faire attitude. After university, the student becomes a full-fledged, independent citizen. He is normally flung into a large city, told by society to make his way. He is ill-prepared for this sort of urban life by a convent-barracks existence in a university. It is a regrettable fact that many elementary things can be taught with words but learned only with experience. The university should not stand in the way of the process of growing into adult society. Let us now move on to the intellectual life of the community.

Unlike other levels of education, the final product of the university is considered the equal (in formal education) of his teacher—in fact in some of the more rapidly evolving fields. This maturation reaches downward: the brightest college senior is surely more able, today, than the dullest recipient of the doctorate.

So the student body is a highly heterogeneous mixture,

ranging from callow and ignorant but not stupid freshmen to professionally mature graduate students, from bonos vivants (of which we need a few more) to grey stones grinding books into examinations. To treat them as a single type would involve intolerable insults, to distinguish them into classes of wisdom or ability or knowledge would involve (beside large costs) intolerable insults also. So we label them by years' residence, which is neither insulting nor informative.

On to the main question: what is the role of the student in the university society? What the role presently is may be a suitable prelude to discussing several current proposals. In brief, the student has no legal voice in the conduct of the academic affairs of a university. In this respect he is only slightly worse off than the faculty: the legal powers of a university reside in the trustees and the powers of the faculty are only those of which it is the custodian. Of course the faculty at any slightly respectable college or university has substantial powers which no board of trustees would dare withdraw.

The students are also a potent influence on the strictly academic side of the university, despite their absence from the formal offices of control. The selection and promotion of faculty members everywhere is influenced by their success or failure as teachers. An utterly distinguished research man who is a hopeless teacher will do all right but he is the remote exception: even the wealthiest universities in the country cannot afford to have 5 percent of its faculty incompetent to teach. But it is the student who determines whether the man is a successful teacher.

The courses which constitute the curriculum are similarly much influenced by student wishes. In fact the prescribed curriculum is roughly six parts the recent past, one part what the faculty wishes it had studied, and two parts what the students wish to study. Since the curriculum in the recent past was constructed much the same way, past and present student desires constitute a major influence. Students, not faculty, drove the classical languages out of their prominent place in higher education and brought about such education.

Both of these influences, I believe, are desirable. Good teaching is helpful to the research man (as well as the reciprocal, better recognized influence of research on teaching); it maintains a comprehensiveness in his knowledge and encourages clarity and simplicity in all his work. The academic world must have roots in the empirical world and student curricular pressures are one part of this nourishment.

Students now often demand a voice—or to be heard, which means a listener—precisely in these areas in which they are already very influential. In particular institutions and at particular

times I have no doubt that of student opinion on teaching and curriculum become blocked or inefficient, but a new machinery will also have its bad days. Would formal organization of student opinion on teachers and causes improve the workings on average?

On the rating of teachers my inclination is to answer, no. A ballot is not really needed, and, what is more to the point, not really desirable. The formal vote on teachers' abilities would have two objections. One is that good teaching is not a matter solely of majority opinion: if a man is useful to 40 students each quarter, his ineffectiveness with 900 other students need not be troublesome. The second objection is that such rankings easily become cruel. A tenure appointment may be embittered and rendered even less useful, for no good gain. The formal communication serves the function adequately. But I would not interfere if students wished to make such polls.

On curriculum the answer is different. Only an informed student can give helpful criticism, and the best way to inform him is by putting him on a committee which studies the matter. Standing committees would be burdensome and boring, but a joint student-faculty review of the curriculum each five years is worth trying. It is worth trying partly because our curricula are based to an immense degree on untested opinion. Does French or German really contribute to the research abilities of a Ph.D.? Nobody knows, although sensible and relevant investigations would be possible. Do we have too much or too little specialization of training—what are the criteria and the tests? Our progress in even raising such questions has been deplorably small, and alert, fresh-minded students might help force a rethinking of many decisions. An experiment could be conducted on both departmental and divisional lines.

The question of procedures is perhaps more important than that of policies: a university is an institution for the unfettered workings of rational argument, not for the dissemination of some particular truths.

Of course the applications of all principles eventually encounter excruciating cases. Suppose a set of students wishes to advance rational arguments for a given academic policy but no one will listen? Has not the faculty or administration then abandoned the ideal of the University?

Although, by hypothesis, the administration refuses to engage in rational discourse, this is no justification for coercion. Men cannot be coerced into voluntary discussion. The students, to continue the example, must seek by non-coercive methods to reopen the discourse.

I arrive then, at the position that even when one party refuses to engage in open-minded discussion, the other party must use rational arguments to open its mind.

Speaker Ban Hit By Federal Judge

(Editor's note — The following are excerpts from the UNC Law School commencement address delivered last June by Federal District Court Judge J. Braxton Craven, Jr.)

By J. BRAXTON CRAVEN, Jr.

Well, I made it. To be invited to make the address at one of the nation's outstanding law schools is a splendid compliment, and, like Mark Twain, I can live two months on a good compliment. Not only have I been invited, but it now looks like I am going to be allowed to speak.

Last February when I received your valued invitation, I was not so sure. State v. Aptheker was still pending before the Trustees; Students, et al. v. State, now pending in a three-judge federal court, had not even been begun.

My wife reassured me: she suggested that I had been invited to bridge the awful gap between Welch and Wilkinson—sort of an Ovaltine in the Afternoon. We then reflected upon my unexciting and innocuous life with some satisfaction: surely, I said to myself, I have never publicly expressed a thought interesting enough to require withdrawal or cancellation of the invitation. Anyway, as I have said, I made it.

I do not believe Mr. Aptheker can make communists out of you or even out of the supposedly tender-minded undergraduates, but I firmly believe he is entitled to try. I do not know what Mr. Welch wants to make out of you—whether neofascists or hot-tents—but whatever it is, I also think he is entitled to try.

More importantly, I think you should have the right—unbridled—to hear both saints and sinners—wise men and fools—and decide for yourselves which is which. You are already sophisticated enough to know that you can't tell a book by its cover nor a man by his hood. Sophistication is a fine thing; it has been defined as "knowing enough to keep your feet out of the crack of the theater seat in front of you." I think your minds have been pitched often enough so that you won't be caught in a crack by me, or Wilkinson, or Welch, or Aptheker.

Yet, there must be, I suppose, some limitations on free speech, if only the minimal suggested by Holmes: that no one has the right to shout fire in a crowded theater. But it was the same Holmes who said: "If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but free-

dom for the thought that we hate."

But I am deliberately not talking about the Constitution, nor are my remarks addressed to my colleagues designated to try the constitutionality of the Speaker Ban Law. Cynics—may doubt my restraint. Even sophisticated people—who ought to know better—sometimes confuse what is wise with what is constitutional. There is little, if any, such relationship. Some very stupid and very terrible things—including slavery and child labor—have been held constitutional. Whether or not the Speaker Ban Law is constitutional—and I express no opinion out of deference to the designated three-judge court—such legislation, in my opinion, is foolishly unwise and plainly immoral, tested by the standards of an enlightened society. Yet, the Speaker Ban Law may be or may not be constitutional.

Professor Frankfurter, before his appointment to the Supreme Court, explained it very well:

"It must never be forgotten that our constant preoccupation with the constitutionality of legislation rather than its wisdom tends to preoccupation with the constitutionality of legislation rather than its wisdom tends to preoccupation with a false value. The tendency of focusing attention on constitutionality is to make constitutionally synonymous with propriety; to regard a law as all right so long as it is 'constitutional.' Such an attitude is a great enemy of legislation affecting freedom of thought and freedom of speech, much that is highly illiberal would be clearly constitutional. . . . The real battles of liberalism are not won in the Supreme Court. To a large extent the Supreme Court . . . is the reflector of that impalpable but controlling thing, the general drift of public opinion. . . . Only a persistent, positive translation of the liberal faith into the thoughts and acts of the community is the real reliance against the unabated temptation to straight-jacket the human mind."

Here at Chapel Hill you have been more protected against what John Stuart Mill calls "the tyranny of the majority" than you ever will be again. As Mill has said, there is a "tendency of society to impose (by means other than law) its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them." The yoke of law is relatively light, but the yoke of opinion is still heavy in America.

Thought control, whether packaged as a Speaker Ban Law or otherwise, is contrary to the genius of a free people.

Ernest Robl

Chapel Hill Is Home For Undergraduates

You drive up the winding road, as the warm breeze pushes the first of the yellowing leaves over the pavement and swirls them back and forth.

You've been away, just a few short weeks, maybe somewhere in North Carolina, or maybe even in Europe, where you've been doesn't matter. Just that you're coming back.

The golden rays of the late afternoon sun grope over the tops of campus buildings, and then, from the direction of the Bell Tower, the faint sound of chimes comes drifting through the air.

This summer, while in Europe, someone asked me about the University of North Carolina. What kind of place is Chapel Hill?

I tried to describe the campus and Franklin Street; that on a hot day, you might even see people walking barefoot. I tried to describe what a football game was like: The crowds roaring.

I told about the buildings, the places and the people; that Chapel Hill was a place where you found all kinds of people.

Yes, I even told about the speaker ban, and the signs that said "Gov. Dan K. Moore's Chapel Hill Wall." I told how several thousand students stood on one side to hear

a man who couldn't speak on their side of the wall. And I told about the night more than a thousand students marched across the campus to present a petition to President Friday.

I tried to describe the residence halls.

I spoke about the courses I had taken, and I mentioned some of the professors and what they were like.

I mentioned this newspaper and how it operates entirely independent of control by the administration.

I talked about Chapel Hill for a long time, because I was trying to give a complete and objective picture. But then it is almost impossible to be objective about Chapel Hill.

The person who had asked the question was a young journalist. He had told me that he was planning to come to the United States within the next year. That was why he had asked about the University and Chapel Hill.

Afterwards, he said that when he came to North Carolina, he wanted to see Chapel Hill. "The way you describe it, it must be a very special place."

Yes, I thought, Chapel Hill is a special place.

And as I drove into town, I remembered the conversation.

The, as another small flurry of leaves drifts to the ground, you suddenly realize it: Chapel Hill isn't just a home away from home. It is home.