

In Our Opinion...

Questions Surrounding Paull Controversy Need Answering

What is the real issue concerning the removal of Michael Paull from his classroom?

Or maybe we should say issues. Or, how many issues?

Here are some questions we wish everybody on campus from the Chancellor to "Fang" the ball-playing dog would seriously think about:

—How big a part did publicity, specifically WRAL-TV's broadcast, play in Paull's removal?

—If it did play a major role, is the University right in yielding to such pressure?

—If it did not play a major role, why was Paull removed in such hasty fashion, and why did the Chancellor become involved in what ordinarily would have been a matter of departmental processing?

—What threats, if any, does this action pose to the freedom of the professors in the future to conduct their courses within reasonable boundaries with immunity from the non-academic world?

—What, in fact, are the "reasonable bounds" we just mentioned? i.e. If the assignment had been made, point blank, to write a theme on seduction or, more generally, sex, would this have been proper? If a teacher deals with sex in his course, should he be removed from teaching duties?

—The whole issue has become a matter of public interest. The Daily Tar Heel and the president of the student body have made public statements concerning it. Why can they not see the compositions to determine if, in their opinion, they are "of an objectionable nature?"

—In his statement last week, Chancellor Sitterson said Paull

was removed from teaching duties because the "normal student-teacher relationship" has been disturbed. What, if there is one, is the "normal student-teacher relationship"?

—Who decided, and on what grounds, that this relationship had been impaired? How could anyone know if a student-teacher relationship had been harmed without first talking to the students?

—The administration has given final authority to reverse this decision to the English department. Thus, in effect, they have said there is a possibility that Paull will be reinstated as a graduate instructor. However, until such time as this controlling group can be convinced of Paull's innocence in the matter, the punishment—his removal from the classroom—will remain in effect. Is this not an application of guilty until proven innocent?

—Finally, we wonder about the preparedness of graduate teaching assistants as a group to teach. Why was Paull's assignment misunderstood? How many other TAs are misunderstood daily in their classrooms? Is there not more to teaching than simply having a thorough knowledge of the subject matter? Does the University make an effort to insure that TAs are capable of teaching as well as learning?

We raise these questions because we don't think they have been answered clearly yet. We feel this is an issue of more than passing importance, and we hope it will not be shurged off until these questions, and possibly many others that we have not mentioned, have been analyzed and agreed upon.

Wise Action Concerning Chase

We are always pleased to see a sticky situation settled for the best of all parties involved.

When we first heard of the damage done to Chase Cafeteria during last Saturday's South Campus Weekend dance, we were afraid the doors to Chase might be locked to use by student groups in the future.

But Dean Long, who headed an investigation of the matter, looked beyond the broken tiles and stained draperies to the real problem at hand—no one had ever conceived that too many people would turn out for the event, and no one was by any means prepared to cope with the huge crowd.

The residence college leaders, in turn, accepted their responsibility to make payment for the damaged property.

A guideline was set up for future social event in Chase—most significantly, limiting the number of participants—and the manage-

ment expressed its willingness to cooperate with student groups in housing such events.

Certainly all those involved regret the embarrassment that stemmed from the event. But, forgetting the unpleasant side for a moment, we think it is encouraging to see a residence college - sponsored social function pack Chase to the seam-breaking level.

And now that the bad has come, the leaders will know better how to plan for such functions in the future.

It all makes for a better social program for the students through the residence college system.

We think someone definitely made the best of a bad situation.

The Daily Tar Heel
74 Years of Editorial Freedom
Fred Thomas, Editor
Tom Clark, Business Manager
Scott Goodfellow, Managing Ed.
John Greenbacker, Assoc. 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
Chuck Benner, Night Editor
Steve Bennett, Lytt Stamps, Lynn Harvel, Judy Sipe, Don Campbell, Cindy Borden, Staff Writers
Drummond Bell, Owen Davis, Bill Hass, Joey Leigh, Sports Writers
Jeff MacNelly, Sports Cartoonist
Bruce Strauch, Ed. Cartoonist
John Askew, Ad. Mgr.

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.

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.

From Back Issues

(Issues that made the news in The Daily Tar Heel on this date five, 10, and 15 years ago.)

Oct. 26, 1961
Carolina will carry the "Torch of Education" from Winston-Salem to Durham, a distance of 90 miles in the 700-mile marathon Oct. 31 to Nov. 3.

Oct. 26, 1956
The Student Legislature last night defeated a bill calling for establishment of a committee to investigate the expenditures of UNC Debate Council.

Oct. 26, 1951
It was decided that the student Audit Board should do the investigating of how the Council spends its money.

Ground breaking ceremonies were held yesterday morning for the final unit of the University's gigantic medical center now under construction. This unit will be the Gravelly Sanatorium, a 100 bed chest disease unit. It will be named after the man whose efforts were largely responsible for the promotion of the unit, L. Lee Gravelly, chairman of the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Sanatoria.

Greenbacker's Blunder

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: "These are the times that try men's souls." I would hazard the guess that many souls have been tried by the DTH editorial "In Defense of the Chancellor."

An inquisition of two hours in South Building, on the morning after the Helmsman expose, using what are admitted to be 'not the usual channels,' which renders a verdict in terms of disturbed student-teacher relations without consulting even one of the students involved and apparently based on the one incident rather than the overall performance of the instructor, does not strike me as a decision devoid of the element of outside pressure, or one where due consideration was given to the actual facts of the case.

With regards to the English department, if a point is to be made it is not that they did not handle the case, but to ask why the case was not entirely handled by that department.

As to whether this question is a matter of policy and not one of academic freedom, I must confess myself to be completely lost in fathoming out the reasoning.

May I ask, under what version of a university can a policy decision to remove an instructor from his classroom be made without taking into account of academic freedom? This might seem a silly question, but it is based on the assumption that Jesse Helms has not been appointed Chancellor in a surprise and secret move of which I am unaware.

More extraordinary is the assertion that 'there is little indication that this unfortunate incident will mar his (Paull's) future at all.' Language fails to properly describe the insensitivity denoted by so callous a remark.

Central to the point of the whole editorial, I understand the Chancellor accepted a decision formulated by others, but this cannot be a reason why the legitimate ire (in my opinion) should not be directed in principle to his office.

If the Chancellor is not responsible for the goings on in South Building, and enjoys a sanctuary in his office, who pray, may we hold responsible?

We are all it appears, uninformed with the exception of the writer himself and those whose actions he apparently agrees with. To whom, may I ask, is this state of affairs due?

If we are to be denied access to South Building, as the writer implies that we should, are we not then entitled to at least a minimal explanation of a situation that affects us all? Surely, the release issued by Mr. Ivey is inadequate to deal with the situation created and the issues it raises.

This unfortunately, is par for the course, for administrators and higher ranking officials seem unable to resist the temptation to keep climbing the high mountain of their own assumed prerogatives.

From these dizzy heights they almost inevitably adopt the unseemly posture of stuffed-shirt authoritarians, claiming that their actions do not require explanation, and far less to be the subject of judgement by those whom their arbitrary decrees affect.

Finally, if any apologies are owed at this time, it is by you, Mr. Greenbacker, for grossly defaming the academic community in which you are situated, but whose spirit and principle you do not seem to share.

Richard French

Editorial Ignorance

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: Mr. John Greenbacker's editorial "In Defense of the Chancellor" was an exercise in ignorance.

This is truly amazing because Mr. Greenbacker attended at least the first part of the meeting in Gerrard Hall. Apparently, however, he did not learn anything while he was there and did not deem it important to listen to "the strident cry of an uninformed student body."

Greenbacker says:
1. The removal of Michael Paull "from his teaching duties was in many ways a well-reasoned one."
2. This "is a matter of policy," which refers to the procedure used in Mr. Paull's reassignment, if I am not mistaken.
3. "This is not a matter of academic freedom."
It was clearly stated at the CFI meeting that except for one misinterpreted assignment their was no reason whatsoever for his removal. If this

were standard procedure the entire student body would be engaged in free study.

Also, Bob Powell stated that the Chancellor was apparently unsure of the correctness of his decision, so possibly the defendant doesn't agree with the defense counsel.

This matter was not carried out in the department as is normally done so this is not a usual matter of policy.

Any time an administrator takes it upon himself to dictate to a department which teachers are qualified to teach a subject because of the pressure placed on him by reactionary elements within the state there is a definite question of academic freedom.

Joe Cowan

Fulminations

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: The journalistic fairness and objectivity of the DTH front-page articles on the Paull incident are almost completely undermined by the equivocal responses on the editorial page.

In the past week's editorial section we read and viewed first, a polemic and cartoon criticizing Jesse Helms' interference in university affairs, then a moderate apology for the Chancellor's hasty decision, and finally an intemperate fulmination and cartoon impugning the motives of the more vocal participants in Thursday evening's CFI meeting.

This group of committed individuals—issue seekers," you labelled them—are not so extreme in their demands nor unvisionary in their thinking as you pictured them to be. For they have clearly grasped what apparently eludes your myopic vision, i.e., the exceptional gravity of the present controversy.

Contrary to your opinion, there is an issue involved in the current clash—an issue so vital and so fundamental to the "idea of a university" that it justifies passionate espousal and equally emotional defense.

That issue revolves around the right to academic freedom presently denied graduate students in general and teaching assistants in particular. Concomitantly, it concerns the obligation of the UNC administrators to foster such rights.

What makes the current conflict so serious is the cavalier manner in which this matter was disposed of. To the most casual spectator it was evident that those officials responsible for this travesty sought to pacify and to quell outside criticism instead of defending and promoting student rights.

Baldly put, the future standing of this university as a major institution of learning is riding on the final resolution of this dispute. Compromise to "outside agitators" will bring in its wake dire costs and consequences to Chapel Hill.

First, such an action would only fortify the zeal of the modern-day witch hunters and book burners in their quest to make this institution lay upon their Procrustean bed of conformity.

Second, the toll from the exodus of some of the university's brightest talent (undergraduate and graduate students, as well as new faculty members) cannot be calculated in its damage to Chapel Hill's image and academic standing.

Third, the capacity to lure more topflight professors, already lessened by the speaker ban controversy, would be further impaired.

As a minor postscript, let me say in all sincerity that, in the event the major tenets of spirit of learning are diluted, my own status as a graduate student in political science would become subject to painful reappraisal.

Ernest J. Yanarella

Dear Jesse

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: Dear Jesse Helms, Thank you for pandering to my prurient interest with your editorial about the "Sex Menace" at the University of North Carolina.

I love those good dirty editorials! I ordered five copies of your speech myself and constantly reread it; those words and innuendos just make me tingle all over, though not as much as when I watched your eyes sparkle with indignation.

I took the other four copies of your editorial and sold them to little girls in my neighborhood for a handsome profit. Sometimes all of us go into my garage and read your speech together.

You really ought to try your hand at writing dirty paperbacks. You're a Natural!

Anyway, keep up the good work.

Frank O'Donnell

UNC Betrayed

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: Chancellor Sitterson's decision Tuesday to reassign Michael Paull was extremely tragic but not at all surprising.

Since becoming our chancellor last year, he has not exactly been a champion of free speech and academic freedom, particularly in the case of the speaker ban controversy and now, in this recent incident.

I must confess that I didn't realize the full implications of the trustees when they expressed joy at having a "North Carolina boy" as chancellor.

They seemed to feel as though being a "North Carolina boy" was an asset and an honor, but if being a "North Carolina boy" means that one lacks the personal integrity and loyalty to the University to stand and defend the basic principles of a university and the basic principles that our forefathers (all North Carolina boys) insisted be added to the Constitution of the United States one hundred and eighty years ago, then I wouldn't consider it an honor to be a "North Carolina boy," but rather a polite way of saying, "He's a good Uncle Tom."

He won't give us any trouble because he knows his place.

My own first impression of the news was a visual image of our chancellor at the knees of Jesse Helms saying, "Yes sir, Mr. Helms; right away sir; very good, sir; that's right, sir."

Whether or not many North Carolinians realize it, the University of North Carolina has received a very high academic rating throughout the nation. UNC and Duke rank as the two best universities in the South, our graduate school rates as one of the biggest and best in the nation, and our professional schools, on both the graduate and the undergraduate levels, are among this country's best.

Yet, those who would have the University close its doors to out-of-state students and become a very North Carolina-oriented school do not have the best interests of the school at heart.

They have done great damage to our reputation with the passage and enforcement of the speaker ban law, and now they seek to do further damage, whether consciously or unconsciously. We cannot allow this damage to be done.

Chancellor Sitterson's actions were disgraceful. From the DTH account of the story, I received the impression that Chancellor Sitterson realized that the instructor was not to blame, that he was following a syllabus, and that a student misinterpreted the assignment.

If so, then why was the instructor punished? If, when

Jesse Helms decided to shoot off his mouth about what a perverted school we have here, Chancellor Sitterson should have defended the instructor on two grounds; one, that the instructor was not wrong; and two, on the basic issue of academic freedom, one that probably wouldn't mean much to Helms.

But, our Chancellor failed us; he failed the University, the principles of academic freedom and free thought, and he failed himself. It's as though our chancellor was admitting that Helms and every other radical reactionary was right. But even worse, the implications of the action are that our chancellor is subservient to Jesse Helms.

When a university leader can be controlled and be the errand boy of any group, whether that group be the faculty, students, trustees, General Assembly, or a television station, his effectiveness as an educator is severely weakened, if not eliminated.

No, I don't think that it is in the "best interests of the educational function of the University" for our chancellor to sacrifice the basic principles of academic freedom and to deprive an individual of his rights merely because some student misinterpreted an assignment and some sensation-minded student became offended.

Since when has it been the role of a university not to offend some people; free thought has a characteristic of offending some people who aren't prepared for it.

But the role of a university is to introduce free thought rather than merely to reflect upon already introduced thought.

Does this incident mean that the job security of every university professor is now subject to the scrutiny of Jesse Helms and his flock of "North Carolina boys"? I wonder if this action or any action would be taken had Michael Paull been a Ph.D. and a professor rather than a graduate student with a teaching assistantship.

In the name of "decency" would Jesse Helms bar D. H. Lawrence, James Joyce, Jean-Paul Sartre, Edward Albee, and others from our University. (I feel sure that he would bar Arthur Miller from even speaking here.) Jesse Helms and his followers must be stopped before they succeed in ruining higher education in North Carolina.

It amazes me that Jesse Helms hasn't pressed for the dismissal of all faculty members opposed to President Johnson's war in Viet Nam and of those faculty members who are outspoken for civil rights. It wouldn't surprise me if he succeeded.

Bruce Burchett

Editorial Untrue

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: In our opinion, your opinion

of the plight of the Carolina coed is wrong.

The situation as stated in the editorial is true, but several important facts have been omitted. It is not so easy to get a date here; or a date that is good that is.

By good we mean a girl that has all the qualities listed in the editorial. Of times I have asked a Carolina coed with whom I was not entirely unacquainted for a date. Invariably, I was brushed off with a phrase such as "No," or "I already have a date."

After five years of this here at the University, I would tend to think that all the Carolina coeds have a date all the time. Therefore, I import decent girls from elsewhere.

If 45 to 50 per cent of the coeds have to stay in the dorm of a weekend, I think it is not a tragedy, but a comedy. I think that these girls have brought this ironic situation on themselves by their very haughtiness and assumed superiority over us fellows.

I recommend that all Carolina gentlemen not hogtied to any Carolina coeds seek other girls even if from abroad.

John Moe

Local Discrimination

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

It is indeed important that we, as persons soon to be leaders in our various professional communities, be informed as to what is going on around us.

The DTH is to be complimented for the role it is taking in presenting the deeper aspects of topic such as the "reorganization" of the Spanish Department and the Paull case.

During the past week, we here at UNC have been honored by the visit of six university student leaders from various parts of Spain. These students were chosen by the U.S. State Department as influential persons in their own communities; economists, political scientists, and newspapermen, and awarded an expense paid tour of several U.S. universities.

It is interesting to note the impressions of these gentlemen, realizing that these impressions will be carried back to their country and spread, as their awards imply, by newspaper articles and public discussions.

One impression stood out particularly about UNC that none of us who talked with the Spanish students could answer. Why is it that we UNC students sit back and observe when, as we walk through the food line at Lenoir Hall, receiving service from negro persons, yet always hand our money to a non-negro?

As one of our visitors pointed out so well, it is only the "in group" that can peacefully lower a barrier. The "out group" can only break it.

Steve Ayala
School of Public Health

