

In Our Opinion...

Fraternity Blood Donation Is True 'Service' Project

Fraternity members are "typed" people."

This is a charge frequently wielded against men of the Greek world accusing them of wearing, saying and doing only the right and "cool" things.

Now we find a case where the Greeks are, indeed, becoming "typed" people, and proudly so.

Members of the Inter-Fraternity council yesterday were catalogued and typed at the Memorial Hospital Blood Bank, initiating a service project which will render members of every social fraternity on campus as "stand-by" blood donors.

IFC service projects traditionally have a two-fold purpose — first, service; second, fraternity image promotion — with emphasis, all too often, on the latter.

Picking up beer cans and trash along the highways leading into Chapel Hill is a fairly good way to improve the image of Greek organizations. But that's about all it accomplishes.

The blood donation project, however, is a gem of an idea for a service project, and one which definitely places the greater emphasis on service.

Dr. Phillip P. Webster, president of the North Carolina Hemophilia Foundation and professor in the Dental School, explained that the Memorial Hospital Blood Bank is experiencing a shortage of blood because Red Cross supplies are being used in Viet Nam.

Donating blood anywhere is a worthwhile activity. But in Chapel Hill this is even more true in light of the concentration of patients from all over this state and surrounding states who come for treatment for hemophilia, leukemia and open heart surgery.

A fraternity member was punning when he said, "This is a project that we can do straight from our hearts."

Punning aside, however, we believe it is a sincere and certainly commendable project.

Don't Mess With Posters

The first visible sign of a campus political campaign is the appearance of posters all over campus.

The next visible sign is the tearing down and defacing of these posters by juveniles who don't have enough money to go out and drink beer and don't have enough energy to engage in anything worthwhile.

The third sign of campaign time is the warning from the student courts that removal or defacing of these posters is an offense against the student body and can be tried by the Honor Councils.

True to form, these three signs have appeared. Now, it's difficult to say that what will be the next event.

It's Been Said...

The Missus was about to start the car. She fastened her seat-belt, then glanced at Mrs. Archie Davis of Durham, who was accompanying her. "Fasten yours, too," she said.

"All right, all right," said Mrs. Davis as she buckled down. "If you're that scared of your driving, so am I."

Tyke was boarding carpool for the Little Red Schoolhouse and the driver inquired why his sister was not coming.

He said, "My sister couldn't come because she can't go. When she's able to go again, she'll come."

Best story of the month appeared in Carl Goerch's column in the current issue of *The State* magazine.

It concerns one woman telling another, "Grace, did you know that your husband is running around after other women?"

"So what?" asked Grace. "And you're not worried?"

"Hardly. I've also got a dog named Fido that chases cars," Grace explained. "And I know that if he ever caught one, he couldn't drive. So I don't worry about either of them."

Couple of lawyer friends, one who went to old Wake Forest and one who went to Carolina, sat side by side at Saturday's game. During the closing minutes, the Carolina man was hollering himself hoarse. Then the final horn sounded.

"Remember the mama whale's advice to the baby whale," said the Wake Forest grad. "It's only when you're spouting that you get harpooned."

Billy Arthur
The Chapel Hill Weekly

'Nonsense, Boy, It Won't Hurt A Bit!'



In Letters

Sitterson Is Upheld

Chancellor Right

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: I have read with interest the story of the Paul case as it appeared in the Daily Tar Heel.

To my way of thinking, the worst thing to come out of this episode, and the unkindest cut of all, is the battery of disrespectful comments about Chancellor Sitterson made by your readers in the "Letters" column.

I also feel that in great measure much of this unkindness and disrespect was generated by what I would call the over-sensitive, if not immature, reaction of the staff of the Daily Tar Heel expressed in print.

I believe a lot of people on the UNC campus owe Chancellor Sitterson an apology.

Chancellor Sitterson does not represent the student body exclusively, nor the faculty exclusively, nor the taxpayers exclusively. His job is the tremendous one of steering a great university to the tender satisfaction of all three interested parties in quest of the American ideal. Accordingly, this same obligation devolves upon each of his faculty members.

A logical extension of this premise is that no faculty member, contrary to what many think has a right, in the so-called name of academic freedom, or some such other trumped-up carte blanche, to manipulate a classroom situation in any manner which is contrary to the spirit or tone of this institution of which he is a member. A good teacher has the ability to sense out this spirit or tone.

Further, certain ethics are part and parcel of the ancient profession of teaching. One of these, and this is particularly true of public education, is that a teacher does not have the right to try to impress his moral code or his non-academic domain of thought on the minds of his students.

The master teacher is he who can discern the distinction between what is and is not academic. Soap boxes were for those who cannot see the difference.

A classroom is composed of many individuals, some with refinement, some without, some with a conservative approach to life, some very avant garde. To disregard this fact is a cross betrayal of the fundamental obligation and duty of the teacher to all his students as well as his ultimate employer, the public.

Chancellor Sitterson may have perhaps proceeded otherwise in this case. The reason he did not can doubtless be attributed to his concern that a member of his staff had violated the trust mentioned above.

An educator of Chancellor stature does not need a daily reminder of what academic freedom is or is not. His interpretation of academic freedom has been formed from years of experience and has withstood the test of his peers and superiors.

Team Spirit

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: We would like to express our views concerning the letter of October 27 about our cheerleaders.

First, we want to express our appreciation to the folks who are so fully behind us as the season progresses. The writers of the aforementioned letter were surely complimentary to our squad, and we want it to be known that we sincerely are grateful.

However, concerning the growing discontent among the various factions of the Chapel Hill Academic Community, that is, about our cheerleaders, we would like to express our opinion on this matter, also.

We truly appreciate the efforts and job done by our cheerleaders, and we would like to mention a few things of which the "Chapel Hill academic community" is evidently not aware:

1) They have done the best job organizing pep rallies that we have seen while we have been here at UNC;

2) The cheerleaders are always present to send the team off when we leave for away games;

3) They (and this is the most interesting point) are always present to greet us upon returning home from away games, regardless of the outcome of the games!

4) They have, as a result of the initiative of our head cheerleader, taken a tremendous interest in the squad on a more personal basis. Each Thursday, the entire group of cheerleaders comes to the Athletic Center at Ehringhaus and eats lunch, "shoots the bull", and becomes better acquainted with the guys they are cheering for on Saturday.

The "repertoire of cheers" really makes little difference to us; during the course of a game, the thing we appreciate most is the awareness that the students are behind us the entire 60 minutes!

Finally, let us again emphasize our appreciation to the writer of the letter of October 27, for he is truly behind us all the way. But let us also emphasize our appreciation to the cheerleaders for their tremendous job thus far this season. Thanks.

The Tri-Captains and Football Squad

"Beef-Cake?"

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: The statement of the house adviser of the athletic dormitory at UA with regard to their "...Roman... or Greek

statues" is, indeed, a classic of naivete, but your editorial comment about Ursula Andress in a "G-string" shows that you have not understood what is wrong with it.

The statues are obscene precisely because "they're all covered up."

The Greeks and Romans realized that a nude body—completely nude—has little erotic interest. By the same token, Ursula Andress, sans "G-string," would not be obscene.

What is painfully obvious is that the little "G-strings" on UA's seven-foot "visible men" add a certain note of coyness to the statues which is highly reminiscent of the pictures in the homosexuals' magazines you see on the newstands.

In short, it is the "G-string" that turns the "beef" into "beef-cake."

T. A. Cabarga

Sanford Man Is RAL Fan

(Editor's note—The following gem of a letter appeared in the Oct. 28 edition of the Greensboro Daily News. It's too good for our readers to miss.)

Editor of the Daily News:

For many months now I have been getting your paper since the "Raleigh News Disturber" turned my stomach on some of their disgusting editorials and limited news coverage. Now it seems your paper has caught the same disease.

I resent your recent editorial on Oct. 20, "Score One For WRAL." I think WRAL is the only decent TV station operating in this territory and I think a darn sight less of your paper for condemning them too. Nearly all of you newspaper editors are just alike. Condemn anyone that stands up for what is right and decent, and condone such that is immoral, illegal and un-Christian.

WRAL may not be absolutely correct all the time in their news coverage but I'll say they do their very best to inform the public correctly.

As for what goes on over at "Communist Hill" (UNC) I wouldn't put anything past that bunch. Remember the old saying, "Where there's a lot of smoke, there's got to be some fire."

I just thank God that there is one good television station left for our children to watch and that there are some good God-fearing men like Mr. Helms left too, because I'll tell you, they are few and far between.

Some day you liberals, as well as them in Washington, are going to have to answer to God. What will you say? S. P. SMITH
Sanford, N. C.

Students Cheated By Modern Universities

From Moderator

Students are being had. Their education is not preparing them for the world in which they live.

About four years ago, a majority of American students did not know the difference between North and South Vietnam—and many did not even know in what continent they were located. (How many students today understand the background to the Arab-Israeli dispute, the issue of Southwest Africa and the revolutionary ferment in Guatemala?)

Less than a quarter of American students today have any inter-disciplinary courses. (How many science and engineering majors feel they have an adequate appreciation of the creative and performing arts? How many history of psychology majors could use—or understand how others use—a computer?)

For the most part, when students' values change in college, the change is seldom due to the influence of the curriculum. (How many students understand that what they are learning today will be outmoded by the time they are middle-aged? How many college students become sufficiently committed to self-education to continue their pursuit of knowledge with equal earnestness after the incentives of grades and a diploma have vanished?)

The problem is not that the traditional curriculum is bad. On the contrary, the present liberal arts and sciences curriculum is far superior to the classical studies of a century ago—rhetoric, theology, mathematics, Greek, and Latin—all taught by rote.

In addition to traditional and valued goals passed on to them by their parents' generation, students in a new age have new expectations.

Today's students expect colleges to treat them not only as Americans but also as citizens of the world—a world threatened with complete destruction if young people do not learn to make it safe for diversity and democracy.

Today's students expect colleges to treat them not only as budding specialists in academic disciplines but also as full human beings who must even now attempt to make judgments in all spheres of knowledge. Too often students have to wedge independent thinking into the free moments between volumes of required reading and sheafs of term papers.

Today's students expect colleges to treat them as young, sometimes eager minds awaiting the wisdom of learned professors. But that is not enough—students expect to be viewed as practicing adults who want to become involved in the process of experimenting with faster ways to find understanding and better ways to apply it.

Few freshmen have entered college without the hoe of greatly improving themselves and in the process their society. On the other hand, no institution is as capable as the American college or university of so dramatically crushing these precious expectations. Something is drastically wrong.

For all the money spent on higher education the curriculum of American colleges and universities remains internationally provincial, academically simplistic, and subtly stifling of the new expectations students bring with them through their innocent and honest appreciation of problems with which they live.

Until the administration, and, more importantly, the faculty, understand how they are misusing their authority, most students are not likely to play much of a role in their own education, much less in educational policy formation.

No one questions that faculty members know more about their subject matter than do their students. On the other hand, it is often the individual student who best knows whether or not he is learning.

It is the student who best knows when he cannot understand what a professor is saying—or when he already knows everything that is being discussed.

It is the student who best knows whether a course is stimulating him to learn more about a subject—or whether it is boring him to death.

It is the student who can best formulate those fundamental and personal questions so bothering him that he cannot readily proceed to other academic matters.

It is the student who can best evaluate when he is beginning to integrate the process of learning with the problems he continually confronts in his life.

The major problem with American higher education is that the teaching of subject matter has been confused with learning subjects that matter. The faculty—and to some extent the administration—have built curriculum models around the goal of teaching a particular subject or variety of subjects. They have assumed, often falsely, that this is the way in which students can learn most effectively.

Worse yet, students themselves too often assume that whatever they learn in a lecture or a seminar is the best educational experience they could have had. Occasionally, a student will get mad enough to go in and tell a teacher that a course is really poor or could be improved. Often a student will sit through a class thinking what a waste it is. But how many students will take it upon themselves to make their classes better? For the most part, this is just not done.

Students just don't care or else assume mistakenly that their teachers know how they should learn as well as what they should learn. Or perhaps their weak position in the academic structure breeds fear. Well, that's a helluvan education.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed and double-spaced. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.