

In Our Opinion...

'Big Time' — Word Is Only As Dirty As Your Mind

Final In A Series
The Time: A fall afternoon.
The Place: A grassy, rectangular field, divided into ten ten-yard sections by a series of white lines, with surrounding seats for spectators.
The Game: Football.
The Object: To Win.

And nobody complains about this. But preface the name "Football" with the "Big-Time" and you've opened Pandora's box.

A few days ago we suggested that if UNC decides to become a football power, "we might as well adjust to what goes along with being in the 'Big-Time'."

What does go along with Big-Time collegiate athletics? Of course, those less sympathetic with the pennant-waving and "Give 'em Hell Heels" cheers will be quick to say that emphasis on athletics weakens the academic quality of the school. We, ourselves, have stated our belief that outstanding athletes are often unable to accomplish academically what a lot of other students can.

And those with evil minds will hint that Big-Time athletics means corruption, fixed games, point shaving and gambling syndicates.

We disagree with these arguments and all the others we have heard against athletic emphasis. Look, for a moment, at some of the advantages of a thriving athletic program.

Think of athletics as a public relations medium with alumni and other people in this state. One of our greatest problems with both these groups is that they seldom hear of UNC except when there is some kind of controversy or scandal that the news media can explode. It wouldn't hurt to have them hear of a successful football or basketball team — maybe a championship or a bowl game once in a while. Just to remind them that we have a set of normal college students here.

We compete against other colleges and universities in the country in all areas of academic achievement. Why not a little desire to be tops in athletics as well?

And the most important reason, why not let the students here have teams they can be proud of? Why, when we go home during vacation periods, should we have to excuse

ourselves and go powder our noses when some kid from another school starts talking about athletics? Then what goes along with Big-Time athletics?

We certainly don't claim to have all the answers, but we pass along a few suggestions that we have heard.

Playing the big teams and drawing the big crowds, we get more money in the athletic purse. Some of this money could be used to employ tutors to help athletes who might be having trouble keeping up with the books.

Athletes should have the choice of taking a reduced course load, especially during the semester their sport is in season. Perhaps it could become routine for them to take a five-year undergraduate course to pick up the necessary hours for a degree. (Even the draft boards allow this.)

A professor from Florida State has suggested that colleges and Universities consider a special curriculum for athletes which would omit many of the requirements of the undergraduate program in liberal arts.

We train students to specialize in pharmacy, nursing, dramatic arts, etc. And the academic community lauds these scholars for their dedication and achievement. But this same community too often snubs students in physical education. And if they don't snub them, they certainly don't want to make any special exceptions for this group.

Perhaps we are failing to see the worth to our society of the physical education major — as high school and junior high school coaches, as directors of YMCAs and community recreation centers. These are the people responsible for guiding the physical fitness programs that everybody from the president of the United States down agree are so important for our people.

Why should an outstanding football player not be allowed to play college ball and then share his knowledge with a team of his own just because he cannot pass French 21?

Yes, things would come along with Big-Time football. Things that we don't have now. But that doesn't make them bad.

'Now Don't Say A Typical Carolina Coed Never Came Right Up And Spoke To You!'



In Letters SDS Seeks Action

Draft, Viet Nam

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
 An open letter to elected campus representatives:
 Students for a Democratic Society has consistently opposed the war in Viet Nam as unjust and immoral. It will continue to do so.

But the issues to which SDS addresses itself are of concern to more than just SDS members. As the war expands in Viet Nam, its influence in the United States becomes more and more profound. The issues that this war raises are now crucial to all of us, both as citizens and as students.

The administration and faculty of this university now make decisions concerning the fate of students and the fate of the university. The use of grades in ranking students raises serious questions concerning the nature and purpose of the university.

The use of university facilities for war research similarly raises important questions concerning the function of the university. Unfortunately there has been no serious public discussion of the justification for such policies.

We must now ask why, outside of SDS, no other campus group or organization has openly debated the issues of the war, the draft, and of the University of North Carolina's relation to the war. Most disheartening to us as students has been the total failure of Student Government to attempt to articulate a position on these matters.

This lack of discussion is particularly disturbing because as the war expands, more and more students are being drafted. This expansion in the draft raises anew the question of the university using grades to rank students.

We now ask that campus-wide discussions should begin on the issues of the draft and of the war. Discussion must be held among Student Government officers and student legislators, who, as representatives of the student body, are obligated to concern themselves with matters vital to the well-being of the students and the university.

SDS has no simple answers for the painful issues it urges be discussed. But no issue can be clarified, no problem ever resolved, if both the issue and the problem are avoided.

We ask you, the elected leaders of this campus, to begin the discussion of such issues as the draft, university war research, and the question of the war itself. It is now time to exercise that leadership.

Gary Walker
 The Viet Nam Committee
 UNC-SDS

(Editor's note — Numerous organizations have held debates on subjects such as U.S. involvement in Viet Nam and the draft, specifically the Westminster Fellowship and the Di-Phi Senate, but the attendance for these events did by no means indicate that the campus was overly interested in the issues. However, a teach-in on the draft has already been proposed by Student Body President Bob Powell, along with a student referendum issue on the same subject. This teach-in, which will be sponsored by the Carolina

Forum, the Carolina Political Union and the DiPhi, will probably be held before Christmas vacation.)

Boys Cause TCCs

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
 Every year since my arrival at this University, the age-old controversy between the TCC's and the Carolina Gentlemen has come to the fore, mainly through the efforts of The Daily Tar Heel.

Tell me, is there so little news on this campus as to necessitate an item such as the one entitled "Carolina Gentlemen Think TCC's Really Exist" which appeared on the front page of the DTH of November 30. I hardly think so.

Some people think this is news; I don't.
 Now I will admit that TCC's may exist, but how can boys say that 65% of the girls here are TCC's when they cannot even come up with a clear definition of one?

Do they condemn girls for conformity? If so, they evidently haven't taken a good look at themselves.

Do girls walk around with their noses in the air? Well, girls, try smiling at boys as you walk around campus—all you get in reply is a look which implies "My Lord, are you crazy?"—at least, this is the case nine out of ten times. I know, I have tried.

I have heard it said that the only people on this campus who smile are freshmen; believe me, I know why!

OK, boys of Carolina, I'd like to know: Just what is a TCC? Am I to understand that those of us not from the North or West are automatically TCC's? As for the basis of your opinions, do you judge all girls on your knowledge of "at least one TCC"? How would you feel if we judged all boys on the basis of one?

One other thing puzzles me—just when was the legend of a TCC born? If boys do not want to date her, then why is she "rarely worries about dateless weekends"?

Let's be frank about this matter, boys—I really would like to know what a TCC is. Is she any girl who is so cold and aloof that she won't go to bed with you?

Many girls and boys on this campus are dateless on weekends, and I have an idea that the idea of a TCC has a great deal to do with it. If TCC's exist, boys, we can all thank you!

Ann Harris

More On Hickey

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
 After several months of speculation it is now a fact that Jim Hickey is the Athletic Director of the University of Connecticut. I would like to make two observations.

The first is that criticism mounted considerably during the last two seasons. The 1965 team was picked to win only two games but won four and came very close in several others. The 1966 squad was a bitter disappointment from the first game. Injuries to key, experienced personnel were staggering and disastrous.

Football coaches are usually evaluated on the basis of their won-loss record. Based on this Coach Hickey is barely average in a conference that still leaves something to be desired. Unfortunately, the record will not show that Jim Hickey is a gentleman in every sense of the word. He will make an excellent Athletic Director.

The second observation that I would like to make is that the screening committee and the influential members of the administration now have the opportunity to select not only the new football coach, but a whole new coaching staff. I hope that they seize this opportunity and select a winning combination.

Paul J. McQuade

Infirmary Great

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
 I have noticed many negatively directed articles in your letters to the editor column. That is the place for them, I guess. I have a few opinions on the administration and teaching myself, but I am not well enough informed to make any assertions.

I would like to say something positive. I am very impressed by the UNC Infirmary. I would like to defend it against any rumors of "mad doctors," grouchy old nurses, or poor food.

The doctors and nurses I have seen are competent. Communication between all the phases of the infirmary and hospital that I have been through has been excellent. And the food is even good, due, I suppose, to the excellent dietician.

William and Ed, the cheerful orderlies, give a positive start to a grouchy riser.

I only hope that no one reading this letter will have reason to visit the infirmary as a patient.

Thomas H. Glendinning

Profs Support Club

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
 In his Nov. 18 article, Owen Lewis gave an account of the first formal meeting of the newly-organized University Art League. Careful to note that "there wasn't a soul from the art faculty there," he implied an apathy on the part of the professors.

Apathy is not the case. Nearly all the members of the art faculty have personally pledged their support, offering their assistance any time it might be needed. (The head of the Art Department, Dr. Joseph C. Sloane, has even made a monetary contribution to our treasury.)

The University Art League was organized to meet the needs of students majoring in studio art. The functions of this organization are primarily the concern of its student members.

The absence of art professors at our Nov. 16 meeting simply indicated their understanding of this fact.

Frank M. Faulkner
 Vice President
 University Art
 League

Professors Abandon Students, Education

(Editor's note — This is an excerpt from a speech delivered before the American Council on Education by Dr. Arrowsmith, a professor of classics at the University of Texas.)

By WILLIAM ARROWSMITH
 Let me say immediately that I am concerned here with only one kind of teaching, and I am eager to talk about it because it seems to me the kind of teaching with which this meeting is apparently least concerned. I mean the ancient, crucial, high art of teaching, the kind of teaching which alone can claim to be called educational, an essential element in all noble human culture, and hence a task of infinitely more importance than research scholarship.

With the teacher as transmitter, as servant or partner of research, I have no concern. He is useful and necessary and, because he does the bulk of university teaching, it is important that his job be effectively performed and intelligently evaluated. But so long as the teacher is viewed as merely a diffuser of knowledge or a higher popularizer, his position will necessarily be a modest and even menial one.

And precisely this, I think, is the prevalent view of the teacher's function, the view overwhelmingly assumed even among those who want to redress the balance in favor of the teacher. Is it any wonder then that the teacher enjoys no honor?

For if we assume that the teacher stands to the scholar as the pianist to the composer, there can be no question of parity; teaching of this kind is necessary but secondary. So too is the comparatively subtle and more difficult kind of teaching that is concerned with scholarly methodology and the crucial "skeletal" skills of creative research.

Only when large demands are made of the teacher, when we ask him to assume a primary role as educator in his own right, will it be possible to restore dignity to teaching. Teaching, I repeat, is not honored among us either because its function is grossly misconceived or its cultural value not understood. The reason for this is the overwhelming positivism of our technocratic society and the technical arrogance of academic scholarship. Behind the contempt for the teacher lies the transparent sickness of the humanities in the university and in American life generally.

Indeed, nothing more vividly illustrates the myopia of academic humanism than its failure to realize that the fate of any true culture is revealed in the value it sets upon the teacher and the way it defines him.

"The advancement of learning at the expense of man," writes Nietzsche, "is the most pernicious thing in the world. The stunted man is a backward step for humanity; he casts his shadow over all time to come. It debases conviction, the natural purpose of the particular field of learning; learning itself is finally destroyed. It is advanced, true, but its effect on life is nil or immoral."

What matters then is the kind of context that we create for teaching and the largeness of the demand made upon the teacher. Certainly he will have no function or honor worthy of the name until we are prepared to make the purpose of education what it always was—the molding of men rather than the production of knowledge.

It is my hope that education in this sense will not be driven from the university by the knowledge technicians. But this higher form of teaching does not die merely because the university will not practice it. Its future is always assured since human beings and human culture cannot do without it.

And if the university does not educate, others will. Education will pass, as it is passing now, to the artist, to the intellectual, to the gurus of the mass media, the charismatic charlatans and sages, and the whole immense range of secular and religious street-corner fakes and saints. The context counts. Socrates took to the streets, but so does every demagogue or fraud in search of converts and disciples.

By virtue of its traditions and pretensions the university is I believe, a not inappropriate place for education to occur. But we will not transform the university milieu nor create teachers by the mercenary device of offering prizes or bribes or "teaching sabbaticals" or building a favorable "image." As presently constituted, the colleges and

universities are as uncongenial to teaching as the Mojave Desert to a clutch of Druid priests.

I am suggesting what will doubtless seem paradox or treason—that there is no necessary link between scholarship and education, and that in actual practice scholarship is no longer a significant educational force. Scholars to be sure are unprecedentedly powerful, but their power is professional and therefore technocratic; as educators they have been eagerly disqualifying themselves for more than a century, and their disqualification is now nearly total.

The scholar has disowned the student—that is, the student who is not a potential scholar—and the student has reasonably retaliated by abandoning the scholar. This, I believe, is the only natural reading of what I take to be a momentous event—the secession of the student from the institutions of higher learning on the grounds that they no longer educate and are therefore, in his word, irrelevant.

By making education the slave of scholarship, the university has renounced its responsibility to human culture and its old, proud claim to possess, as educator and molder of men, an ecumenical function. It has disowned in short what teaching has always meant; a care and concern for the future of man, a Platonic love of the species, not for what it is, but what it might be.

It is a momentous refusal. Perhaps in the end teaching will be better off campus than on, but in either place it is now faring very badly. I do not exaggerate. When the president of Cornell seriously proposes that the university should abandon liberal education so that specialization can begin with matriculation—and when he advocates this in order to reconcile the conflicting claims of research and scholarship—it should be obvious even to the skeptical that education is being strangled in its citadel, and strangled furthermore on behalf of the crassest technocracy. I find it very difficult to imagine the rationalization of these salaried wardens of a great ecumenical tradition, who apparently view themselves and the institutions they administer as mere servants of national and professional interests.

We lack educators — by which I mean Socratic teachers, visible embodiments of the realized humanity of our aspirations, intelligence, skill, scholarship; men ripened or ripening into realization, as Socrates at the close of the Symposium comes to be and therefore embodies, personally guarantees, his own definition of love.

Our universities and our society need this compelling embodiment, this exemplification of what we are all presumably at, as they have never needed it before. It is men we need, not programs. It is possible for a student to go from kindergarten to graduate school without ever encountering a man—a man who might for the first time give him the only profound motivation for learning, the hope of becoming a better man.

Learning matters of course; but it is the means, not the end, and the end must always be either radiantly visible or profoundly implied in the means. It is only in the teacher that the end is apparent; he can humanize because he possesses the human skills which give him the power to humanize others.

If that power is not felt, nothing of any educational significance can occur. This is why the humanities stand or fall according to the human worth of the man who professes them.

If undergraduates ever met teachers of this kind, the abstract, inhuman professionalism of the graduate schools might have some plausibility; there would be an educational base.

But nothing whatsoever can be expected of a system in which men who have not themselves been educated presume to educate others. Our whole educational enterprise is in fact founded upon the wholly false premise that at some prior stage the essential educational work has been done.

The whole structure is built on rotten foundations, and the routines of education have begun to threaten and destroy what they were intended to save. There is a very real sense in which scholarship has become pernicious to the understanding and the love of literature; the humanities as they are presently taught are destructive of the past and the future of the present.

History Was Made, And You Were There

We waited anxiously for the opening of Carmichael Auditorium last fall. Our anxiety became impatience as the fall wore on, and we began to wonder if we would get into it in time for basketball season. As we all know, we made it just in time.

But perhaps our impatience would have been less apt to show itself had we known we were awaiting the unveiling of an "historic site."

That right! Our office received a news release from an insurance company this week announcing that Carmichael has been selected as one of the 12 historic scenes to be portrayed on the company's 1967 calendars.

The release said the local attrac-

tion was selected "because of its outstanding historic value to the people of this area and its appeal to persons throughout the South."

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Fred Thomas, Editor
 Tom Clark, Business Manager
 Scott Godfellow, Managing Ed.

John Askew Ad. Mgr.
 John Greenbacker..... Assoc. Ed.
 Bill Amlong News Ed.
 Kerry Sipe Feature Ed.
 Sandy Treadwell .. Sports Editor
 Bill Hass Asst. Sports Ed.
 Jock Lauterer Photo Editor
 Chuck Benner Night Editor

STAFF WRITERS
 Don Campbell Lytt Stamps, Ernest Robl, Steve Bennett, Steve Knowlton, Judy Sipe, Carol Wonsavage, Diane Warman, Karen Freeman, Cindy Borden, Julie Parker, Peter Harris, Drummond Bell, Owen Davis, Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders.

CARTOONISTS
 Bruce Strauch, Jeff MacNelly

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; \$9 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

Briefly Editorial

A lot of people will tell you, and it's true, that citizens throughout the state keep tabs on what is going on at UNC and other U. S. campus.

However, it is not necessarily true that the public always understands fully what it hears.

Take, for instance, this conversation overheard in a local pub while we were home for Thanksgiving:

"What do you think about LBJ?"
 "Well, I don't know much about 'em, but Murrigan's Cafe must have 'em by the billions."