

In Our Opinion . . .

John Greenbacker

No Easy Way To Decide What's Fit For Printing

"All the news that's fit to print" is a motto the *New York Times* has made famous the world over. With our six - page limitation on size *The Daily Tar Heel* has been accused of operating on a policy of "All the news that fits, we print"; however, we do try to adhere to the noble standards outlined by the *Times*.

Naturally we are not able to print everything that comes our way and might be called news. Likewise, we get other material—ranging from letters to lost and found articles — which does not bear publication. We might give you an example of two such items we received this week:

First there was a typewritten lost and found notice: "Found — One tube of Revlon lipstick, in the vicinity of Old East, on Saturday, Dec. 3. Any coed (be she typical or not) claiming said lipstick, before receiving lost merchandise, will be required to identify it in one of the two socially accepted methods. Either (1) allow finder to conduct lipstick taste test, or (2) have claimee whisper (ever so softly) 10 times into the finder's ear the name or number of the lipstick shade.

"Persons interested in an appointment time should call 'Seventh Heaven', 710 Morrison, 929-5014, and speak with David Yelton. For the more daring, however, just stop by Room 710 anytime after 8 p.m. any day — but never, never on Sunday."

More recently we received a letter of the ransom note variety. Printed words and letters of different sizes and styles were affixed by cellophane tape to a sheet of standard theme paper. The message read:

"Confidential. To the Editor: You'll be sorry if you print *The Tar Heel* again. It's time to call a halt to your hog feed. We hate you. Signed, The Hoods, Del Rio, U.S.A."

Interestingly, the reverse side of the theme paper had check marks in the "good" column beside "thought," "general effect," "organization," "paragraphing," "diction," "grammar," "sentence structure," "punctuation," "spelling" and "mechanics."

We think it obvious why such items as the two described here are not printed. However, it is also our policy to screen advertising for reasons which are less obvious. One reader questioned our policy in a letter we received yesterday:

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:
As I understand it, the DTH has refused to print certain advertisements for Troy's Radio and Stereo Co. I believe the decision not to print these ads because they were in "poor taste" was made by the Business Manager and/or a group in the advertising department. This letter is simply an inquiry as to (1) who makes the decision that an ad is in poor taste or obscene and (2) what is the criteria for

Signs Of The Times

Sure signs that Christmas is almost here:
The lights in the Franklin Street decorations downtown are beginning to burn out.
Prices are beginning to skyrocket.
Term papers and book reports due.

GM has a stand of ribbon and tinsel on the hand rail of their stairway so none of the nice old ladies bringing letters to the DTH can support themselves while climbing the steps.

Your girlfriend has been dropping hints about a certain "little" item she saw in a magazine and is just dying to have.

this decision? I am especially interested in the definitions of obscenity and offensiveness which are used and the point or conditions at which a reference to sex is unprintable.

Robin Dial

The answer to the first question is simple. Such decisions are made by either the advertising manager or the business manager in most cases. Sometimes the editor is involved in the process.

We would like to clarify one point. No advertisement from Troy's has been withheld from publication. Almost all of them, however, had been modified. (This, of course, is with the exception of the first one concerning the size of stereo equipment and post-football game entertainment of dates, which slipped by without our knowing about it.)

The answer to the second question is a bit more complicated, and, in fact, has no standard answer. Obscenity, offensiveness and reference to sex, we feel, must be considered in relation to the specific use of any word, expression or picture.

A term, used in an article on birth control, for example, might not be at all acceptable as a caption under a picture of a Carolina coed listening to a radio. As a general rule we try to avoid printing anything which would be offensive to a majority — or a sizable minority — of our readers.

God knows we've had our trouble staying on the right side of that thin dividing line this year. We have, no doubt, had something to offend everybody at some time or other. You can rest assured that anything we censor is not cut because we personally dislike it. We defy anyone to show us something that will gross us out. But we do have to remember our reading public:

And, judging from the comments we've received as a result of a recent cartoon (despite its overwhelming popularity with a large portion of the campus), perhaps we're going to have to try harder.

To the writer of the letter, if this doesn't help answer your question, we invite you to stop by our office and look at some of the copy we have changed. Then decide whether or not you would want to walk across campus and look at people who knew you were responsible for its publication.

The Free University of North Carolina?

An improbable title, isn't it? More improbable, too, is the idea that such an organization and the numerous implications it has for the university community could become a reality in Chapel Hill.

But sit down, students, professors, administrators, townsmen. Sit down, compose yourselves and read on.

The improbable is about to become actuality, and sooner than you think, for Student Government's education reform groups have finally crystallized their thinking and formulated a plan of action that, if successful, will significantly alter the educational processes of the University.

Since the Reidsville conference on education, student leaders have been aware that there was widespread support among the faculty for experimentation in UNC education. The real difficulty, as everyone at the conference knew, would come in translating the ideas into action.

The dialogue on education was continued on campus by means of seminar groups set up by Student Government.

These three groups continued to talk about education for about a month and a half, until the participating students began to express the opinion that they had talked enough.

No one had any really clear idea of what to do to bring about the changes they wanted. Some foresaw a long battle with the University administrators that would ultimately prove fruitless. Only the faculty could be counted on to give support to some of the ideas.

Two of the education reform workers, David Kiel and Jonathan Gibson, consulted with a number of professors and the school of education to establish small, student-directed seminars. Other groups sought to work for the institution of pass-fail grading on a trial basis.

All these procedures, however, required and still demand considerable patience and student suasion, and many were not satisfied with the scope of the results.

Into this vacuum stepped a man with nerve enough to propose the big idea. Jed Dietz, a student legislator and an early supporter of the reform movement, mobilized one seminar group to establish a free experimental university on this campus which would be put into operation next spring.

The plan was simple: Students in the group proposed the names of professors they knew might be interested in the program, and went out to seek their aid. Each professor was asked the question, "Name or describe a course you have always wanted to teach, but have never had the opportunity to do so for one reason or another."

The professors were then asked if they were willing to "non-direct" this course for a small group of students in a non-credit seminar. This means that the professor would meet with a group of students whenever they chose to discuss the subject and plan for further study.

Under the plan, the professor would not be lecturing to the students, but would lend his presence and occasional comments to the group's remarks. The system would tax the professor's time limits very little, and the meeting places would be informal and relaxed.

They could meet in a professor's home, in Graham Memorial, or on the lawn if they pleased.

This system would foster student motivation to learn, would bring out student individuality of thought and individual direction of learning activities without the damaging influence of regimented

classroom situations. With faculty - student relationships placed on a personal level, the entire value of the intellectual confrontation will be increased significantly for all parties involved.

Registration for these seminar classes would be simple. The professor's name and a brief description of the course would be posted on a piece of paper in a public area, say Graham Memorial or Y-Court. Students would drop by and sign up for whatever they are interested in.

With this plan in mind, students have been going about the campus enlisting faculty support. The results have been described as being good to astounding.

Not one professor has been critical of the idea; all thought it would be a healthy thing. Kiel, who was not really convinced that the program would work, was persuaded that it would by one enthusiastic professor he interviewed for the program. Those who could not participate in the program because of prior commitments regretted sincerely that they wouldn't work with it.

To date, nearly thirty professors have listed courses they would like to "non-direct" with the experimental college, more than enough to initiate the program, if we

use the experiment at San Francisco State or New Mexico as examples.

The students who are planning this thing are making no claims that they have all the answers. They are plagued by doubts that it will work, that their suppositions are correct or that the student body will support the idea.

They realize they are backed up in this enterprise only by aspects of Rogerian psychology, Paul Goodman's concept of university education and a compulsive intuition that tells them to act, even if they embark on an uncertain journey.

However it is viewed, this free university idea is a fantastic one and deserves all the praise and support it can get. Indeed, it may be labeled a success from the very beginning, if for any other reason than because it is an active attempt to better the intellectual life of the university.

To a student body long plagued by grading systems, sententious and boring professors who talk constantly, mass lecture classes, insignificant memorization, test regurgitation, educational irrelevance and depersonalization, this outlet may be the long-sought relief.

In this age of student alienation, we could pray for nothing greater.

Letters To The Editor

Conformists Allow Waller To Rot

A Curiosity

Editor, the *Daily Tar Heel*:
I read John Greenbacker's Sunday Tarheel editorial on SDS leader Gary Waller with a good deal of disappointment. To me it was an unpleasant reminder of what can happen to someone with off-center ideas in a university with a rather conformist atmosphere.

It would have been understandable if Mr. Waller had been presented as a kind of archaism, an amusing absurdity from out of the essentially adolescent ideological struggles of the 1930's, or, on a lower level, as simply a trouble-maker.

Such charges are easily made and easy enough to refute, for there is no hidden psychological effect behind the charges; everything is strictly on a good guys - bad guys basis. But Greenbacker's article on Waller took another tact.

Greenbacker, and by implication, the other Tarheel writers, just loved him. After listening to Waller say, "I don't owe this damned country anything," Greenbacker's only response is: "He has a way of smiling at you when he makes statements of this sort that is very difficult to describe in words. Its malicious and impish in nature, and it never appears unless accompanied by a strange brightness in his eyes."

Next Greenbacker suspects that "the ATO from Drake University" is "putting us all on." Conceding later that "when the chips are down" Waller speaks "with force and authority," we are left with this interesting comment: "We all hated to see him go, because it isn't often that our day is brightened by a campus character of Waller's magnitude."

The article in reality illustrates a clever and devastatingly effective method of making a man rot sweetly. Waller will henceforth be seen by the Tarheel editors, at least by Mr. Greenbacker, through a mist of smiling tenderness, not as a man whose ideas are to be taken seriously, but as a subject for a journalistic exercise in "human interest," as a "campus character," nice to have around to add color to the dull Carolina atmosphere.

We were not asked to attack Mr. Waller as a force for formidable and important political and social ideas, which many of us oppose on rational grounds. Instead, we were asked by Mr. Greenbacker to admire Waller as a curiosity.

It is indeed saddening to wonder if such is not to be the ultimate fate of all genuinely radical differences of idea or of character in an environment as conformist as this university. If the man holding these ideas is not attacked head-on and in an ad hominem argument, as was Mr. James Gardner a few

years ago in a particularly vicious DTH editorial, then readers are gently tricked into chucking at him behind his back.

I do not mean to suggest that Mr. Greenbacker's use of this method of character disposal was deliberate. Not at all. My real concern is that it probably was not.

George A. Glenn

Pitiful Sam

Editor, the *Daily Tar Heel*:
Before reading Mr. Sam West's recent letter, I would have discounted the likelihood of such a shallow, callous defense of Kappa Alpha's petulant prank and such a heavy-handed, slashing assault on the character of various protesters against alleged injustices perpetrated on this campus.

I should therefore like to address myself to the following query: What makes Sammy run? What makes Sammy run? In answering this question, I am laboring under two severe restrictions. First, whereas Budd Schulberg could devote several hundred pages to unravelling the answer, I have only two or so hundred words in which to do it. Second, Sammy Glick was only a figment of author Schulberg's imagination; Sammy West, on the other hand, is all too real.

That the *Daily Tar Heel* should entitle Mr. West's comments, "Frat Man's Defense," does a gross disservice to the other fraternity members on campus. Indeed, it brings to mind the well-known Jewish quip — "With friends like this, I need enemies?"

But to get down to brass tacks. Mr. West wants those who "resent so much of what goes on down here" to "get the hell out of here."

For his information, I will not leave, nor will I silence myself. In fact, one could easily throw his advice back to him; suggesting that he go somewhere else is he doesn't like it here. Unlike his "ideal society," which has no place for me, mine does have one for him.

And by remaining at UNC, I, as well as the other supposed epicene characters, may convert him. That certainly is assuming a lot, but my confidence in his better judgment is surpassed only by my belief in the value of the ultimate objective—community.

What underlies Mr. West's attitude is the fear and uneasiness rampant throughout contemporary society. In an effort to ally his own concern, racial intolerance, sex, etc., he strikes out against all who articulate his suspicions.

assumed sexual proclivities, this act, on the contrary, sheds enormous light on his sexual insecurity.

If writer West wished to know what makes me run, i.e., what caused me to write this letter, part of the explanation is this: by glossing over the affront to the humanity of the Negro youngsters by saying that it "added a little flavor" to the Beat Dook parade, he lessened my, and his, dignity. For to diminish one is to diminish all.

As a colleague of mine so astutely observed, the problem is not between white man and black man, nor between Northerner and Southerner, but between man and man.

Ernest J. Yanarella

Women, Heed!

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:
Mr. Greenbacker:
Despite the opening challenge of your article "Dirty Old Men Show Contempt for Women" in last Wednesday's DTH, I read the column, in temperate language and all.

It made me sad. Sad because I must agree (although not willingly) with many of the points you so bluntly presented. Despite several unhappy

truths brought out in your column and other recent DTH stories aimed unfavorably at the TCC, I think it time someone spoke in defense of the girls on campus lest they be forever unduly branded.

I do not believe that the so-called TCC is in majority on this campus. It looks as if your lecherous friend has not been too discerning in choosing female companionship, and, unfortunately, has based his contempt on the behavior of a very few.

Had he a little more perception, a little more experience in life himself, he might know that there are individuals on this campus well worth the time if he were willing to seek them out.

Had he a little more imagination too, he might offer his date more than the usual juke box frat party or the Saturday night beer bust. He could instead plan ahead and dare to do something a little different, and I don't mean something that takes more money.

So often I get the feeling the Carolina Gentleman is afraid to talk or assumes his date is not capable of speaking intelligently. If all he wants is a live body to accompany him to Saturday night oblivion, than a TCC is

all he deserves. Many girls, I think, feel cheated when they are constantly escorted to the usual fiascos. How can a girl express anything of consequence with the blaring of the juke box ringing in her ears or if her date is in the fifth dimension?

I think this lecherous friend of yours should expect a little more from his dates. That is, he should let her know he appreciates intelligent conversation and individuality. If he would be considerate, too, I think he would find that not only does the coed perk up to the challenge, but the two of them will actually enjoy each other.

If he gets no response to this treatment, then indeed he has found a TCC. That is, he has discovered the fact early and does not have to call her again.

In the past controversies between the TCC and the Carolina Gentleman have raged and waned, accomplishing little more than the airing of incoherent and ill-founded complaints.

Your column, sir, was an eye-opener. And I hope the coeds read it carefully.

Donna Relfander

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Fred Thomas, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager
Scott Goodfellow, 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; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

