

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Tom Gooding, Editor

Personally speaking

A word of thanks to all who helped during this year ...

The editor of The Daily Tar Heel is held responsible for everything that appears in the paper. He rarely knows when something will go wrong, when a necessary story will be neglected, when a person will be misquoted, when an administrator will get upset because the paper reports some fact, when some decision made by one of the 40 individuals on the staff will upset one of the 20,000 members of the University community.

The editor must devote 40 to 50 hours a week to the production of the newspaper. However he can not oversee every page, picture, cutline, story and headline that goes into the paper every day.

The first major decision every editor must make, and probably the most important decision he will make during his year, is the selection of his staff. That staff must make the countless daily decisions on the individual stories and pages that go to make up the paper. They are the people that make or break the editor and the paper.

The staff does the work that makes a daily newspaper possible for the students of this campus. They are the ones the editor must place complete faith in to get the paper out every morning. They rarely receive the credit they deserve.

We wish to take this opportunity to show in some small way our gratitude to:

-Rick Gray for providing moral support since the beginning of the campaign last spring and for serving as Associate Editor, editorial writer and jack-of-all-trades when a problem arose;

-Rod Waldorf for taking charge of the print shop during the orientation issue and for ably handling the job of managing editor;

-Mike Parnell for artfully handling the personal nuances of a news stories and the editing the news stories to professional quality;

-Chris Cobbs, Mark Whicker and Howie Carr for producing an excellent sports section;

-Frank Parrish for handling the feature page;

-Ken Ripley for putting up with the wire machines and being so devoted to the paper;

-Terry Cheek for providing a

final check every night between 10 p.m. and midnight;

-John Gellman, Cliff Kolovson, Johnny Lindahl and Leslie Todd for keeping high quality in DTH photography;

-Lou Bonds for putting up with Student Legislature;

-Glenn Brank for keeping us guessing about what time he's coming to work every day;

-Keith Carter for keeping up with the graduate students and their thing;

-Bob Chapman for being our ROTC token and handling Student Government;

-Woody Doster for covering Student Legislature after Lou Bonds started wearing Mickey Mouse undershirts;

-Sue English for putting up with our snide comments about "sorority girls";

-Doug Hall for being the most talented freshman the DTH has had in a long time;

-Jessica Hanchar for being the most dependable, industrious and valuable member of the staff;

-Richard Helbig for working with me again after four years;

-Karen Jurgensen for constantly destroying male chauvinistic statements, and continually keeping the news editor in line;

-Susan Miller and Rachel Scott for correcting all the mistakes made by all the staff writers;

-Pam Phillips for keeping Harry Bryan's ego deflated by telling the staff what he did as editor of his high school paper;

-Harry Smith for all the extra work he has done;

-Lana Starnes for "Elephants and Butterflies" and all the time she spent trying to improve the paper;

-Evans Witt for being our token fratty-bagger and covering the Board of Aldermen meetings;

-Janet Bernstein and the entire advertising staff for keeping us financially solvent;

-Bob Wilson for collecting the money that paid staff salaries and for coming back to the DTH;

-Charlton Campbell and the printing staff at the Chapel Hill Weekly for their understanding and cooperation;

-Harry Bryan for letting the current editor leave his position knowing the paper will be handled with skill next year.

DTH Associate Editor Rick Gray says Spearman is not a god. There have been times I would have disputed Rick's statement. However, at the very least Walt Spearman has been a father-in-residence for me during my college career.

He has given me most of my academic knowledge about journalism, most of my guidance in the field of journalism, the best personal advice possible and the inspiration to accomplish what I wanted to do.

Unfortunately, all I can give him in return is my unlimited respect and my thanks.

Walt, thanks for everything.

Tom Gooding

Rick Gray

Paper belongs to the students

Everyday The Daily Tar Heel is there. Students read it in class. They work the crossword puzzles, they get mad at the editor or a staff writer or a reviewer or they laugh or agree with what the paper has to say.

The Daily Tar Heel is expected. But perhaps it is not understood, just as most newspapers are not understood by their readers.

The Daily Tar Heel, and all other college newspapers, are unique among newspapers. They are written, edited and published for a highly selective readership.

And because of the type of readership college newspapers have, their problems are unique.

Should the paper speak the feelings of the majority of students on campus?

Should it be a mouthpiece for the college administration?

Should it merely act as an extension of Student Government?

Or should it act as a newspaper, speaking its own voice in behalf of its readers?

On a campus where the daily student newspaper is the only major source of communication between students and their student government, between students and their administration and between students and students, these questions are of major importance.

This year The Daily Tar Heel has tried to re-establish itself as a newspaper rather than a rag. We have tried to present a variety of opinions in our editorial page columns. We have tried to present the

news on this campus objectively and fairly.

And we have tried to reflect, through the stories, reviews, editorials and columns, the image of this University which we believe true.

In some cases, there may be evidence to substantiate a claim that we followed the wrong course, that we were, in one way or another, unfair to someone or to some group.

But on the whole, and this is the opinion of one columnist with an admittedly biased view, we have done what we set out to do.

The Letters to the Editor column has not been closed to anyone. We have printed all letters that were not libelous or that were not so long as to make them impractical.

To those whose letters were edited or left out, we apologize, but there was a reason.

To those students who feel that their group was unfairly treated by the paper, we also apologize, but we also ask them to remember that there are 18,130 students on this campus who pay for The Daily Tar Heel and we have no choice but to print what is of interest to the majority of those students.

There are students and faculty members and administrators who will always claim that The Daily Tar Heel is little more than six to eight pages of leftist, communistic propaganda each day.

There are those who will always say we are a bunch of chauvinistic male pigs or a bunch of racist, reactionary fascists who have no sympathy for the oppressed people in this nation.

And there will be those who always like the paper no matter how bad it may be.

Those of us who have worked on The Daily Tar Heel this year have done so because we enjoy what we are doing. The vast majority of staffers plan to be connected with journalism in some way when we graduate, or if we graduate, as the case may be.

But mostly we have worked on The Daily Tar Heel because we believe, we have some skill that can make the paper a better paper, that can insure that students know what is happening in the Union, in South Building, in Chapel Hill and on all parts of campus.

Next week there will be a new staff for the paper. The turn-over will not be complete. We ourselves will be leaving, as will the editor.

The majority of the staff after spring break will be the same people, but they will be in new jobs.

They will be working for many of the same things they have worked for the past 79 years.

But more importantly, they will be working to make The Daily Tar Heel a better paper and to make this University a better place to go to school, just as the staff of every Daily Tar Heel has for the past 79 years.

The specifics may change.

The names in the masthead will shift around and some will disappear.

But the message the paper will be trying to put across will always be the same, for that is the nature of college newspapers.

We are spokesmen for the students. We give them a place to voice their opinions, and we work to provide them with the information we feel they must have if they are to profit in any way from the four years they spend on this campus.



Letters to the editor

'Gadfly' reader doubts Cumming

To the editor:

First, let me apologize for my lack of expertise in the art of literary criticism, but after reading Mr. Bryan Cumming's article in the Gadfly on Tuesday, March 23, 1971, entitled "The Need for Tasteful Architecture," I found myself with some serious doubts about Mr. Cumming, and I felt I would like to let others know that there is at least one student of this university who does not agree with him.

"The five-story monolith Greenlaw, crammed in behind Bingham" is the first quote that I very much object to. I find the description of Greenlaw in very poor taste and highly inaccurate. I would refer Mr. Cumming to Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language for the definition of the word monolith. I suspect that we poor illiterate members of the "masses" would find it rather difficult to make use of this building, effective or otherwise, if it were truly a monolith. If the crumming of Greenlaw behind Bingham is what Mr. Cumming objects to, this I consider a legitimate objection. Either Bingham should have been enlarged and renovated so as to keep in the mood with the other architectural structures and preclude the need of another building, or the damned thing should have been torn down before Greenlaw was built, thus freeing this space for a new and larger building, one which would not have crowded another.

"The dignity of Greek columns and the mellow charm of stone and wood" may be fine and good for a landscape of "subtle traditions" and "symmetry" but it does very little towards housing the "masses" and providing a place for study.

The implication in Mr. Cumming's statement that "The underlying theme of the new architecture is totally utilitarian" is that this is wrong. I personally prefer to live and work in a building which has been designed to be "efficient, relevant and functional" rather than to try to live and work in one on which the emphasis of building has been placed on "the dignity of Greek columns." After all, whatever I may be, I am not a pigeon.

Mr. Cumming also goes on to hold up for ridicule the Carolina Union as an example of a building for consumers, "a sprawling shrine to the pragmatic bourgeois mentality" he calls it. From this, I am to assume that all consumers possess a "pragmatic bourgeois mentality." I suppose that being a scholar Mr. Cumming is not a consumer, since the

two are apparently never one and the same in his mind? Again I would refer Mr. Cumming to the dictionary.

"An atmosphere of dignity and serenity encourages the free interflow of ideas and the cultivation of a rich individual awareness." That's true. That's just the atmosphere that I seek when I go to bed to sleep.

Les Wagoner II
324 Avery

Reviewer needs fresh perspective

To the editor:

The Winter number of "Carolina Quarterly" contains 4 pieces of fiction, 22 poems and 3 book reviews. It would be a flaming miracle if any single person liked or agreed with or even understood each of these items completely—the editor didn't.

But it does seem gratuitously harsh for your pseudonymous "Leaven" to flush the magazine, as he does (Tar Heel, March 23), solely on the basis of a shortsighted discussion of only six poems. (He does praise 3 poems by Kuzma, Rankin and Culross: "If the Quarterly contained these three poems only and nothing besides. I would tell the reader to buy it.")

One is staggered. How in the name of critical cant is "Leaven" allowed to call a particular magazine number "a botched job" when he examines for us only 40% of its poetry (and likes a third of that) which represents but 10 per cent of the magazine's bulk? And don't plead space and time. The mind boggles. Did he not read the remainder? As an English graduate student he is undeniably busy, but is there not something like a professional ethic at work here which would demand at least passing notice of the other 90 per cent—particularly if he is going to "recommend" against buying it? I have to chuckle.

"Leaven" calls this Quarterly "solipsistic," "Too refined," "rarefied," and "self-conscious." Simultaneously he characterizes its poetry as weakly dependent upon an "apparent faith in the efficacy of concrete description." Ahhhh, are we never to be freed from the pedestrian taunts of "Sing Along With Mitch" critics plumping for immediate and universal appeal? For that's the

advice "Leaven" generously offers to the editors. He reminds us that, "The best poetry has almost invariably been communication on a large scale." One feels moved to reply, "Ohh crap, get a shovel."

That this poetry is esoteric and highly personal one cannot deny. It is imagistic, at times fragmentary (spaced out, if you will) occasionally sexual and not always under complete control. But I believe all of it, together with the fiction deserves to be aired in the Quarterly. For it is a sampling of what young writers in this country are doing, with varying success. It is a kind of melodic (or unmelodic) history, a chronicle, in small, of the times we're muddling through.

The question an editor must put to himself is, what is the function of a "little" magazine. "Leaven" notes that the Quarterly is much-honored, and he is right. But the reason it has achieved any decent reputation is because it has generally striven to gather and publish new and exciting young writers, it has provided first light to struggling, inchoate and not always sane imaginations engaged in the act of creating literature—"bad" or "good," "universal" or "unintelligible."

One of its saving graces is that the little magazine is ephemeral. Each issue is largely forgotten by all but the editors, the contributors and a few sharp-eyed New York publishers pretty quickly after its appearance. But in this unlikely congeries is occasionally spawned the glimmers of something better—at least something deserving of better than the odorous fate of piecemeal and myopic condemnation.

I cannot object to the mysterious "Leaven's" poetic judgment. It is presumable serious and to that extent valid. Nor do I take exception to an informed and representative blood-letting; but this critic's piece is neither. I believe, he needs his perspective freshened.

And as for facile large scale communication for its own sake? Never. George Wolfe, Editor Carolina Quarterly

Capitalist legacy not perfect either

To the editor:

On March 23rd the DTH printed two

letters which directly and indirectly commented adversely on socialism. It is interesting to note in first letter by Rusty Davis about violence in the Paris Commune that he quotes Allan Pinkerton. Mr. Pinkerton's only relationship to history is in labor history. If Mr. Davis' father has worked with his hands all his life he might have told his son what the name Pinkerton meant to a union man. He would have told him of the hired scabs, goons and private armies that were part of the Pinkerton agency. There are many 50-year-old steel union organizers who could take off their shirts today and show Mr. Davis what Pinkerton meant to those who tried to fight U.S. Steel's private, 300 man Pinkerton army.

Mr. Davis quotes Mr. Pinkerton on violence in the Paris Commune. Mr. Pinkerton is an expert on violence. The difference is that, as Mr. Davis writes, the violence in Paris came amid "civil war," while Pinkerton's violence was sanctioned by U.S. Steel, the U.S. Government and protected by law as part of the necessary overhead in making a profit.

The legacy of international socialism is the fight for decent wages, an end to national oppression, an end to sexual oppression and for workers control. Not all of these goals have yet been won in all places. The legacy of international capitalism is private and public armies to break strikes, slavery and discrimination of national minorities, wars like Vietnam, colonialism, sexist exploitation and the battle for profits at all costs. Luckily capitalism has not achieved all its goals and is today losing ground. However, would Mr. Davis care to debate the histories and legacies of these two movements?

Marie Dauforth
Young Socialist Alliance

The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters to the editor, provided they are typed on a 60-space line and limited to a maximum of 300 words. All letters must be signed and the address and phone number of the writer must be included. The paper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Address letters to Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.