

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. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Harry Bryan, Editor
Saturday, April 24, 1971

Awards of the week

The No Babbling Brooks Award—to Chancellor Sitterson for refusing to meet with Student Government Attorney John Brooks in a conference with SG leaders.

The We Can't Get Nun Award—to Pope Paul VI, who Friday made a plea for more young persons to serve as priests and nuns.

The "From the Mouths of Babes" Award—to the UNC psychology major advertising for young children to make tapes on the topic, "Speech Development."

The Spaced-Out Award—to the Wright Brothers Museum, which had to turn down the lunar module Kitty Hawk because they don't have enough space for it.

The Timeless Administrator Award—to Dean of Women Kitty Carmichael, who ordered the clocks in women's dorms set back Sunday morning. Unfortunately, Eastern Standard Time dictates they be set forward.

The Loser's Loser Award—to the American Legion post sponsoring a dance on behalf of Lt. William Calley. The Legionaires lost \$600.

The Sheepish Grin Award—to an embarrassed Journalism School Dean John B. Adams, who invited all his journalism classes to attend the Order of the Golden Fleece ceremony, not knowing it was part of the ruse to get him there for the honor.

The Messy Phrasing Award—to the N.C. Assembly for the second week in a row. This week UPI

reported they "killed" a bill to abolish the death penalty. Last week, they "axed" a bill to liberalize abortion.

The "Burn Your Drawbridge Behind You" Award—to the legendary Ghimghoul Castle, which nearly burned down Monday.

The Almost Half-Dead Award—to UPI for reporting "3/8 killed on the highways Wednesday."

The Hold on to Your Harpoon Award—to the U.S. Government, for outlawing whale hunting.

The Puny Pepper Award—to the UNC researcher who reported this week that hot red peppers, used daily as a food seasoning throughout the world, may cause malnutrition and gross retardation.

The Pinocchio Politico Award—to student legislator Charles Gilliam, who during a legislative session was overheard asking conservative boss Joe Beard, "How do I vote?" If you want to see him do his thing, pull his string.

The Much Adoo Award—six feet and ten inches of it, to be exact. Basketball coach Dean Smith has recruited Robert McAduo, a junior college cager star.

Headline of the Week Award—to the Charlotte Observer for the following headline: "Bill Booe Boos School Board; Board Boos Booe Back."

Lana Starnes

These people are very wierd

There's nothing more enjoyable on a nice spring day in Chapel Hill than to sit somewhere in the grass under a tree and watch the people go by.

You can see people of all shapes and sizes. You sit and watch and eventually come to the realization that people are very different... very odd... very weird.

And here are a few of the most unusual I have ever heard of...

The **HEAVIEST** human of all times tipped the scales at 1,069 pounds in February of 1958. His name was Robert Earl Hughes, six and one-half inches tall, from Monticello, Ill. He weighed 11 1/2 pounds as a baby. Hughes was buried in a

converted piano case which weighed nearly 1,100 pounds and had to be lowered by crane.

The record **CHILDBEARER** was the wife of Fyodor Vassilet (1816-1872) of Russia. She was the mother of 69 children. She gave birth to 16 pairs of twins, seven sets of triplets and four sets of quadruplets.

The **LONGEST FINGERNAILS** belonged to a Chinese priest in Shanghai in 1910. It took him over 27 years to achieve nails up to 2 1/4 inches in length.

The **LARGEST** normal newborn **BABY** was a boy weighing 24 pounds 4 ounces born in June of 1961 in Ceyhan, Southern Italy.

The **MOST TATTOOS** worn by Vivian "Sailor Joe" Simmons, a Canadian tattoo artist. He has 4,831 tattoos on his body.

The **LONGEST PREGNANCY** was 389 days for a 25 year old woman in Woking Maternity Hospital, Surrey, England.

The **MOST ALCOHOLIC** person was a hard drinker named Vanhorn born in London, England. He averaged four bottles of ruby port per day for 23 years prior to his death at 61. It is believed that during his lifetime he emptied more than 35,688 bottles.

The record for **SLEEPLESSNESS** is held by an elderly woman in Cape Town, South Africa. She voluntarily went

without sleep for 282 hours and 55 minutes (11 days, 18 hours and 55 minutes).

The **LONGEST HAIR** is that of Swami Pandarasannadhi which measured 26 feet in length in 1949.

The **SMALLEST BABY** which has survived was Marion Chapman, born on June 5, 1938 in South Shields, County Durham, England. She weighed 10 ounces at birth and was fed hourly through a fountain pen filler.

The **LIGHTEST** human being (adult) was Lucia Zarate, an emaciated Mexican midget of 26 1/2 inches who weighed 4.7 pounds at the age of 17. She "fattened up" to 13 pounds by her 20th birthday.

Letters to the editor

Thesis costs ruin grad budget

To the Editor:

Several denizens of Craige dormitory were talking about a painful experience which many graduate students here at the University of North Carolina must endure, paying the typists and xerography fees required to provide the University with the required number of copies of Master's theses and Doctoral dissertations of the quality the University demands.

A cheap job on a short thesis can easily exceed \$50.00 and what History graduate students pay is astronomical.

Needless to say, the students' budget is ruined, and ruined towards the end of the year when budgets become thin for any student. Such a burden is obnoxious and should be taken off the student's back.

Therefore we propose that the University step in by paying the costs of typing and xeroxing theses and dissertations. The University can certificate typists who now do freelance thesis work to spare the University's secretarial staff the added burden and refer graduate students to such certified typists. The student could use any available University owned xerox machine and charge his thesis related copying to the University. The typist and student would simply fill out a form listing the number of pages typed or copied and University secretaries could easily check the validity of such forms before checking the theses and dissertations.

Ultimately, the student must pay for this kind of service, and the costs of thesis preparation can be included in the fees which each department charges. In effect the student would pay for his thesis preparation in installments, a method far less painful than the situation which now exists.

Gordon C. Miller (Environmental Sciences and Engineering)
Warren Galke (Epidemiology)
Petya Perkins (English)
Robert Thyken (Political Science)
C.M. Milliren (Chemistry)
Marha J. Payne (Classics)
Kathleen F. Keefe (Germanic Languages)

also recalled that the Angels were hired in an indirect through the good offices of the Grateful Dead, and not directly by the Stones. In fact, Mr. Leaven would have recalled that the Stones themselves were not much of a factor in the negotiations which made Altamont the bummer it was. All the arrangements were left to middle-men. And yet Mr. Leaven criticizes "Gimme Shelter" for not drawing a direct connection between the Stones and these negotiations. How could it, when the Stones were actually only peripherally involved?

This is not to say that the Stones are any less culpable. If anything, their disinterest and non-involvement in the negotiations renders them more so. "Gimme Shelter" is a disturbing film precisely because it does not connect the Stones with the violence at Altamont. The Stones are shown breezing their way from gig to gig across the country, without a care in the world, oblivious to the mundane negotiations preceding each concert. At the end, we are left with Altamont. One knows all along that the Stones could have vetoed the hiring of the Angels, if they had cared enough to soil their hands and find out what arrangements had been, or were being, made. Jagger said later that he thought the Angels merely the American counterparts of the British Hell's Angels, who have often been employed to police concerts in London. Anyone who has seen a free concert in Hyde Park cannot help but be struck by the naive implicit in such a statement—when it comes to violence, the British Angels are definitely minor league.

Mr. Leaven would have us believe that "Gimme Shelter" is a whitewash, that it exonerates the Stones from blame. I would assert that it does the opposite, that by illustrating the lack of concern for their audiences which has characterized the Stones of late, "Gimme Shelter" becomes anything but a whitewash. And if Mr. Leaven really believes that nonsense about the sex, violence, and drugs in the Stones' lyrics inciting the listener to rape, pillage, and addiction (perhaps he would also have us believe that aphrodisiacs do work), then I would suggest that Mr. Leaven stick to reviewing those old favorites of his, "The Wolfman" and "The Man with the Atomic Brain."

John Marshall
327 Craige

Leaven clear on Quarterly

To the editor:

In reference to the already tiresome debate between Leaven and the editor of the "Carolina Quarterly," may I simply state what appears to me painfully obvious. Mr. Leaven wrote what was on the whole a sympathetic review of the "Quarterly." He said he would refer only to the poems and considering the limits

of space, he did an admirable job of conveying the sense and the style of the poetry in question.

He was very clear on his criteria for judgment—if the reader disagreed with Mr. Leaven's view of the world of poetry, he could certainly not dispute the reasonableness and calm with which that view was put forward. I contrast this with the hysterical flailings of Mr. Hicks and his colleagues. If the editors of the "Quarterly" cannot accept reasoned criticism of their published work may I humbly suggest they restrict themselves in the future to circulating their creative efforts only among themselves.

S. Charney
Durham

Witt botches speech report

To the editor:

As a long-time supporter of the administration policy of Vietnamization and a silent critic of The Daily Tar Heel's prejudiced coverage of anti-war activity, I was a bit shocked by Tuesday's story on David Dellinger's speech.

Mr. Evans Witt, a defender of administration policy in Indochina and, in other cases, a reasonably reliable reporter, blew it. I am, as I said, a supporter of Vietnamization and a critic of prejudiced coverage in the Tar Heel; however, I am also a critic of Mr. Witt's obviously biased coverage of Dellinger's speech.

First of all, Hill Hall seats approximately 600 to 700 people. Mr. Witt said the speech was attended by a "sparse audience of 300 persons." With all but approximately 150 seats in the auditorium filled, the crowd must have been closer to 500 people, as reported in other newspapers.

His story, secondly, was filled with mis-quotations. I realize that Mr. Witt was writing on a deadline and that taking notes on a speech such as Mr. Dellinger's is difficult, but in many places the whole point Mr. Dellinger was trying to make was blatantly misconstrued by Mr. Witt.

Thirdly, Mr. Dellinger is a draft resister. Granted he was convicted of "draft evasion" during World War II, but he had turned down a CO status and had served his three years. He did not try to evade anything. He chose to disobey the laws and he took his punishment.

I want to close by saying that I do not agree with what Mr. Dellinger says, but I defend his right to say it. And I find it somewhat difficult to believe that The Daily Tar Heel would purposely slant a news story so that it made an anti-war speaker look bad.

Non-objective news coverage by anyone, whether he stands on the political right or left, is a severe threat to the tradition of a free press in this country.

Bross Stein
Jones Ferry Rd.

The Daily Tar Heel
79 Years of Editorial Freedom
Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.
Lou Bonds News Editor
Rod Waldorf Associate Ed.
Glenn Brank Associate Ed.
Mark Whicker Sports Editor
Ken Ripley Feature Editor
Bob Chapman Natl. News Ed.
John Gellman Photo Editor
March Cheek Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.
Janet Bernstein Adv. Mgr.



Ken Ripley

Soul Food: what it means to be loving

"You do pretty good with love," one boy said this week. "But do you have to throw Christianity into it? I'd just as soon worship love—which is all life is about, anyway."

He echoed the sentiment of too many people I've talked to in the last few years—the idea that love is somehow separate from God and is the essential bedrock of life in its own right.

No doubt, many people try to worship the idea of love. It's easy to see how we can. Love is one of the strongest, deepest, most enduring of human emotions. We need love—to feel loved and to be loving. Life becomes sterile without the richness and warmth of loving relationships. Life becomes hateful without the compassion, the concern, the caring that love reflects. Love is perhaps the greatest gift of being

alive—and it is a gift that is eagerly sought.

But love is a gift of life, not life itself—be it romantic love or deep self-sacrificing love. And thus the center point of religion—and Christianity—is not the gift of love, but the origin of that gift. We can dismiss religions that do not involve love, because they fail to make sense in a world that does have love. But if we really are enthralled with the concept of love, then we've got to consider the different religions and their interpretations of love's origin.

There is a certain temptation to turn around John's famous comment that "God is love" to read "Love is God." But two things happen when we try.

First, we find ourselves searching after a meaningless concept. What value does

love as a principle have in itself? Can love by itself relate to other people, have compassion, make us whole? Love, faith, hate, and other abstract concepts mean nothing in themselves—they are only expressions of the person. What is significant about love is that there is someone who loves.

A good example is the love of a girl for a boy. What is more important to him? Is it that love is so great for the boy, or that a particular girl is loving him?

It seems to me that even those who hold love as their own "god," are actually worshipping it in the way people around them—including themselves—put love into action.

To a Christian, this idea of love being an expression from one person to another is important, just as significant as the

type of expression love is. The Christian believes that love is that type of positive concern and caring which by itself is a concept, and things don't love. Only people love, and that people love and are loved is important.

But secondly, when we substitute "Love is God" for "God is love" we miss the point of the entire Bible—that God is the source of love and to cut ourselves off from that source. This insight is not unique to Christianity. Other religions say the same.

It isn't too hard to see what happens when love is shut off. Selfishness, avarice, greed, and cruelty abound. Sometimes it seems that what is so amazing is not that men can be so unloving to others, but that men can be as loving as they are.

I won't separate love from

Christianity, because the whole Gospel message is rooted in love. "But God shows his love for us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us," Paul writes. The Bible points to the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross as the highest example of love—God's love for man. God, not love, has acted to reunite man with Himself through Jesus Christ. And it is to God, not the love He shows, that the Christian responds.

But if we can't have love without God, we can't have religion without love. Jesus told his disciples the greatest commandment he could give was to love God, but he added, "And a second is like it. You shall love your neighbor as yourself." Christians are told to put the love they have into action, or face just repudiation by a love-starved world.

For the Christian, putting love into action means more than an occasional "good deed" or an annual contribution to the missionary field. Love is reflected in what we do for others—the poor and oppressed as well as for our friends. It is reflected in the way we pursue our careers, the political beliefs we hold, the morality we advocate. Love may mean taking a stand, or making a sacrifice. But however it is expressed, love means more than saying "I love you." It means proving it. Christians' followers of Jesus Christ, not love, but unless Christian love is real, the world has every right to doubt the Christian message.

Love is a powerful gift of God. And as with all gifts, Christians must learn to share.