

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, October 30, 1971

The Daily Tar Heel Awards of the Week

It's A High Frying Flag Award: to the U.S. Court of Appeals, which last week upheld the six-month sentence of an eighteen-year-old youth for "desecrating the American flag." The youth committed the atrocity of cutting a V-shaped peace sign in a miniature flag. A small sentence for a small flag.

The Slanted View Award: to U.S. Senators, who have threatened to cut down funding of countries voting against the U.S. resolution to keep Taiwan in the United Nations.

The Put Off Until Tomorrow What You Can't Do Today Award: to the 77 women, who took part in testing the "morning-after" pregnancy prevention pill with 100 per cent success. Of the pill, that is.

The Boy Did You Get A Wrong Number Award: to Committee of Concerned Athletes chairman Bill Richardson, whose telephone number is listed in the new

directory as "c/o Football Office."

The Put On The Blakes Award: to Chapel Hill Police Chief W.D. Blake, who announced police will begin issuing citations instead of warnings to bicycle riders violating state traffic ordinances. Ride on, Chief.

The Eat, Drink And Pray To Mary Award: to Chapel Hill Aldermen, who revoked a city ordinance prohibiting the sale of beer on Sundays.

The Great Bumpkin Award: to N.C. Governor Bob Scott, who changed the date of Halloween from Sunday to today. Having almost succeeded in restructuring our Universities, Governor Bob is undertaking restructuring the entire calendar year.

The Community Chess Award: to the Chicago Board of Education, which ordered Susan Solomon, 15, dropped from her high school chess team because of a rule barring women from interscholastic competition.

The Sweet Sixteen, Never Been Kissed Award: to Virginia State Attorney General Andrew P. Miller who said Thursday a 16-year-old girl does not need her parents' consent to undergo sterilization surgery.

The Free Howie Carr Award: to DTH columnist, assistant sports editor and sometimes martyr Howie Carr, who filled in the biography section of a Hearst contest entry blank thusly: "I was born January 17, 1952, of poor but honest Irish immigrants in the teeming slums of Brooklyn. You grow up quickly in the junkie-infested tenements, and I was no exception."

Howie ended with: "I was a choirboy at St. Ignatius of the Prolonged Suffering and Goopy Death" and "my social life has been more or less restricted to the Omega Delta house where I am currently serving as Pig Night social chairman." — Howard Louis Carr.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.

Doug Hall News Editor

Lou Bonds Associate Ed.

Lana Starnes Associate Ed.

Mark Whicker Sports Ed.

Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Paddi Hughes Adv. Mgr.

Ken Ripley

Soul Food: don't flaunt religion

It seems axiomatic that most of us like to show off, but I seriously doubt if Jesus would ever say, "If you've got it, flaunt it."

Christians believe that God is real, that He is active in the lives of men, and that Jesus Christ can make a significant difference in people's lives. Christians believe that the Bible is not just a book we use on Sunday to talk about something that affects only our "religious" instincts. To a Christian, the Bible offers relevant insights into human nature that affect all we are, do and say.

And Christians, being human and caring about those people around them, like to talk about their faith. And where Christians once were silent, afraid to talk about Jesus Christ, more Christians on campus today are no longer afraid to share a God so meaningful to them. Christianity, so long driven underground on campus, is surfacing again as an intelligent and viable alternative to the way we now live.

Christians should be free and willing to talk about their faith. "Always be prepared to make a defense to any one

who calls you to account for the hope that is in you." Peter urged, "yet do it with gentleness and reverence."

He might have added one other qualification—use a little common sense. The writer of Ecclesiastes did note, however, "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak."

Sometimes it isn't easy to tell, for any of us. We don't have to be a Christian to put our feet in our collective mouths. We like to show off what we know, and classes are often deadened by the student who has to tell all he knows in one class period.

The problem for a Christian is to temper enthusiasm with "self-control." We can get so carried away about talking about Jesus that we "flaunt" our faith.

"I've got a so-called Christian in one of my classes," I was told a few days ago, "who has to bring up Christ and look up Bible quotes to read to the class every time the prof says something. Too much is too much. The class hates it. I'm a Christian, and I hate it."

Too much is too much. If Christianity

is relevant, it will be so without our trying to force it. If Christ is real in the Christian's life, his life should reflect it. Christians should "always be prepared to make a defense (or explanation)" for what makes them tick, but we don't need to wear sandwich boards that say, "I am a Christian."

True faith does not depend on words to show itself, and Jesus spoke bluntly about those who advertised their faith without delivering.

"Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven," Jesus said, "but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven."

"Beware of practicing your piety before men in order to be seen by them," Jesus exhorted. Christians were not to show off their righteousness but to be righteous. "Little children," John wrote, "Let us not love in word or speech but in deed and in truth."

Jesus did not proclaim his own relationship with God except to glorify God. He did not trumpet his own virtues to gain attention. Jesus was a "preacher," but he did not drag God into every

sentence to "make" God relevant—he spoke to the subject and "when" God was relevant, he said so. Jesus shared his message. He did not flaunt it.

And Jesus did not just talk about God. His life reflected God. He did not just say, "Forgive." He forgave. He did not just say, "Be perfect." He was. He did not just say, "Lay down your life for your brother." He did, and it is because of what he did—not just what he said—that Christianity exists today for all men.

Christians today, the "ambassadors for Christ," are looked at not only for what they say but for what they are. And what are people to think when they see Christians "flaunting" their faith, speaking without sensitivity, advertising their Lord without coming through with the evidence? Rejection is a terrible feeling, especially when we've asked for it.

"He who hears you hears me," Jesus said, "and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me."

Bob Lenski

New coastline highway absurd

Still another environmental battlefield appears to be taking shape in North Carolina — this time in an unspoiled section of the Outer Banks. If I didn't know better, I would say the whole thing is absurd to worry about.

Can you imagine building a 17-mile state highway, possibly four lanes wide, along a virtually uninhabited beach, to provide access for a village of 17 people? Can you imagine wasting \$1.7 million of the taxpayers' money (excluding the cost of purchasing the right of way) to build such a road, when only a few of the villagers even want the access — and when others came to the village specifically for

its isolation?

You probably can't. It takes a rare imagination to anticipate what our modern highwaymen, and other despoilers of nature, will attempt next. Because we have permitted them to perpetrate such atrocities in the past, they have begun to believe they can get away with anything. And they'll be right — unless the public begins to assert itself.

If, after reading this article, you are disturbed, take a few minutes to write Governor Scott, and state Attorney General Robert Morgan (Attorney General's Office, Raleigh, N.C.), the official directly concerned with the

possible illegality of this supposedly "public works" project.

The road our Highway Commission is considering would run north from the tiny town of Duck (8 mi. north of Kitty Hawk) to the microscopic town of Corolla. Today, only four-wheel drive vehicles and boats can reach Corolla's 17 inhabitants, which has prompted area Highway Commissioner Joe W. Nowell, Jr. to tell the Raleigh News and Observer, "I think we owe these people an access in and out." Others, voicing similar sentiments, carefully ignore the fact that Corolla's residents, as a group, are neutral on the subject.

Twenty-five thousand dollars of state money is currently being spent to survey for a 200-foot (four lane) right of way along the ocean side of the bank which, ecologically, is the wrong side. A number of people appear eager to see such a road built, but oddly, only a couple of them live in Corolla.

The traditional legal justification for public spending on roads is to provide access for residents. Obviously there are other considerations involved here. They are:

1. The finances of three beach front property owners. They control more than two-thirds of the land through which the proposed road would go, and can expect its value to increase 100-fold should the highway be built at your expense.

2. The enrichment of Currituck County. The county commissioners scarcely care what kind of ecologically unsound development takes place along their beach, as long as the state finances it and it increases the county's property tax revenues.

3. The perpetuation of the highway industry. The highwaymen realize that an increasing number of North Carolinians are coming to the conclusion the state will soon have highways enough. Self-interest leads them to oppose the public interest.

State Highway Commission Chairman Lauch Faircloth recently said there are no plans for proceeding with construction following the survey. Yet on September

8, the Commission's public information office released this statement: "The route is now being surveyed and as soon as that is completed, about Dec. 1, a public hearing will be held in the area and the purchase of right of way can start. It could go to contract next year, highway engineers said."

Regardless of the Highway Commission's true intentions, there are a number of people who are determined to see the road built. If even a dozen people who read this will express their determination that the road not be built—at least not with their money—it could lead to something.

Attorney General Robert Morgan is the man to write. In September 1969, in connection with a proposal to build a highway to privately owned Bald Head Island, he stated, "It does not appear to be a general policy of the Highway Commission to build highways through lands owned by an individual or corporation for the purpose of developing lands." He suggested that the legality of such a highway would be "questionable."

Let's be certain that he, and other officials, make public pronouncements on this highway as well.

Letters to the editor

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.

Letters to the editor

Prescribed distribution of grades is unjustified

To the editor:

Why are we here? We students are here to obtain an education, a specialized preparation for our ultimate goals in life. The faculty and administration are here, not to give away that education, but to make every effort, to provide every possibility, that we might achieve it. Then is there any justification whatever for a prescribed grade distribution to which a graduate instructor, helpless to authoritarian powers above him, and the students must be subjected? Such a prescription denies the possibility of success to an undetermined number of students.

Based on a normal curve, a required grade distribution for a class assumes that the class is truly representative of a universal population. The class in question, however, is not. It is a course in educational history, and it is limited to persons who are education majors. Immediately any "normality" of the class population is destroyed. I am not convinced that the performance of my section will duplicate a non-majors' section without statistically significant deviation.

I do not overlook the possibility that the required curve may not be "normal." It was, in fact, not described as such; it was only noted that there exists a prescribed distribution of the final grades for that class. If the department gods have taken into consideration the obvious and subtle differences between classes, upon what do they base their curves? And if their rationale seems sound, I am unimpressed.

In the sense broader than that of fulfilling a requirement, I am in the course to learn. Everyone there is there to learn what he can, not to compete against the others. If the course is taught well, if the students work well and learn all that is defined as objectives for the course, nothing should prevent them from their rightful grades. Yet there is a blocking force, and it does one of two things. It proves we have been lied to all along: Not everyone, only a given percentage of a group relative to itself, may receive an education. Or it requires that teachers teach poorly, such that some of the students through confusion, faulty instruction and personal prejudice do not attain their proper level of success. Why are we here?

I humbly submit this short piece as an outraged attack upon an abomination, and in defense of my instructor, my impressions of what education should be, and my personal liberty to pursue and to succeed at what I have begun.

Name withheld by request

'Fiddler' show was enjoyable

To the editor:

Having just read, with some interest and growing disgust, the remarks of a Mr. Saltzman concerning last weekend's offering of "Fiddler on the Roof," I am convinced that something in the man's childhood experience must have created a

certain bitterness . . . a bitterness that he has chosen to spew forth, blatantly, onto the heads of the innocent cast of the production.

Saltzman's remarks were not the first unfavorable utterances I had seen in the paper. An earlier review had pointed out certain strengths and weaknesses, which, while I disagreed with some of the negative musings, still seemed to be basically fair, honest and objectively stated.

But Mr. Saltzman has jumped into this thing feet first — as opposed to head first — and the inevitable result is that his letter sounds more like a swift kick than a rational observation. He seems to lodge a one man vendetta against alleged atrocities of the stage . . . it's almost as if he took the entire effort as a personal affront. One gets the image of the cast meeting secretly backstage prior to the opening curtain, gleefully plotting to offend all theatre goers, Saltzman in particular.

I attended the same Sunday evening performance that Saltzman found so distasteful, and oddly enough I was thoroughly entertained. I thought the cast showed considerable joy in their steps and motion, and I laughed right out loud at several of Sid Rancer's lines. I even stood, along with scores of other theatre goers, and applauded at the end of the performance.

Of course, I do not pretend to be Chapel Hill's authority on dramatic art, orchestral direction, or the Tora, but even such a novice as myself can see that what Saltzman lacks in discretion he makes up

for in vehemence.

Saltzman gave his address as being 106 Ackland Art Center. He did not make it clear whether he lives there or simply works there. In any event, I'm sure that such cultural surroundings qualify him as critic. But, even coming from the bowels of Ackland Art Center, the letter still seems unfair.

Perhaps my difference in opinion comes from the variance of perspective. After all, I stayed through the entire performance and Saltzman writes that he "walked out."

I suppose it remains to conjecture whether Saltzman's opinions are shared by the majority of those attending the performance. I doubt it.

But to show that I'm not bitter, I'd like to extend best wishes for continued mastery in dramatic criticism to 106 Ackland Art Center.

Mitch Simpson
300 S. Columbia St.

Rent increase not necessary

To the editor:

Mr. Kepner:
As to your latest whim of intelligence, allow me to congratulate you. I agree, a rent increase is warranted.

I assume that this rent increase will be used to augment the existing colonies of ants that now abound in dormitory rooms. Or perhaps the rent increase will

go into building new and better dormitories which will be necessary in the future due to overcrowding, for overcrowding has become so much a part of college life here at UNC. After all, if people survive tiger cages, then crowded dormitory rooms must be considered a luxury, and of course it follows that students do not need closet space, dressers or desks that were promised them. O yes, we were given a bed.

Mr. Kepner, I do not know whether you have ever had to live in old dormitory rooms with concrete beams making the ceiling only five feet high. Perhaps you have never seen the one inch accumulation of dirt that lies under our beds. But we live here, in these miserable conditions, and now you find that our rent is not enough. Please tell us what you have done with the money that students in overcrowded rooms have paid. Or have you forgotten that a refund is due to us?

I hereby challenge you to live in our room for a period of one week, and at the end to declare, with a clear conscience, that a room rent increase is necessary and just.

Carlos A. Suarez
409 Manly

Individual must decide morals

To the editor:

This letter is in reply to Mr.

James Feagin
240 Morrison