

THE JOURNAL



What's A B.C.A.?

by j. charles autrey

Through a well-timed whim of the powers-that-be, UNCC has been given the go-ahead to implement one of the most innovative degree programs in the southeast, it not the entire country. The Bachelor of Creative Arts, the result of several years planning by the Creative Arts faculty (and students to a lesser extent), is much more self-directed and unstructured than the usual academic fare.

Thus, the student himself is the single most important determining factor in his own education. There has been much rumor circulated about this program; and, until a few weeks ago, any real truths coming out of the muttering confines of Rowe were coated with a thick, aromatic layer of artistic bullshit.

To clear this smell, haze, several students and faculty members were talked to, and their responses presented a fair picture of the program, its problems and its possibilities.

A student enrolled in the B.C.A. will be working with problems that he identifies within the field of the arts with whatever interests him. Part of the philosophy behind the B.C.A. program is that library and audio-visual resources ought to be as important as classroom activity, and that relevance is significant to the point that it will be useful to the student later in his life, and that creativity is an individual process.

The most commonly known and discussed fact about the B.C.A. is that there will be no classes as such. There will be seminars held at the discretion of faculty and/or students held at times when a group of students can gain from group activity as opposed to individual work. These seminars will form at the times when there is a need seen for them; they will terminate when they cease to be valuable.

Along this same line, there will be no grades or credit hours either. The B.C.A. student will not have general degree requirements of minimum

April fool's issue questioned

analysis

by j. charles autrey

Human Decency, Motherhood, and other aspects of the Great American Dream received another setback Friday, April 14, when the PUB Board refused to chastize the Journal for alleged "flagrant abuses" of free press in several recent issues of the publication. The Board meeting was convened after a recent WSOC editorial by Freeman R. Jones and a petition signed by 27 students in the Engineering department accusing the Journal of a multitude of sins, came to the Administration's and the Board's attention.

The meeting began at 11:30 a.m. with a prepared statment from Vice Chancellor McEniry's office read by Miss Bonnie Cone, who later left to introduce someone at a luncheon. Though veiled in layers of bombasm, innuendo, and patronizing concern, the V-C's message was clear enough. There was much talk of "abused freedoms" and being "lascivious without redeeming social value." Freedom of the press the statement seemed to say, is okay as long as the Journal sees fit not to exercise it. The statement urged the Journal to return to its vehicular function as a community bulletin board and implied that if it didn't, it would find itself with no funds.

Afterwards, Sanskrit Editor-in-Doubt Michael Dobson asked Chairman (Advisor) Perzel why this matter wasn't brought to the Board's attention previously, as Miss Cone and Dr. Perzel answered that they had received many complaints before. Perzel answered that the Board could not act until there was a written complaint or the Board decided to investigate a situation by itself. The first written complaint he received was a petition signed by 27 students of Dr. Davis, a professor in the Engineering department.

At this point, Dobson requested that the Board go into executive session and dispense with the people of the press, particularly the cameramen who were milling around, distracting the board members with lights, clicks, and buzzes. Michael McCulley, former editor of the Journal and invited to speak in his own behalf, rebuked Dobson, saying that outside agitation caused the inquiry, so the press should be allowed to remain. After member Dean Duncan reminded the board that an executive session might be illegal, Dobson sat alone when the board voted 6-1 against his motion.

With that resolved, Dr. Perzel threw the floor open to discussion on the matter at hand - what to do about the irascible rumblings emanating from the muddy furtive and perverted confines of the Journal's offices.

It was discovered that the petition-signers may have been coerced by an indignant Dr. Davis. So, the Board voted 5-3 to disregard the 27-name petition as not being representative of student opinion. Thus temporarily left without a reason to be in session, the board decided 8-0 to pursue the matter on its own initiative as it would look bad to have the matter dismissed on a technicality.

McCulley began his testimony by saying that there would be no apologies made by the Journal to anyone about the content of any edition, including the April Fool issue. He said that he didn't think that much weight should be given to Freeman R. Jones editorial as the University population doesn't reflect the composition of the outlying communities.

Just as students differ from the general populace their creative and journalistic outlets differ also. McCulley said that he felt that such experimentation was both good and necessary. The veiled threat of a funding cut-off in the Vice-Chancellor's statement, according to McCulley, would have to involve the curtailment of all student activities and activity fees. Any specific cutoff of funds to the paper by the Board of Trustees for the stated reasons would amount to censorship and would be patently illegal.

Following McCulley's statement, a discussion ensued concerning a case at N.C. Central where funds to a student paper were specifically cut off because of the publication's refusal to accept ads from white businessmen. To Perzel, this ruling seemed to prove that a paper could be censored specifically, but McCulley pointed out that the paper in question had broken the Civil Rights Act, whereas the Journal had merely exercised its part of the First Amendment, which is not a crime as yet.

Sanskrit editor Dobson favored the Board taking an idealistic stand, neither upholding nor chastizing the Journal, but recognizing its right to exist unfettered and uncensored.

Member Dr. Sinclair, from the Philosophy Dept., wanted to know what the students themselves thought about the paper's recent policies. It turned out that

WVFN had taken a 24-person telephone poll on the matter and it turned out that feelings were evenly split about the paper's merits, but practically no one wanted the publication censored.

It was pointed out that it was practically impossible to get a decent sampling of student opinion as only 783 out of 4700 students cared enough to vote in the election of the editor.

In a grim meeting otherwise infested by a bad case of Drooping Eyelids, and Tight Lips, a few heads turned when Michael Dobson turned against the consensus by criticizing the Journal for its mediocrity but at the same time saying that bad taste isn't subject to legislation.

Then, unexpectedly, McCulley, looking as if he was preparing for confession, entertained the board with a dissertation on what THE BULLSHIT APRIL FOOL EDITION WAS ALL ABOUT.

The crowd hushed expectantly as if waiting for manna. He explained that the April Fool's edition was only a concentrated version of the bullshit he had been printing all year, and that it followed in the sacred tradition of Harvard Lampoon by providing a much needed comic relief before exam and term-paper time. He said that he thought that the April Fool's and all other editions of the Journal

(continued on page two)

Dobson petition denied

by bill holder

On the night of Monday, April 17 the Student Superior Court met to hear the controversial case concerning the recent Sanskrit election. The election committee had previously ruled that Michael Dobson used unfair and illegal campaign measures in the election campaign of March 8 and 9. They ruled that this could have given Dobson and unfair advantage that thus netted the seven votes that won him the election.

The court met to rule on Dobson's petition. Dobson, in his petition, asked that the Election Board's decision be reversed and that he be rewarded compensation for his time and "worry."

In part Dobson's petition stated, "Michael E. Dobson is confirmed as Editor of Sanskrit for the school year of 1972-1973, and all rights, privileges, duties, and obligations of that office are confirmed in his name."

Dobson faced Duncan in the court Monday night to argue for his petition. Dean Duncan was the defeated candidate in the Sanskrit election and had subsequently failed a complaint against Dobson's practices in the election.

Chief Justice Vickie Hinson presided over the proceedings. The proceedings themselves were somewhat comical as it became more of a debate between Dobson and the defense than a formal court. A long time was taken for heavy laden discussion on whether the complaint had been filed formally or not.

The defense argued that Dobson had placed a sign illegally on the window of the dorm cafeteria in his campaign. This is forbidden by the publicity laws. Dobson countered that

his staff had placed the sign without his knowledge or consent. And that further, the defense continued, Dobson had used recent issues of Sanskrit for the making of signs. Dobson again contended that his staff had used these materials without his awareness. Several of his staff members confirmed this.

The court was recessed while the judges deliberated for almost ninety minutes. The ruling of the court was that:

1) "The campaign staff is acting for and is a representative of that candidate. Therefore all candidates are responsible for their campaign staff concerning election procedures."

2) "The Election Board has original jurisdiction in all matters concerning election of students, this includes publicity."

3) "The Student Superior Court is in agreement with the ruling of the Election Board that Mr. Duncan may have been placed at an unfair advantage by illegal publicity... Thus the Election Board is upheld in its ruling and the election will proceed as called for by the Elections Committee."

Another election will thus be held between Dobson and Duncan, April 19th and 20th. Dobson was also charged with five dollars court cost.

Dobson made a statement afterwards. "I was somewhat expecting the decision of the court, but I had not lost all my faith in human nature and felt that they could rule otherwise. I will appeal the case to the University Court and seek an injunction to halt the upcoming election until that body makes its decision."

Topless club

An interesting item appeared in the minutes of last week's Student Legislature meeting. A motion was made by legislator Boone Wayson and seconded by Charlie Kelly which would provide our harried legislators with a well deserved break from the strenuous burdens of the offices.

The motion read, "I move that \$160.00 be allocated to the Topless Club to take a trip through Charlotte's leading night clubs. And if there is an

overwhelming demand, the girl's dorm will be renamed to Billy the Kid #2." The motion passed 8 to 1.

A second motion, introduced by Fish Foster and seconded by Ron Young read, "I move that a copy of the Topless Bill be sent to the student media and the Charlotte Observer and

News." This motion was defeated 12 to 1.

The Journal invites the members of the Topless Club to submit an account of their experiences for publication in the next issue - watch this space for developments. There is strong reason to suspect that they were only kidding.

