

DTH Editorial Page

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.

A Year In Retrospect: What We Have Learned

Second of Three Parts

Yesterday we examined briefly the motivations and attitudes which bring individuals to the editorship of The Daily Tar Heel, concluding that out of the routine duties associated with the post come the experiences which contribute to the growth, maturity and understanding of those who hold the job. Now we turn to glance backward over some of our experiences of the past twelve months, in an attempt to assess some of the most important in terms of what we have learned.

When we assumed this post a year ago, we attempted to make clear our intention to dedicate The Daily Tar Heel to the dual purposes of leadership and service. The extent to which we have succeeded in that intention is for you alone to judge.

Naturally, we have attempted constantly to assess our own performance as the year has progressed, and our most consistent barometer has been the "feedback" of student opinion. Now, as we attempt to balance the ledger of mutual understanding for our term, we are extremely gratified to find a significant sum of public response on the credit side.

This is not to say that we have been continually successful or right or well-received; we haven't, and for that we are also grateful. Many times our readers have pointed out our errors or demonstrated their displeasure with our point of view, so that in the end both the paper and the student body have profited from an exchange of ideas and opinions. Needless to say, we too have gained much from this interchange, and if our horizons are wider and our opinions more flexible today than a year ago, much of the thanks must go to those who saw fit to object and criticize.

In evaluating the response of the University community to our efforts, certain key issues naturally come to mind. Our thoughts return, for example, to the controversial "student poll" which was on - again, off - again for a period of two weeks last spring. The student body wanted a poll; we felt they should have it. But in the end, the majority took a giant step toward learning to live with defeat when the Constitutional Council said "no."

In the opening days of this academic year, the student body made our hearts warmer when 5,000 turned out for a pep rally which we co-sponsored with Student Government, and all of us learned a little more about what the "Carolina spirit" really is.

Shortly thereafter, one of the most disappointing chapters in the year's chronicle occurred when we discovered that Negro students were the victims of flagrant discrimination in housing assignments. With the aid of Student Government, and with your support, the discriminatory policy was struck down, and we all learned a little about justice.

Our next venture out on a limb was to endorse Dan Moore and Lyndon Johnson, decision which seemed to rate general understanding and approval. We then fought in favor of NSA, and it was gratifying indeed to find that a majority of our fellow students agreed with us that our NSA affiliation should not be the victim of prejudice, lies and hatred.

By the time the "James Gardner incident" exploded into the headlines,

our editorial policy concerning this University was clear: we would protect it against every threat which seemed capable of undermining its foundations of responsible inquiry, progressive leadership for the state, and service. In retrospect, it may seem that we were unduly harsh with Mr. Gardner; but as one who chose to personify certain circumstances which we felt to be irresponsible and potentially damaging to the University — including unfounded accusation and unrestrained public protest — Mr. Gardner made himself the focal point of an entire University's concern.

Time has not dimmed our initial judgment that Mr. Gardner's "protest" was unwarranted and ill - conceived. Yet there is one outgrowth of his and his supporters' actions that deserves mention; namely, the Free Speech Forum.

We have long believed that this entire University is a type of "forum" for free speech, and Mr. Gardner's abortive rally proved as much. Yet it is clear that for many students this freedom is uninvested capital which draws no interest in an intellectual bank. Aside from the vocal leadership of the student body, there is little constant evidence of the existence of this University-wide forum, and the majority voice is heard only when its rights are threatened, its pocketbooks touched or its biological urges aroused.

Intellectual growth demands more than that one simply stand up for his beliefs when the chips are down; those beliefs must be constantly discussed and appraised if they are to be worth defending in the ultimate crisis. So long as the beliefs of the majority lie dormant without assertion, apathetic has more than a touch of validity as a descriptive term for many students on this campus.

A Free Speech Forum as a regularly scheduled series of discussion is superfluous on this campus, for the opportunity to speak is constant. What is needed is a new motivation on the part of the "Carolina gentleman" and the "typical Carolina coed" to exercise their mental faculties more often, rather than putting the task off on Student Government and other leaders.

By watching the "James Gardner incident," then, perhaps we all learned how NOT to stage a responsible protest and how important it is for everyone to make himself heard.

Finally, we appreciate your collective decision to hear us out in the matter of next year's Daily Tar Heel. We supported Ernie McCrary because we knew he was the most qualified and interested candidate, not because we were certain that he would continue our editorial policies or try to imitate us. Under his guidance, the paper will certainly change, as indeed it should. The personality of the editor is reflected throughout the pages of each edition, and we neither expect nor encourage Ernie to follow our example in every instance.

The confidence placed in Ernie and in us by his election is perhaps the most pleasing aspect of our year. For every outgoing editor has no greater concern than that the temperamental will of the people provide a capable and strong leader for the coming year.

In summary, there are many other issues of the past year which merit discussion. One of these, the Speaker Ban, will be our primary topic tomorrow. As for the others, perhaps they will be lost in the void of time; perhaps they will be aroused for future debate; perhaps the shifting fortunes of history will bring them to some ultimate climax. Whatever their fate, they are the testimony to our passage through this institution and this era, and we have found it challenging to deal with each of them.

Thank you for your attention and your support.



"Right Of Way"

Letters Knock Governor, Council

Elections Board Has A Defender

Editors, The Tar Heel:

During all the furor and chaos of elections night, congratulations were given to many for a job well done, but few remembered to give credit to Bill Schmidt, chairman of the Elections Board. Without his tireless efforts much of the work which went into campus elections would never have been done. It certainly is a shame that when the March 30, 1965 editorial gave public thanks to Bill, it did it in such a grudging and half - hearted manner.

It now appears that there are many "Carolina Coeds and Gentlemen" who are of the opinion that the Elections Board acted in a cautious, irresponsible, and careless manner. Perhaps the job performed by the Board was not perfect, but is anyone? One must realize that there were only 15 of us to handle a campus - wide election with many thousand ballots.

If our fellow students would stop mud - slinging and devote a little time to improving our elections system, perhaps their "valuable" efforts might prevent this so - called "mis-handling" of campus elections from ever occurring again.

Barbara Bell
Elections Board,
1964-65
200 C Nurses Dorm

to do too well. It was quite amusing - and heartening - to have President Johnson and Lt. Gov. Scott (both far more progressive than Moore) outpoll him. So I doubt sometimes if Gov. Moore can accurately feel the pulse of the people of North Carolina.

Another dandy idea of Moore is to be cautious - wait AT LEAST another two years for a higher education bond issue. He prefers waiting because the highway bond issue is coming up for a vote. No one will dispute the validity of the highway bond issue, but the need for money for higher education is RIGHT NOW, not sometime in the distant future.

Highways can be built anytime, but it is very difficult to get someone to go to school when they are 25 because they were denied the opportunity at 18 due to lack of state funds. I thought that education was the number one priority of the Moore Administration. Apparently by the way Moore speaks, and the way the State legislature cuts down educational appropriations, somebody is making a lot of hollow promises.

It is a shame that North Carolina will have to wait until January, 1969, when hopefully Robert Scott will move into the Governor's Mansion, to have a governor committed to progress like Luther Hodges and Terry Sanford were.

It's going to be a long wait.

Robert Farb
318 Teague

Moore Refuses To Take Stand

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Governor Dan Moore's comments to the N. C. Editorial Writers' Conference this past Friday deserve rebuttal.

In believing it unwise on the part of the University to advocate repeal of the Speaker Ban Law, Moore said: "I believe if you put that thing up to a popular vote today . . . it would be overwhelmingly the law." The fact that the majority of the people might be for the Speaker Ban is probably what deters Moore from urging repeal.

It is most likely that privately he is against it and if he were a student here today he would probably feel like most of us. However, Moore seems frightened by the idea of opposing a majority will.

Great leaders stand up for their principles whether they are in the majority or minority. Obviously, Gov. Moore is not a great leader, or does not care to stand up for his beliefs, or both. And for Gov. Moore to be able to understand how the people feel about anything, one need not look back past last November.

Moore thought that openly supporting President Johnson was a liability because he thought Johnson was not going

only four votes.

As a result, the election was contested by Kirstein, and the re - count the next day merely added to the confusion of the Election Board. Not only was there a miscout, but in addition it was discovered that ten ballots had been forged.

Kirstein found himself the proud possessor of ten additional votes marked on the "bullet ballots" of another candidate - in a different color ink! Our stealthy night visitor did not even take the trouble to be subtle! Kirstein was absolved of all blame, but the contest for the fourth seat was still unsettled.

Chaos obviously reigned and it was understandable that the Elections Board should call for a re - election. But here lies the rub.

The Constitutional Council construed the election laws (Article IV, Section 2) to call for a re - election with all original candidates included, even the top three who had earlier achieved clear pluralities. On what possible grounds could the Council base its actions?

This body took advantage of the loosely worded election laws to turn the democratic process into a judicial farce. There is no clear thread of logic in this decision to include the apparent "winners".

It was a grave injustice to Brame, Blackwell and Shuff, who were now forced to continue their campaigns for seats to which they were rightfully entitled. In Shuff's case all his campaigning was to no avail.

Now, two weeks later, Shuff's election is reversed. Is this the will of the 142 people who voted for him on March 23? Is it the wish of the electorate that Wardlow, who finished fifth originally with 132 votes, should lead all candidates the second time around with a meager 79 votes?

With whom should the responsibility for this situation lie? Obviously, the ultimate blame falls on the mysterious night visitor who took it upon himself to insure his candidate's election. But this is avoiding the question, since once the deed was done, its aftereffects were handled in a particularly amateur fashion.

The Elections Board exhibited a masterful lack of concern for the protection of the ballot boxes on the night of the election. The General Election Laws also need to be re - written, or at least drastically devised to delete vague clauses.

But even the haziness of the regulations cannot excuse the illogical decision handed down by the Constitutional Council.

Given this unfortunate situation, partial blame must rest with the Daily Tar Heel for the absence of the necessary coverage of the re - election. Less than half as many voters turned out on April 6 to re - vote. The lack of sufficient publicity must be the major explanation for the poor voter participation. Noting the sweeping changes in

Playboy Interview Disgrace To Art

By ART BUCHWALD

The New York Herald Tribune

I was interviewed in Playboy this month and it's amazing how many people read it. You think Playboy only appeals to college boys and traveling salesmen, but it's just not so.

The day after the article appeared, I came home and my wife was waiting. "Your interview is in Playboy,"

"Who told you?" I asked.

"Joan Conway."

"What's she doing reading Playboy?"

"That's not the point. Joel had the magazine and he was showing it to all his friends at school when the teacher caught him. It was bad enough to have the magazine, but when he said the reason he had it was because his father was in it, the teacher didn't know what to do."

"It's not my fault," I protested.

The phone rang and my wife answered it. "Yes, I know, Marion. Joan called me about it. No, I didn't see the other pictures. Thanks for calling."

"Marion Dalinsky saw it, too," she said.

The phone rang again "Hello, Mary. I can't talk now. He's home. I don't know what I'm going to do about it. I'll call you later."

"Mary Lindsay has a copy," she said.

"Boy, Playboy has an interesting readership," I muttered.

My son came running in. "Vickie won't give me back my Playboy," he cried.

Really Shocked

Vickie is our cook. She came in a moment later. "My goodness, Mr. Buchwald, my friends are really shocked. They never thought I'd work for anyone whose picture would appear in Playboy."

"What's wrong with the pic-

ture? I've got all my clothes on."

"But nobody else has," Vickie replied.

The phone rang again. It was Polly Kraft, who happened to pick up the magazine in the drugstore, etc.

My wife said she'd call her back.

"I don't see why everyone should be so shook up because I happened to be in Playboy."

"It's a cool magazine," my son said.

"There's your answer," my wife said. "How can I keep him in line when you're posing with a bunch of nude girls?"

"I wasn't posing with nude girls. I was in the front of the book and they were in the back. My article doesn't touch the 'Playmate of the Month' even when you fold it way out."

"You probably were there when they took the pictures of the 'Playmate.'"

"I wasn't anywhere near when they took that picture."

This time when the phone rang I answered it. It was my mother - in - law. When she heard my voice, she shouted, "Lecher!"

"I'm not a lecher!" I shouted back.

"Sex fiend!"

"Mom, will you calm down and say what's on your mind?"

"Tell my daughter I have room for her and the children."

"That's nice," I said.

"The town's in a state of shock," she cried. "You can't get a copy of the magazine anywhere. I bought the last five copies they had."

"I'll send the family in the morning."

"What are you going to do?" she demanded.

"I'm moving in with five bunnies. Playboy takes care of its own."

answer single items on this test. As often as not he is interested in problems that are not directly associated with college or college - age people.

On the other hand he may be very concerned with the possibility of detecting people who are likely to have emotional difficulties requiring treatment (work in this line is well under way). How many of us wish we would have known ahead of time that a friend or acquaintance was going to "go off the deep end"?

The researcher may be attempting to isolate the personality characteristics of non-graduates who do better or poorer than expected on the basis of college boards, in order to help counsel high school students on whether or not to go to college, or on what college to attend (there are already some reliable findings on this problem).

He may be interested in problems less related to practical application (for instance, what personality characteristics change most on this test, or to "way out" practical applications (there is a scale that will make a good professional baseball player)).

The important point is the use to which such findings are put. It would be ludicrous for the Giants to turn down a prospect who has been hitting .350 in the minors, or to fire Willie Mays, because either of them did not do well enough on the test. It would be equally ludicrous to turn down a high school valedictorian because his MMPI score wasn't what one might expect.

Test results of this sort are intended to supplement other more direct indices of a person's behavior. They are meant to help allay or preclude difficulties, or to help direct people to fulfill their potentials as human beings. In order to do so, items relating to many facets of human experience (religion, sex, work preference, feelings of anxiety, etc.) must be used.

There is absolutely no judgmental factor in their use. No implicit preferences for certain kinds of people are acted on when the MMPI is examined. Essential to this use as supplementary tool is the idea that such a test is used to predict behavior. Should it be used as a screening device, it will do so in proportion as the empirical findings substantiate its use in this manner. Then it may be possible, in the college setting, to anticipate a student's behavior with the purpose of helping him, his fellow students and the university.

It seems to me that N. C. State recently would have done well to have had a way of anticipating or more quickly detecting the pyromaniac who levelled a part of their campus. It is conceivable that the MMPI, or a similar instrument, may be found useful in detecting just such people.

Peter David Krones
Dept. of Psychology

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

Second Class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester; \$8.00 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.