

# The Daily Tar Heel

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. ERNIE McCrARY, EDITOR

## DTH Awards Of The Week

**Lizard of the Week:** Anybody with something nice to say about Duke.

★ ★ ★

**Good Guys of the Week:** Graham Memorial Director Howard Henry and his staff who were responsible for salvaging part of the weekend with Louis Armstrong Saturday night and the Supremes Sunday.

★ ★ ★

**Most Amazing Fact of the Week:** The city of Tokyo now has 5,569,143 males and 5,292,707 females.

★ ★ ★

**Contest of the Week:** Car-packing contest at Southern Methodist University, where 37 squirming girls stuffed themselves into a four-door sedan — with the doors closed. Unfortunately they did not break the collegiate record of 38 in a car.

★ ★ ★

**Cops of the Week:** Paris police who ruled that a woman found dead in her apartment two months ago committed suicide. This was her condition: Bound hand and foot, gagged and pinned to the floor with a Japanese dagger through her back. They even made a film to show how it was possible.

★ ★ ★

**Driver of the Week:** The Wood River, Ill., girl who, desiring to listen to the car radio, turned the ignition. She turned it the wrong way, the motor started and the car ran through two yards and slammed into a porch. She said she tried to put the brake on, but it turned out that she had her foot on the accelerator.

★ ★ ★

**Poll of the Week:** First Union National Bank's poll of customer opinion of above-the-knee skirts. Results: 83 per cent of the women said the skirts just won't do, 46 per cent of the men agreed, teenage girls were evenly divided on the issue and teenage boys favored short skirts 63 per cent to 37.

★ ★ ★

**Quote of the Week:** Comment on a Charlotte girl-watcher about the results of that skirt poll just mentioned. He said, "I'm shocked, but you must remember that North Carolinians have a habit of drinking wet and voting dry."

★ ★ ★

**Crook of the Week:** The bandit who walked into a San Francisco bank Thursday, showed a gun and said "Give me all your money." The woman teller just smiled and he ran out the door.

## Nobody Is Safe

If this keeps up, they might as well outlaw automobiles.

Safety councils advise drivers to stay off the roads during heavy-traffic holiday periods. And don't drive in bad weather, they say.

Don't drive when you're sleepy — pull off the road and take a nap, they command. And certainly don't drive after taking "stay-awake" pep pills.

Of course nobody but a fool would get behind the wheel after having a nip of holiday spirits.

But now the Greater New York Safety Council has issued this statement, "Overeating produces a condition of torpor that leads to traffic accidents for motorists and pedestrians. If you indulge in heavy eating, don't go into traffic for at least two hours."

So now you ought to stay home if you eat too much.

No wonder the highways are so dangerous these days.

# The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Ernie McCrary, editor; John Jennrich, associate editor; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thomas, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobol, ad. mgr.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. 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.



David Rothman

## A Satirist's Nightmare

Nearly all good satirists have unhappy childhoods, according to Art Buchwald. Throughout my entire life, I'd been very happy, and with that in mind I asked my editor to drop my column.

"Please," I begged. "I'm really entirely incapable of turning out decent work. I never wet my bed. I did well in kindergarten. I was popular with my peers. And I would have fainted had anybody suggested I run away from home like Buchwald."

"Well, Rothman," the editor declared, "you may have had a happy childhood at home, but there's absolutely no reason why you can't have a miserable one at college."

I wouldn't have listened to him, except he threatened to burn up all my comic books.

The next step was a talk with Buchwald when he came to Raleigh. I threatened to libel him in *The Daily Tar Heel* if he didn't share his trade secrets.

So the nationally syndicated humorist gave them to me, and I libeled him anyway.

After the column got started, everybody began interpreting my message differently. Among those who offered the most expert analysis were the members of the psychology department.

The truth, of course, is that I wrote serious columns and depended on the printer to make them funny by throwing in a few typographical errors.

Naturally, fame did bring its complications. Once, for instance, I stopped by Paul Dickson's office while doing a news assignment. "What is your name please?" the secretary asked.

"David Rothman," I proudly proclaimed.

"Are you sure that's your only name?"

"Pretty sure."

"Well, I don't think you're telling the truth. That face looks fairly familiar. Are you certain you're not the student whose identity card photo I found on the floor of the Lenoir Hall ladies' room?"

And then there was the time I thought somebody was holding the door for me.

"Thanks," I complacently oozed.

"The hell I held that door open for you!" the somebody replied. Whereupon he slammed it in my face.

"You'll have a paranoid on your staff if this keeps up," I advised my editor.

He grinned and said my misery would help me become a better satirist.

From that point on, the editor did his best to make my life as wretched as possible. I was given the poorest typewriter in the office. All our pretty female staff writers were instructed to shun me. I had to scrub the floors, empty all the ash trays and make sure the radiators were working.

"Damn it!" I cursed. "You can't do this to me!"

"Oh yes I can!" he snapped. "My approach has been entirely successful. Your satires are becoming more professional; your wit is at its best; your brilliance is unequalled. Besides, we no longer have to pay for a janitor."

"Thanks!" I croaked, convinced he thought my columns should be nationally syndicated.

Then the editor smiled and exclaimed: "Art Buchwald sure was right! People indeed write their best satires when they're miserable. That's why from now on you'll no longer receive your paycheck."

## Students Robbed Of Points

By BOB BETTIS

Help! We college students are being robbed!

You might also call it mistreated, cheated, taken advantage of, and pushed around. In short, we're getting a rotten deal.

What's the source of this brutal suffering, you ask? Stated generally, it's the case of the pluses and the minuses. Stated specifically, it's the hurt and waste of not getting great big, academic, quality point credit for all those A minuses, B pluses, C pluses, and D pluses we occasionally make.

Now the University has set up what it considers a neat system of rewarding students for diligence in academic matters. Our studious efforts are translated into A's, B's, C's, D's, and F's, which in turn are awarded a quality point value of four, three, two, one, and zero respectively.

That's all fine and dandy as far as it goes. Unfortunately, the situation is complicated by the several hundred faculty members who have their own ideas as to what constitutes an A, B, C, D, or F. They express these ideas in the form of a grading scale. Assuming that the average grading scale is 95-100 equals A; 90-95, B; 80-90, C; and on down the list, a unique question is posed: What happens to the student whose semester average comes out to — say 89.5? It has been claimed by some observers — mainly professors — that good attendance and displayed interest in the course will influence the professor to give his pupil the benefit of the doubt. Thus the grade in this instance would be B minus. However, our experiences have been quite to the contrary. More than likely the student receives a C plus, which automatically drops to a C the moment it leaves the professor's office.

Therefore, we recommend a slight revision of the quality point program in order

to recognize pluses and minuses. A method that would make us happier goes like this: A pluses, rare as they are, would be equivalent to 4.5 quality points. An A, instead of the usual 4.0, would be equal to 4.2. An A minus, rather than being disregarded, would have a 4.0 value. And so this equation applies to the other letter grades.

Such a method would undoubtedly be better for all concerned. Students would be happier for obvious reasons and professors would be happier because they no longer would be regarded with contempt for downgrading us bright scholars with useless pluses and minuses.

# Film Scandal Party, Not Moral Problem

By JOHN GREENBACKER  
DTH Political Writer

For about two weeks now, students and partisan politicians have been offering their opinions about the Morrison obscene film scandal.

It takes a while to piece any big story like this together, but if you talk to enough people, you will get a few things straight.

The films were advertised as being co-sponsored by the Student Party, but the party leaders were not contacted before the films were shown.

The three student politicians who planned the films were SP members, but two of them were freshmen and the other involved could not be regarded as a truly high SP official. Several high SP officials did view the films, but had no foreknowledge of the showings and had not offered official SP approval of the function for their party.

The showing of the films was a partisan move. The freshmen who planned the thing originally did so on the spur of the moment as a means of drawing crowds in Morrison away from the University Party freshman class candidates' campaign speeches in progress on the first floor.

Not only did members of the SP attend the film showing, but also present were some of the UP freshman candidates who tired of talking to themselves.

Members of the Men's Council, Morrison officers and resident advisors also showed up.

Those who sponsored the movies went to bed that night satisfied that they had "helped" their party, collected some money, and at least temporarily shaved the horns of hundreds of male students.

If the SP leaders present worried about their party's involvement in the movie show, they probably felt it was too late to stop the proceedings, and at the time it seemed like a reasonably clever, if very dangerous idea.

The next day, however, the UP was hopping mad. The fact that the Dean of Men's office was investigating the matter along with the Attorney General's staff was of little consequence. The fact that those actually responsible for the film showing would receive Men's Council sentences didn't matter.

Former student body vice president Don Carson, the true leader of the UP, saw the necessity for making the case public information and making sure the SP got its share of the scandal blame.

Carson is a very hard-nosed politician. A formidable opponent, he will not let the other side get away with anything without a fight.

If the information were made public, would it hurt the University? Carson knew it could, but the story would get out anyway with a little time.

Carson also knew that breaking the story in the height of the Speaker Ban controversy would not hurt the vote on the law's amendment. The votes had already been promised to Gov. Dan Moore, and the fact that the controversy had no effect on the vote was confirmed by State Sen. Robert Morgan recently.

Henry Skinner, an independent legislator from Craige, Carson's residence hall,

blew the whole thing up in Student Legislature after consultation with Carson.

The very least one could say about Skinner's statement is that it was worded in an unfortunate manner. Maybe he didn't sit back and think about it before he said it.

The tone of the statement was highly self-righteous, denouncing "filthy pornography" and speculating that because some Morrison officers may have participated to some degree in the film showing, they may be guilty of mismanagement of Student Government funds.

Actually the investigation of fund usage was an excuse to get SL in on the controversy, even though no one seriously thought such mismanagement could have occurred. The recent \$1,500 appropriation by Student Government to Morrison Hall hasn't as yet cleared the student body president's desk.

Skinner adroitly laid all suspicion on the shoulders of "resident advisors, high Student Party officials and officers of Morrison."

His remarks were followed by a wave of horribly pious statements by several legislators.

The SL investigation committee will in all probability turn up no instances of misuse of funds, and fortunately funds to Morrison will continue.

Why couldn't the UP have merely issued a statement itself on the unfair campaign tactics of certain SP members? It would have made the issue so much clearer, and the SP would have not been forced into the position of defending the actions of all their members.

With the issue having been placed by the UP on a moralistic basis rather than on a partisan one, the terrible yoke of moral condemnation has been extended to cover the reputations of many basically good persons were only slightly involved in the Morrison incident.

The actual perpetrators of the illegal and unfair activities in Morrison will probably be punished severely, as will many students whose only crime was their possession of natural human frailties.

Those foolish persons who spoke so loudly and piously about the matter will probably be satisfied with the results of their statements.

Maybe, some day, one of those individuals who spoke so self-righteously on this issue will lock his door, sit back, and pick up a battered copy of "Playboy."

And when he does, he may come to realize that there is a bit of "filthy pornography" in every man.

## LETTERS

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters must be typed, double spaced and must include the name and address of the author or authors. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel.

### Letter To The Editor

## Smith Confuses Words

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

In a letter attacking the views of Lipsitz and Wynn, Paul A. Smith repeats the following argument, which has appeared before in the DTH: "The authors say . . . that they are against war. The fact is that it is impossible to be for or against war. The word war is a description of a state of affairs and it is impossible to be for or against a description. The question is whether the authors are against the cause of war: aggression."

It is Mr. Smith, not Lipsitz and Wynn, who is confusing the description with the state of affairs. It is quite possible to be against the application of a description to a particular situation, but this is not the issue. No one is arguing here about whether

to call the situation in Viet Nam "war." What Wynn and Lipsitz oppose is war, not "war"; the actual state of affairs, not the term used to describe it. If Mr. Smith's point were valid, he could not possibly be against aggression either.

As one who is interested in hearing both sides of the question, I object to this kind of argument, which is found throughout Mr. Smith's letter. Surely the opponents of the views of Wynn and Lipsitz can find some points of disagreement without resorting to this. But at least we are indebted to Mr. Smith for a classic case of the confusion of use and mention.

Nancy Thompson  
134 Bagley Drive

