

## The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

SCOTT GOODFELLOW, EDITOR

### Required Courses Leave Much To Be Desired

We have been aware for a long time that the required courses in the General College have discouraged many enthusiastic freshmen.

These courses often occupy the major portion of a student's time during his first two years at Carolina, and consequently they should be watched carefully. Presently many required courses are dull, over-demanding and unstimulating. We consider each of these characteristics as antagonistic to the principle of college education—to encourage learning and open-mindedness.

When the problem is carefully considered, many suggestions come to mind. First, every effort should be made to have the smallest classes possible. In many cases, large classes have been formed so that full professors can teach them, rather than smaller classes with younger professors or graduate students. We would rather have the attention which always complements small classes during the first year of college, than the "bulk learning" which results from huge classes for the only benefit of hearing a person who has taught longer (and not always better). Of course, every effort should be made to encourage professors to teach the smaller classes.

A second suggestion is to allow a greater choice of courses to the freshman starting his General College career. Perhaps a variety of courses in the history department would substitute well for modern civilization. Introductory physical sciences have long been noted as some of the most difficult courses in the University, and yet liberal arts bent freshmen often end up taking two.

The best solution to problems involving an increased number of

course choices would be to specifically instruct academic advisors so they could adequately understand the direction which a student's academic career should take at the beginning, rather than broadly declaring that there is no way of telling and putting him at the start of the grid.

A third suggestion for creating greater interest in introductory courses would be for a universal realization that reading lists are entirely too demanding and that very few students even attempt to master them all. Even those who religiously read every spare moment frequently do not profit enough so that their efforts are indicated in grades.

A fourth suggestion is to eliminate department-wide teaching guidelines, allowing teachers themselves to decide exactly what they would like to do with a certain class. Such a move would encourage teachers to assign material which they find interesting, rather than what someone else has enjoyed. Students would soon learn who did well at course designing and a sort of competition would develop among classes, a competition which is good.

Finally, there are many introductory courses where it is actually detrimental to a student not to be a major in that subject. Careful scrutiny should be given all introductory courses to determine if this is the case, and courses should be established for non-majors where it would be profitable.

Required courses are meant to be a foundation for students to better equip them as effective citizens after graduation. There is no reason why these courses shouldn't be given the same enthusiasm by both teachers and students which is given to more advanced courses.

### It's Okay, Dean Cathey—We All Understand Why

"I really don't see why on earth the girls want to stay out until 2 a.m., but if that's what they want I have no strong objection. Seniors should have some extra privileges," said our Dean of Student Affairs, C. O. Cathey.

Although we're not quite so befuddled as to why a 2 a.m. weekend curfew is good, we too have no objections. In fact, the deadline extension is a move which smacks suspiciously of a more liberal attitude regarding women's rules.

Wonderful! Few are more aware than we are of the position which the Dean of Women's Office is in regarding feelings in the State toward liberalization of coed regulations. We are also aware that any dramatic change in the present rules would cause an instant furor of response, hardly endearing "that radical Chapel Hill" to those in the State who support it.

Consequently we are delighted that the move has been made, but it is important to realize that it is without any real importance if the trend stabilizes there. By executing the move as a "senior privilege," Dean Cathey has opened the door for further senior privileges. And when 2 a.m. is the weekend deadline, a later or all-week deadline can hardly be op-

posed, and will eventually occur. In short, we are still a long shot from satisfactory women's rules and will continue to press for them. But we are pleased that the initial change has been made.

### The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Scott Goodfellow, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Sandy Treadwell, Manag. Ed.

John Askew, Ad. Mgr.

Peter Harris, Associate Ed.

Don Campbell, News Editor

Donna Reifsnider, Feature Ed.

Jeff MacNelly, Sports Editor

Owen Davis, Asst. Spts. Ed.

Jock Lauterer, Photo Editor

David Garvin, Night Editor

Mike McGowan, Photographer

Wayne Hurder, Copy Editor

Ernest Robl, Steve Knowlton,

Carol Wonsavage, Diane Ellis,

Karen Freeman, Hunter George,

Drummond Bell, Owen Davis,

Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders,

Joe Saunders, Penny Raynor,

Jim Fields, Donna Reifsnider

Joe Coltrane, Julie Parker

CARTOONISTS

Bruce Strauch, Jeff MacNelly.

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.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

### Today's Thought

Never change horses in the middle of the stream. You might get wet if it rains.

### Profile Of A Professor: Dr. Brandes

## The Genius And The University

By JOHN W. BECTON  
At Ohio University he had position, prestige and financial security.

He was on the most important faculty committees. He was known and respected throughout the school. He was "fixed" for life.

"I believe you either go forward or backward. You don't stay in the same place," says Dr. Paul D. Brandes. Then he refers to the parable of the talents in the New Testament.

Dr. Brandes left Ohio rather than risk falling into a comfortable rut, "leaning on his Ph.D." For this would be "burying his talent in the ground."

He saw a challenge at UNC. "Here there are more smart students, more of a chance to be 'in the thick of it.' I would rather play sub on a first rate team than star on a third rate one."

Dr. Brandes came to Carolina last fall to a speech department in its infancy, but one in which he could see quite a future.

He has helped construct a speech major curriculum which has been approved by the English Department and is now under consideration of the

speech department will also have a permanent, well-equipped location when the new English building is built. A lab in the basement of Bingham Hall and classrooms on the first and second floors will be equipped to utilize the recording facilities in Dey Hall via remote control.

Dr. Brandes taught at the University of Mississippi and at Mississippi Southern College (now the University of South Mississippi) before he went to Ohio. A native of Kentucky, he graduated from Eastern Kentucky State College in 1942 with a major in English and minors in history and music. He received his M.A. from the University of Wisconsin in 1947.

He took his Ph.D. in 1953 at Wisconsin. His major was in rhetoric and public address and his minor in law. His wife holds an M.A. in English from Vanderbilt University. They have one daughter, age 17.

### STUDENT NEWSLETTER

Dr. Brandes keeps in touch with many of his former students by means of a newsletter. There are still 77 on the list from "Ol' Miss" where he taught from 1947 to 1953.

"We play our part through you, the students," he says. "I like to know when my students 'make good.' That's where the real reward comes from."

The first goal in teaching, Dr. Brandes believes, is to motivate the student. And he uses whatever means he thinks necessary—good-natured ribbing or harsh criticism, conferences, or term papers.

"I don't care if you hate me, if that's the price of progress, though I'd rather this not be the case. Professors like to feel the students are friends."

One of the hardest things for a teacher to learn, says Dr. Brandes, is to admit that he will entirely fail to reach one out of five of his students. "But he can't let that interfere with the effect he may have on the other four."

Dr. Brandes is concerned with the acute grade-consciousness of the students here. Yet he is aware of the pressures which cause grade-consciousness, among them being the graduate schools.

"Grad schools should take students more on the basis of character than grades. We ought to encourage the 'C' student who has the personality needed in the teaching profession. Many of these would make good college instructors."

Dr. Brandes detects a heterogeneous student body at UNC. There is no insistence that one conform. "And I'm referring to ideas, not dress."

Students here are quite sophisticated in "shopping around" for professors, Dr. Brandes has also noticed. He moreover points out that much money is spent on keeping high calibre classroom instruction at Carolina.

"For instance, in our English Department, no M.A. candidates teach. At Ohio, however, you are lucky if you get an assistant professor before your junior year."

Dr. Brandes perhaps best sums up his attitude toward his profession when he says, "Everyone has only one life to live. If you can persuade a few to live it all the way, it is worth the effort."

"So we have until 2 A.M. huh?"

Ha Ha Ha!"



### Our Fathers Are Blind!

(FROM CAL. DAILY)

That's the trouble with trying to explain something so desperately important, she thought. The images, the wisps of reality swim in your head and you try to grab at them, try to put them together and come up with a coherent explanation but you can't. The images won't stay still for you. They're there, but they won't stay still.

He had asked her to explain herself, and her generation. In the way of all fathers before him, he was concerned. She tried to tell him, but she had failed. Because there was no way to communicate.

He asked her in the language that was hers: "What's happening?" And she wanted to say, "Us." We're what's happening—now, and tomorrow, and forever, and maybe next week, too.

We are different, she wanted to say. Don't you see that? Different than social man has ever been and we are terribly scrutinized by you. You watch and you analyze. But you don't see it, not really, and you won't.

Because you can't see what we are if you are not us. You can never get to where we are if you were not there to begin with. Because we are a fantastically complicated blend of our times, our age, our environment, and most important, what you have given us—our education, our affluence, our cynicism, our doubts, our desires.

And unlike you she thought, we can no longer completely communicate with our parents. Her head began to ache, and she frowned. It's not that we dislike you, or fear you, but that we just have no means of explanation. Our generation does not have a name. It has no guidelines. Perhaps its complete lack of boundary, of borderline, of definition of what, in the end, defines it.

She wanted to explain to him that her generation did not know an enemy. That Communist, Black, Jew, these were names of another era. That curiosity had replaced fear. And that, most important, acceptance had replaced tolerance.

Because war is rotten, period. There are no two ways of looking at it, she thought, and the thought stung with its intensity. How can you continue to say "War is bad, but—" Can't you understand that it is not wrong to refuse to kill? That it has to start somewhere? That it must start with us?

"Don't think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" he would ask her, with a mocking smile. Come now, it what he really meant. Grow up. Face reality. Not everyone will see it like you see it. It is not so simple.

But it is, she wanted to an-

### Peter Harris

## Vietnam Crusade Is Now A Reality

People are very economy-minded; they seek simple solutions and tend to think of things in good-bad terms.

Wars, to Americans, have received this kind of historical breakdown, usually ending with G.I. Joe killing the last filthy Eastern Menace in a furious battle on some Pacific island or jungle inlet.

It is a very simple act for most Americans to believe in the American Moral Crusade, the gallant world-wide jaunt to save the free world from the evils of Communism. It is so simple that even educated people can be duped into expressing the doctrine of democracy as the primary reason why the United States ventures into countries half-way around the globe split with civil war.

This writer has held before, and still does, that the original motive for entering the Vietnam War was not because we were defenders of freedom, but because we were exercising our right as the most powerful nation in the Western world. In other words, the idea of a moral crusade was a lot of bunk.

The irony of the war, now, is that it is truly turning into a moral crusade for almost all the people involved.

After years of preaching the moral doctrine, President Johnson has put the United States in a fishbowl-like situation. We must now produce, on our promises, we must help the Vietnamese raise their standard of living to heights unimaginable under any other government's aid. If we were to fail to win over the people in Vietnam, or if we failed to prosper their economy the United States would be eternally scorned by the rest of the world. To refute a rather near-sighted Congressman's statement, we cannot say, "To hell with world opinion!"

### PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATION

There was a psychological experiment done a few years back which involved a very boring game of putting pegs into holes. After the game was finished each participant told the psychologist that they thought it was extremely uninteresting. The psychologist took aside two students and separately told them to persuade new students about to take the test that the peg game was fascinating.

One student was offered \$1, the other \$100. The results of this new experiment were that the person who received \$100 retained his sense of disdain for the peg game, while the \$1 student said, after the persuasion session, that he now felt that the experiment was pretty exciting. In other words, the \$1 student had to rationalize his fibbing to the new students by accepting his own lies. The \$100 student needed no rationalization since the \$100 provided him with an adequate reason for lying.

A similar response has occurred in Vietnam. Due to the lack of reward in fighting the war, and due to the questionable intentions of our government when it actually entered the war, the people involved in Vietnam have had to rationalize their support of the war by not only stating a moral crusade, but by actually living this crusade.

In other words, partly because of the fishbowl existence of the war, but perhaps more because of the need to believe in what he is doing, the Vietnam supporter has begun to act on his formerly hollow promises. The promises cannot remain hollow, and they will most assuredly produce a better, more prosperous, and politically more stable Vietnam than could otherwise be possible.

It is a wonderful irony that the war will produce some good, more than can be offered by a dying Ho Chi Minh. It will be a wonderful irony, even after all the blood, all the atrocities, and all the deaths have been accounted for and dispassionately forgotten.