

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 and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Tom Gooding, Editor

Merzbacher Reforms Should Be Retroactive

The Faculty Council should vote today to make the Merzbacher curriculum reforms retroactive for the whole University.

The Merzbacher Committee, which spent nearly a year studying academic reforms, proposed in their original statement that the reforms be made applicable to all students currently enrolled in the University.

However, before the committee's report was presented to the Faculty Council the recommendation was altered by the Chancellor. We feel that the Chancellor made a mistake in removing the request.

Many courses that are required under the present curriculum have not been revised for the past thirty years. This, of course, was one of the primary reasons the University decided to investigate the possibility of curriculum reforms.

If there is a need to reform the courses themselves and the list of required courses, why not also make the reform applicable to all students?

We assume that the reforms will bring about improvements in the curriculum. If so, then all students should benefit from the improved curriculum.

The only substantial reason the administration has given for not making the reforms retroactive is that students should graduate under the same catalogue with which they entered UNC.

However, the tuition and fees currently paid by upperclassmen are considerably different than

were the amounts listed in the catalogue when the upperclassmen entered the University.

If students are going to have to pay more to attend this institution then they should receive some benefits for the additional costs.

We might also add that housing costs have risen since most students now in school entered.

Many students have already been working on getting the reforms made retroactive.

Joe Wheeler, president of the freshman class, has organized a petition supporting the extension of the reforms.

That petition, which now has 3,000 signatures, will be presented to the Faculty Council chairman today during the meeting.

The reforms already accepted by the Faculty Council are:

- English composition, two courses.
- Physical education, two semesters.
- Social sciences, three courses.
- Natural sciences, two courses, one of which must be a laboratory course.
- Foreign language or mathematical Science, present requirement in either one must be fulfilled.
- Humanities and fine arts, three courses.

Students that want to benefit from the improved curriculum should go to the Faculty Council meeting in 111 Murphey Hall today at 4 p.m. and let the faculty members know how they feel.

I-Week Deserves Support

Thanks to the International Student Center the students of this campus will have an excellent opportunity to enjoy and participate in various international

Tom Bello's Year Should Be Good For The Students

Tom Bello was sworn in as President of the student body Thursday.

We look forward to working with Bello in the coming year. In the past The Daily Tar Heel and Student Government have not been what one could call "cronies."

They cannot afford to be.

The Daily Tar Heel, following the traditions established by other newspapers, acts as a watchdog.

We hold that our duty is to see that Student Government acts in the best interest of the student body. If Student Government does something we disagree with, we will make our feelings known.

On the other hand, when Student Government does something to benefit the students, we will give those responsible the praise they deserve.

We think that with Tom Bello, Bill Blue and Ann Rothe serving as the leaders of Student Government we will have many more occasions to praise Student Government than we will to criticize.

We wish Tom Bello and his administration the best of luck in gaining all that they seek to gain in the coming year, and we hope that we will not have occasion to criticize.

activities throughout the upcoming week.

I-Week, an annual project of the ISC, begins today and the activities will run for the next week.

The highlight of today's activities will be the keynote address by world news commentator David Schoenbrun on "Nixon's New Foreign Policy."

Schoenbrun's speech will be held in Hill Hall at 8 p.m.

The ISC will have visitors on campus this weekend including: 22 foreign high school students, 21 college students from Iraq and 22 more foreign college students. We hope UNC students will make an effort to meet these foreign students.

I-Week activities also include foreign meals, sports events, movies and political discussions.

The entire list of events is indeed impressive and should benefit any student willing to take out the time to participate.

We offer our thanks to Roger Hardister and the entire staff of the ISC for providing this opportunity to the students. And we encourage all students to take advantage of the activities.

The Daily Tar Heel
78 Years of Editorial Freedom
Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.
Harry Bryan News Editor
Rick Gray Associate Ed.
Laura White Associate Ed.
Chris Cobbs Sports Editor
Mary Burch Arts Editor
Mike McGowan Photo Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.
Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.
Ken Smith Night Editor

John Agar

Was Editor's Election Below Us?

Very little is less interesting than yesterday's politics. After each election, we always manage to eke out some lesson—but most people's energy goes into new projects, new interests: into forgetting.

The reason may be that each of us, from the voter to the winning candidate, has a vague feeling that he's been involved in something below him. Why else does each election inevitably result in commitments to depoliticize politics? All of the candidates said they wanted to make the Tar Heel broadly representative—that is, offensive to no one, as apolitical as possible. One wanted to do away with the "spoils system." The new editor has just suggested that his post ought not to be elective.

There must be something very wrong with the democratic process if it elicits this kind of criticism. And yet...

I was in the Tar Heel office around 10:30 on the night of the runoff election. The results had already come in, and the

staff apparently has celebrated and cleared out.

The Tar Heel office is long and narrow, and the floors were littered with scrap paper and Gooding campaign material. The room was empty, except, inexplicably, for Steve Enfield.

I had badgered Enfield obnoxiously during a UNC Press Club interview of the editorial candidates. He was sitting at one of the desks, and when I opened the door, he said, "Hi. Want to debate me?"

I said it was too late. It was the most neutral thing I could think of: he was down, and it made no sense kicking him.

He said, "Congratulations," and I thanked him and went back into the Union.

I guess he had thrown me a little off balance. I thought about getting a coke, then changed my mind and went back to the Tar Heel office.

Enfield-Benfield's candidacy—intercepted candidacy—was, in a way, the

big story of the election. Their mistake, circulating a statement purportedly signed by campus notables—many of whom immediately repudiated it, just about blew them out of the race, and they finished fifth in a field of six. It was an error so obvious that I found it unimaginable. I assume that there was some kind of story behind it, and I asked Enfield.

"You want to hear about that?" he asked. "That really destroyed my faith in people. If you want to write a column about that—"

I said that disillusionment was Bobby Newell's department.

But, as it turned out, there wasn't much to be disillusioned about. In the course of the campaign, Enfield and his runningmate had spoken to many people and gotten verbal commitments. Their mistake was that they assumed that the average voter was going to be more sincere and constant than the average candidate.

And what was the average candidate? Enfield-benfield stressed "A Return to Responsible Journalism," though they seldom bothered to show where the Tar Heel had ever been anything but responsible.

It's true that both of the co-candidates had a long list of qualifications—Enfield said, "If we had gotten into the runoff, there wouldn't have been any issue of 'affable anonymity.'" (a phrase I had used to describe the Carter-Schorr team); but Enfield-Benfield campaigned more on slogans than on qualifications, even when the latter were there for the asking.

Bryan Cumming, after failing to get into the runoff, taxed the student body

for not succumbing to a campaign which, he felt, had been the essence of "imagination and enthusiasm." But, actually, he had little more than the fashionable vacuity which typifies televised politics. Where were the issues?

Well, Bobby Nowell had the issues. But that wasn't enough. If Cumming and the others had the sickness, Nowell went to the other extreme. Like people moving opposite directions on a circle, they eventually met; and if Nowell's campaign was firmly based on ideas, it resembled, at least to me, a dramatized sulking fit. If the only way we were to get issues was filtered through the gimmickry of self-dramatized forthrightness, honesty that kept pounding its breast and crying, "I'm pure!"—then one almost wants to say, What the hell?

I've left out two candidates—having had my say about Carter-Schorr already. Douglas Campbell never was very serious. It may be that he expected to win on the basis of his being more self-effacing than anyone else. If so, and if this was another dose of integrity, then integrity has become a pretty paltry thing.

Last, there was Tom Gooding, whom I supported, and who won. I knew Tom during the summer, knew how able he was and how he viewed the issues. Yet, it was disappointing to me that his campaign, too, skirted anything substantial—that is, for the mass of voters.

Let us abolish this and reform that, and correct all the evils we see—and yet, I tell you there will still be one problem more difficult than all the rest. My friend, it is you.

WARNING:

YOU COULD BE TRIED AS A POTENTIAL KILLER!



A Little Less Census

Greetings and Congratulations! You have been selected out of 200 million American men, women, and children to take part in our 1970 census as a representative sample.

The following questions are intended to reveal general tendencies about our overall population. Your answers will be painstakingly analyzed by sociologists, psychologists, political scientists and a whole bunch of computers.

So take your time—each question, simple as it may seem, is very important.

- I am a (check one)
 - a. homo sapien
 - b. liverwort
 - c. foreigner
 - d. a and f
- I live (check one)
 - a. in a house
 - b. in a home
 - c. on a farm near Paint Lick, Ky.
 - d. in a cardboard box near the junk yard.

- My job is (check one)
 - a. glue factory foreman
 - b. glue factory flunkie
 - c. part-time shepherd
 - d. filling out government forms

- My favorite hobby is (check one)
 - a. painting loads
 - b. making paper dolls out of the DTH
 - c. watching prescriptions being filled at the drug store.

- Community organizations I enjoy are (check one)
 - a. Order of the Golden Gerbel
 - b. The Black Panthers
 - c. The Ku Klux Klan
 - d. Spiro Agnew Fan Club No. 57

That's fine. You have just completed the first part of our survey. Now you will express your opinions of public issues:

- VIETNAM
 - a. I don't decide what to do about the war, I think I would ... (check one)
 - b. bomb Hanoi
 - c. bomb Saigon
 - d. pave the whole thing and build a shopping center.

THE RACE PROBLEM

The only solution I can see is ... (check one)

- a. that we must all live together and remember we are brothers as long as they don't try to move in next door.
- b. that there must be flesh colored band aides for everyone.
- c. Is this the 500 or the 1200 meter race?

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

I think I would be more socially acceptable if ... (check one)

- a. I didn't have terminal acne.
- b. I wasn't a jellybean junky.
- c. I didn't show pornographic movies on my front lawn at night.

POPULATION CONTROL

The only way that reasonable family planning can exist is through the ... (check one)

- a. education of ignorant Cherokee Indians
- b. bombing of Red China
- c. elimination of the rabbit test

STUDENT RIOTS

Universities may be brought under control by ... (check one)

- a. locking the students in their dorms
- b. locking the administrators in their offices
- c. stricter control of auto parking permits

This is the end of the survey. We appreciate your cooperation. Please do not punch any extra holes in the test as this may confuse the computer.

Do not forget to sign your name on the census honor pledge: "I have neither given nor received help in the conception of my family."

Thank you.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters to the editor, provided they are typed 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

Readers of the Tar Heel will recall a letter printed in the paper last week which passionately rebukes the editorial accusing the DKE fraternity of "perverting the heart fund drive."

At first glance, Miss Hanes' rebuttal seems admirable enough, for her defense of the beloved DKE boys is forthright and sincere. Yet upon a second reading, one can hardly eschew the reactionary sentiment that seeks strength through emotion and neglects reason altogether.

For instance, she admits in her opening sentence that it was "okay with her" that the DKE boys were obnoxious in raising money, provided such a technique reaped booty—a provincial regurgitation of Stephen Decatur's still infamous cry, "my country right or wrong." Yet this initial piece of trash is less inflammable than the debris that follows.

Her impassioned locomotive quickly derails itself when she goes on to suggest that the DKE fund drive is at least as worthy a cause as the effort to support the workers laid off by the scrupulous food service. Such a gift for inaccuracy is ill-received for she suggests that the DKE fund drive sprang from an intense, sincere, and resolute compassion for people afflicted with heart ailments.

Such is not the case. One need not scratch too deeply below the veneer of the DKE fund drive to detect the motivation for it. Social organizations, such as the DKE fraternity, are hardly the going thing (to use their idiom) these days—a fact that is painfully obvious to the organizations themselves. If the point needs clarifying, all one need do is take in the next I.F.C. meeting to observe the mirror-ridden and paranoid illness that

plagues fraternities which are continually seeking to improve their image on campus to compensate for their irrelevant ways.

Consequently, the DKE fraternity's fund drive as an external act might appear quite noteworthy to the dangling bait-biters, a category into which Miss Hanes slips. The underlying attitude however, not the exterior act, should be the focus of concern. Participating in a heart drive hardly means that the DKE fraternity is undergoing a metamorphosis in attitude, but rather serves as an apology for an organization so set in its ineffectual ways that an occasional display of tokenism assuages the feelings of embarrassment and inadequacy.

Next time, Miss Hanes would do better to look beneath the external act and observe the underlying attitude. Next time, the DKE fraternity plans a mixer, they would do better to call it off and donate the anticipated expenses to the heart fund—an act which would constitute a real sacrifice.

Peter Callaudet
719 W. Main Street

BSM Tutoring—Who Does It Help?

Editor:

There is an attempt among various legislators to cripple the BSM tutorial program by cutting or halting appropriation to the BSM for the project. These legislators have raised questions about the value of the program to Carolina students since the budget is supposed to serve the students.

This is a valid question and I hope these thoughts might be of value to those who are trying to answer this question. I was a tutor in the project during the first semester of last year. Although all the tutors hoped that their tutees would be the main beneficiaries of the effort, I don't think anyone can deny the value of the program to the tutors.

First of all it gives students a chance to do something meaningful, however small, to mitigate the effects of injustice which plague these black children. Secondly, it is a learning experience for those who tutor. Most tutors have had very little contact with black children until this program began because of the institutional barriers in our society. The program offers a way to cross these barriers. Thirdly, tutors may become

interested in teaching from the program or use their skills if they are already interested in education. Fourthly, it establishes a rapport between the student body and the black community.

Although all tutors would agree on the above, none of us would deny that it is a mistake to view the issue in this context. The most important questions that one should consider is: Does the program benefit the black tutees? I think most of those who participate would agree that it does. BSM's continued backing indicates their feelings on this question.

Clearly the program is worthwhile to the black children, the black community, and to the hundreds of Carolina students who have and are now participating. Far from cutting the budget the legislature should increase it. If there have been errors in the management of the program then they should be corrected.

This does not mean that the program should be eliminated. It would be a shame and disgrace to allow the prejudices and personal vendettas of legislators against the BSM to find their expression in the elimination of this worthwhile program.

Sincerely,
Dan Moss, Jr.
203 East Rosemary Street

Hinson Article Wasn't Kinsey Report

To the Editor:

Re: the letter to the Editor by Ronald Mikulak printed Wednesday, March 18. I was distressed to discover that Mr. Mikulak was distressed over the article I wrote about Project Hinton.

He expressed the fear that "Project women see the men as sensitive eunuchs, and Project men see their female counterparts as very bright vestal virgins." Although I don't wish to deny that this may be the case in some instances, I think Mr. Mikulak is making a grave error in basing his conclusion on the "Emphasis" story I wrote.

The article was not intended as a "Kinsey Report" on Project Hinton. Its purpose was to inform the campus as to the social and academic opportunities in the Hinton experiment.

Terry Cheek
953 James