

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

Lana Starnes

Sex Education Needed Badly

"That there should one man die ignorant who had capacity for knowledge, this I call a tragedy." (Sartor Resartus Book III, Chap. 4)

Sex education has become one of the central topics of conversation on this campus since last month's sex symposium and the distribution of the controversial booklet, "Elephants and Butterflies."

and discussions students were told the facts concerning contraception, abortion, pregnancies and venereal disease.

The questions are now out in the open and are being discussed freely.

Consequently, the symposium was a success. It helped enlighten many and has promoted further investigation into sex education.

From my point of view the booklet itself has been a tremendous success. It has given us a source of information and has spurred many more questions still to be answered.

The importance of having such information available was not apparent or real to me until very recently.

Monday night I went with Dr. Takey Crist and a UNC medical student to a sex symposium at Meredith College in Raleigh. There Dr. Crist delivered a speech along the same lines as many he has given to coeds on this campus.

He told the girls of the "sexual wilderness" we are living in and the problems we have encountered. He discussed contraception, abortion and pregnancy. The psychological proponents involved as well as the physical ones were reviewed.

I sat in the audience and watched the response he received and the way the girls opened up to him. Their faces were bright and alert. In the question-and-answer period following the lecture the questions that I myself have heard so very often were asked and again Dr. Crist supplied the answers.

The thing that impressed me the most was the interest of the girls and their eagerness to learn. At long last they had encountered someone who knew the answers and wasn't afraid to give them.

Approximately 100 girls sat crowded around Dr. Crist after the meeting firing one question after another at him. There was no end to the questions or their desire for knowledge. There were no limits to their scope of interest.

I was also startled by the realization that this was a group of college students, all very intelligent women who were almost totally ignorant of their own sexuality.

I was distressed at the fact that these

girls had to come to college to learn from friends or books or from what ever other means available about sex. This is something that they should have been taught years ago...in high school...in junior high...or in the home.

But what distressed me more was how other girls, girls who weren't in college, those who are out in the world working, are finding out about sex. How are the underprivileged blacks and whites and the uneducated obtaining this information? Learning by experience in this case is not exactly the best means. An unwanted pregnancy or a backroom abortion is hardly an equitable price to pay for this type of education.

So, I have come to see the vastness of the problem. The problem that exists is to educate the youth of today about sex, to lift the barriers of guilt and superstition and like Dr. Crist says, "Tell it like it is."

To me this is a real problem, one that desperately needs to be solved. So, for all of you who are constantly rallying for one cause or another, for Peace or Kent State or self-determination or whatever, here is something of immediate importance that you can adopt and work for. Help educate the youth today. It's time we came out of the dark ages and talked about our problems openly and truthfully.

And the best part of it all is that we can all help. Just think, for every one person that you help in presenting the facts and disproving some myth there are many more that he in return will enlighten. It is a chain reaction we can all help start.

Students Welcome Conservative Talk

Jesse Helms has declined an invitation to speak to Political Science 95-A.

Helms, in a letter to course leaders, said "I would not care to be associated in any way with any forum that considers it appropriate to invite Rennie Davis to speak on a tax-supported campus."

Helms went on to claim "My appearance would be considered by some as a justification for your having had Davis, and I imagine that is why the invitation was extended to me."

That statement, Mr. Helms, is as absurd as saying that Davis was invited as a justification for having the state chairman of the Young Americans for Freedom speak to the class.

Or if Mr. Helms was ignorant of that fact, we wish to inform him that David Adcock, the YAF state chairman, spoke to the 95-A class before Davis' appearance.

We find it hard to believe that providing a forum for such outspoken critic of this University would justify having other political figures speak.

The invitation was issued to Helms, not because there was a need to justify any other speaker, but because he is a conservative

well known for expressing his views.

We agree with the reply to Helms' letter in which Skip McGaughey and Tom Denyer, class instructors, said, "We need no justification for Mr. Davis' appearance other than the right of North Carolinians to listen to whomever they please, whenever they wish, wherever they happen to be."

Certainly, Helms' views are diametrically opposed to those of Davis. It would seem Helms would welcome the opportunity to refute the statements made before the class by Davis. Unless, of course, Helms thought he was incapable of refuting the arguments presented by Davis.

Helms, by refusing to publicly advance and defend his views, is contributing to the alleged imbalance of left-wing philosophy presented to the students on this campus.

There have been few conservatives willing to speak before Political Science 95-A. In fact, the instructors have been looking for conservatives willing to stand up for their views in public.

Helms has been invited to speak on this campus during previous years but has always refused to appear.

Maybe Helms declined the invitation because he isn't willing to stand in front of a class of 1,000 college students and defend his beliefs. Helms undoubtedly will find more security behind his television screen.

We are sure that Helms would be greeted by a generally unreceptive audience but who would claim Davis spoke before 2,000 friends?

Helms should remember that even if the class as a whole would not be in agreement with his opinions they did invite him to speak and would extend every courtesy to him.

It is a bit startling to realize that there are numerous supporters of the system who are unwilling to inform and involve today's students in a dialogue concerning that system.

We can only extend our condolences to those conservative leaders who lack the conviction to present their views and extend an invitation to others who are willing to speak before the class.



Grover B. Proctor Jr.

7-24 Policy Against Minority

"There is a minority [within the student body] which has the right to go to bed at a certain time, and even if it is as little as ten per cent, they should not be denied that right, even if it overrides the majority."

-Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson

There are two very important factors involved with any decision concerning visitation: visitors and noise. This sounds rather perfunctory and as if there were very little thought in that statement, but I think a definite case can be made for its validity.

The subject of visitation policies has been discussed at great length, almost ad absurdum, on this campus, but, like the

weather, few seem to be doing anything about it. And perhaps another column on the topic such as this one will contribute nothing to rectifying a messy situation, but maybe the viewpoint of one who feels he has been victimized by outgrowths of this problem will prove helpful.

The two factors I mentioned often interact and are found together in situations where visitation is a problem. Let's look at both separately and see what difficulties commonly arise.

The fact of visitors of the opposite sex being allowed in a residence unit is hardly a question anymore. Cries arise of maturity and the ability to assume responsibilities of having any visitor at

any time to his or her room. Incensed students recoil in horror at the thought of being babied by administration rules regulating such visitor traffic.

The fact is that such controls tend, not to limit the rights of the student who wants to have visitors, but to insure the rights of his fellow neighboring students who live in immediate proximity. I admit that some of the regulations, indeed, are not pointed in this direction. A quite striking example is the practice as I understand it at Greensboro. In order to have any visitation whatsoever, the entire dorm must vote to have such, and, during the period in which such visitation is in effect, no one in the entire dorm may shut a room door beyond the width through which a person may enter comfortably. It seems that such rules, while serving a definite purpose in regulating visitation, do nothing but hinder those who merely want to go to sleep in private, with the security of a locked door. But generally the tendency is to protect the rights of those who are in this predicament, as seen in the Chancellor's statement above.

When I decide I want to shower, I would like to know that there exists at least ten hours in twenty-four that there definitely will be not females in the suite bathroom. And when I wake up in the morning and journey to the bathroom to try to accomplish the Herculean feat of making myself presentable for the day, I don't want to run into females in the suite hall who might be coming or going.

And, above and beyond all else, I don't want to have to enter the suite hall in my pajamas at 2:00 a.m. on week nights to try (often in vain) to quiet my fraternal order of suitemates and their female guests to at least a tolerable 50 to 60 decibels.

This problem of noise is, I am convinced, the biggest one connected with visitation. I say connected with visitation because I have empirically proven to my satisfaction (the hard way, alas!) that, though men's dorms often produce tremendous amounts of noise by themselves at times, with the addition of females, especially in certain areas I know of, they tend to create louder disturbances and partying.

On weekends, I don't begrudge anybody the right to make as much noise

as they want, to have all the parties they can stand, even to tear down the building (which they come close to doing occasionally, I fear), as long as they leave my room in place. But this business of doing all of the above on week nights is simply too much.

Whatever happened to that curious (though seldom enforced) little institution called "Quiet Hours"?

And whatever happened to those appointed officials called Residence Advisors who used to be here to make certain that such flagrant violations of common courtesy and thoughtfulness were stopped, but who now refuse to accept this as one of their duties?

The solution proposed last week which would entail a massive moving project to relocate students in blocks by their preference on visitation is the last straw insofar as trying to solve the problem is concerned. While imposing a relocation on most students and causing inconceivable confusion, it is nothing more than soft-soaping the true culprits: those who abuse the right of visitation as set down by the Administration and who selfishly ignore the privacy of their neighbors.

So while the University community debates and decides this issue, let them never forget the minority (like me) spoken of by Chancellor Sitterson who merely wants a night's sleep in peace.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters to the editor, provided they are typed on a 60-space line 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.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.

Mike Parnell News Editor

Rick Gray Associate Ed.

Harry Bryan Associate Ed.

Chris Cobbs Sports Editor

Frank Parrish Feature Editor

Ken Ripley National News Ed.

Terry Cheek Night Editor

Doug Jewell Business Mgr.

Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.

Nelson Drew

Visitation Plans Won't Work

Yesterday the Consultative Committee submitted their recommendations on visitation to President Friday's Administrative Committee, which is to make a final decision on the matter. These recommendations include provisions for self-determination in some housing units, and this must be considered a significant step forward.

However, the recommendations also provide for some housing to have no more than the current visitation policy, and for others to have absolutely no visitation at all. These provisions were undoubtedly included by the Committee out of their honest concern for those few students who would not want visitation, and a feeling of obligation to the taxpayers of the state, whom several members of the Committee also must represent.

Unfortunately, there are several objections which must be made to this plan of visitation on the basis of differentiated housing, and these objections tend to far outweigh the merits of the proposal.

The most obvious objection is that the recommendations beg the question of self-determination for students. The students

who are now forced to live in university housing are freshmen, sophomores, and first year transfer students. A large majority of these students are under 21 years of age. Yet the Committee recommendations provide for true self-determination only for students 21 or over. All others would have to get parental permission.

Thus, it would be the very group of students that is forced to live in university housing by the administration that is denied the right of self-determination.

One of the reasons that students are forced to live on campus when they come to Carolina is that the living conditions in dormitories are so poor that students flock to move out as soon as they can. It would seem logical that the best way to correct the situation is not to force students to live on campus, but to improve the living conditions. Unfortunately, the policy proposed by the Consultative Committee would have just the opposite effect for a majority of students on campus.

A second major objection, and one which has been virtually ignored so far, is that fact that if implemented, a

differentiated housing visitation policy could kill the residence college system on this campus. Since the vast majority of students have indicated that they want visitation, it is obvious that students would move out of areas having no visitation as quickly as possible. What would remain would be little more than a concentration camp for freshmen and transfer students, having no experience or identification with the residence college at all.

In order to have college officers who are competent to do a good job, it is necessary to have people who are familiar with the operation of the residence college. In addition, these people must be willing to live in the college for at least two years, since their terms of office last from the middle of one spring semester to the middle of the next. Such people would be almost impossible to find. In areas with no visitation, experience would be almost non-existent, and it would be even harder to find some one willing to stay for two full years.

Areas having visitation would fare little better. The problem of a high turnover would still exist in areas having restricted visitation, as students

constantly moved in from no visitation areas and out to self-determination areas. Areas with self-determination would have a high number of students moving in who had no identification at all with their new college, so even these areas would face problems.

Dorm spirit would also sink to new all time lows. The lasting associations a student normally forms with his friends in the same dorm would be non-existent. Since the university administration is generally quite concerned with those "non-academic activities which nevertheless effect a student's academic performance," it is surprising that they have not complained about the detrimental effect of trying to live and study in such a poor atmosphere.

The problems involved in trying to make a policy such as the Consultative Committee has proposed are monumental. There is, however, a sound solution. Since, by including provisions for some self-determination, the committee has indicated that self-determination is not in itself inherently evil, why not take the logical step and allow all housing to have self-determined visitation policies. That would indeed be a significant step forward.