

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
Wednesday, December 9, 1970

University increase soaks water users

The Town of Carrboro has issued a well-reasoned list of defenses for the suit filed against it for non-payment of the increased water rates the University has charged since August.

The basis of the defense presented by Carrboro is that the University has obtained a monopoly on the local water supply and is attempting to make an exorbitant profit out of the water system.

The Town of Carrboro also provides a persuasive argument for the University to sell the water facilities to Carrboro and Chapel Hill.

The defenses point out that the University owns the facilities "for the purpose of providing such services and facilities to the

students or staff of the University of North Carolina."

However, it is then noted that "sixty-four per cent of its present daily production of approximately four million gallons is produced for non-university consumers consisting generally of the defendant (Carrboro, ten per cent of production) and individual residential and commercial customers in and near the town of Chapel Hill (fifty-four per cent of production).

When the University undertook the water system there was a need for such action. However, today the situation is considerably altered to the point that the University does not even consume a majority of the water.

Regardless of the outcome of this particular case the University should now realize it is time for Carrboro and Chapel Hill to control and operate the water facility.

Wave Playmate at Bill Buckley

William F. Buckley, well-known and noted apostle of all things right, will speak in Memorial Hall tonight.

Buckley's appearance tonight will be his first on the UNC campus since 1963 when he addressed a crowd of nearly 450 people in the same building.

And read them an article he had written for Playboy magazine.

Buckley not only presented the article as his speech, but he charged \$500, or thereabouts, for his services, more than enough money to buy an entire Playboy for everyone in the audience.

We hope everyone who goes to hear the right's answer to Norman Mailer, Gore Vidal and Charles Goodell will make sure to carry the latest issue of Playboy with them.

Maybe Buckley would like to see this month's Playmate.

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.
John Gellman Photo Editor
Terry Cheek Night Editor

Doug Jewell Business Mgr.
Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.

Letters to the editor

Students want self-evaluation

To The Editor:

I am writing in response to the December 3 letter of Dr. William Koch of the Botany Department. In his letter Dr. Koch outlined his reasons for and methods of self evaluation of his teaching methods. In the letter Dr. Koch states, "At the end of a course, the 'grade' I give myself relates to how well I have met the behavioral goals I had set...Although I don't enjoy grading myself on a course I'm involved with, it does help me." Finally, Dr. Koch asks, "Is this true for students also?"

If I can, and I believe I may, extend Dr. Koch's question to—shouldn't this be true for students also—then the answer is a definite yes. To me, self-evaluation is the responsible result of independent action. However, since the students' educational responsibility and independence have been totally usurped in most cases, student self-evaluation is a farce.

Self-evaluation works, as Dr. Koch knows, when the individual has the independence to set his own objectives and to establish his own best way(s) of meeting those objectives. Faculty have this independence, students do not.

As long as administrations and faculty (with notable exceptions such as Drs. Koch, Sloane and Gentry) decide what is worth knowing and how it is to be learned, student self-evaluation will continue to be a theoretical concept, notably abstract and ethereal.

The opportunity for making responsible educational decisions such as what is worth knowing and how it will be learned, originally usurped in first grade, continues to be illusive in higher education—whatever "higher" means. More and more students are realizing they

are being cheated by this and are not liking it one bit. Most faculty do not seem to understand. I am reasonably sure students will be making certain that reluctant faculty and administration do understand in the near future.

David A. Rohe
153 Daniels Road

Camp Pinewood ad discriminatory

To The Editor:

I was unhappy to see in the Wednesday paper inclusion of an advertisement seeking to hire "only clean-cut young people" for positions at one Camp Pinewood. It would seem to me that accepting such obviously discriminatory advertising is equivalent to accepting appeals to hire on racial or religious grounds. "White only need apply" is obviously so vile an ad as to warrant refusal for Tar Heel publication.

I believe the paper that editorializes for Bernie Oakley's right to cheer UNC's teams with all his hair as he wants it, can hardly accept revenue from disgusting ads from Camp Pinewood.

J. Stephen Walters
407-A E. Franklin St.

Secretary Laird lacks 'pizzazz'

To The Editor:

A recent confrontation between Melvin Laird and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee confirmed an oft-whispered reality. It can now be reported with assurance that Mel just

does not possess the pizzazz necessary for Secretary of Movie-Making.

After all, Clark Clifford allowed big Duke Wayne (the True Grit of the Green Berets) to use U.S. Army equipment in his epic cinematography. Alas, Swell Mel, as he is known in production circles, can't even make a cloak-and-dagger scene with the hottest spring-loose-the-good-guys material since CBS dropped "Mission: Impossible" from the Sunday night line-up.

For instance, why didn't Swell Mel employ the arts of the real Hollywood winners? Imagine what Lee Marvin could have done with the episode. (He might even have copped that Oscar which eluded him in "The Dirty Dozen.") Not to mention the dauntless correspondent Nelson Drew reporting for the DTH from a tiger cage remote control unit. But no such splashy doings for Mr. Laird. The best he has to offer is a few still photographs of the compound model, later rejected by Life magazine. Presumably the paper maiche model will be sold to "Sesame Street" for later viewing.

All this goes to show that the real Oscars still belong to those dashing, Fairbankesque solons from the South—Fulbright and Gore. Visualize, if you will, the fantastic movie to be made from this drama of movie critics reviewing the seemingly endless stream of Dick 'n Mel "B" grade flicks. Rick Gray, of course, will write the screenplay telling the behind-the-scenes tale of the Old Gray Fox and the Arkansas Albatross. It will be a clever plot indeed as it deals with two Southern critics who deplore the Hawks Corp. movie company, with its Cecilie B. DeMille Complex. Who knows,

if the producers made a quick deal they might even get Martha Mitchell to play the dumb Southern belle?

Graham Wooten
Durham

Reader, Ripley going to heaven

To The Editor:

I have not been able to read Ken Ripley's columns, but I would like to defend the role of being a Christian.

In the past few weeks you have printed letters against being a Christian. May I say that I have found it to be the most rewarding and worthwhile thing I have found and I would not trade it for anything you might offer me.

The letter printed yesterday asked Ken why didn't he grow up. As far as I can see Ken has grown up. To be a Christian you have to have a good backbone that can take anything. Because, you will be persecuted, talked about, laughed at, and there will be those who will try and get you to change your faith. On top of this you have more temptations than you know what to do with.

The question is—have you grown up enough to withstand all of this? Or are you taking the easy way out and following the crowd? Ken and I will be rewarded with the kingdom of heaven—will you?

Susan Thomas
School of Journalism
Snow Camp, N.C.

Grover B. Proctor Jr.

Conservatives welcome Buckley speech

"Though liberals do a great deal of talking about hearing other points of view, it sometimes shocks them to learn that there are other points of view."

—William F. Buckley Jr.

A conservative on this campus has very little opportunity for bright moments when guest speakers and lecturers are announced. Who of us can really get very excited if Jane Fonda or Rennie Davis showers high-flown but shallow rhetoric around UNC?

And yet today, as most of you know by now, we can proudly boast of our own spokesman—William F. Buckley Jr. Let me extend a most hearty welcome to Mr. Buckley and my hope that he finds his visit here a rewarding and stimulating experience.

I heard one of my classmates make a rather backhandedly complimentary comment about Mr. Buckley sometime ago. He said, summing up, probably, the majority opinion on campus, "Buckley is without doubt one of the most brilliant men in the country. It's just too bad his genius is misdirected."

????

Of course, tonight he will have the opportunity to refute that statement's detrimental intent while re-affirming his intellect. But I would like to devote the rest of this column to some of his more biting (and revealing) quips collected over the past years. The subsequent (as well as the opening) quotations have been selected from David Franke's edition called Quotations from Chairman Bill: The Best of Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. For a compendium of what is accurately labeled the best of the man, I highly recommend the book.

University campuses have attracted much attention today, and as might be expected, they have not escaped Mr. Buckley's critical eye. Though few here (excepting possibly the Administration) may be inclined to agree with him, he makes the succinct observation, "As a general proposition, colleges are best administered by administrators, next best by faculty, and most worst by students." With his tongue sliding very comfortably into his cheek, he wrote, "...the academic community has in it the biggest concentration of alarmists, cranks and extremists this side of the giggle house."

Nor do the "darlings of the Left"

escape the sharp end of his pen. Let me give you a few of his better comments concerning some of the sacred cows of the liberal establishment. Why not plunge right (pardon the pun) in with Mao: "...the greatest genocidal maniac in the history of the world, the same Mao Tse-tung who killed four times as many Chinese as Hitler killed Jews."

Former first ladies? We have them, too. "...following Mrs. [Eleanor] Roosevelt in search of irrationality was like following a burning fuse in search of an explosive; one never had to wait very long."

Then, as the tongue shifts to a more comfortable place in the cheek, he goes on further. "Test. Who said (a) 'It is my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy...?' Who said (b) 'Goldwater Republicanism is the closest thing in American politics to an equivalent of Russian Stalinism?' Everyone knows the answer to (a). Who knows—or will care, particularly—that the answer to (b) is William Fulbright?"

By the way, the last quote appears in Mr. Franke's book under the subject of "Double Standards." Most fitting.

Turning to Muhammad Ali (trans. Cassius Clay), he says, "He became a Black Muslim, which is a pseudo-religion for unbright neurotics who feel the need

to hate all white people."

Of a long-standing foe in New York City, he moves on, "...the point might be made that there is no extant Republican philosophy, and that Lindsay is its prophet."

The list of quite brilliant excerpts goes on and on, but I think four more will give you a rounded, if thin, view of Mr. Buckley's philosophy and wit. Three appear next, purposefully untruncated, save by the date of their appearances. July 24, 1962. "...we view our atomic arsenal as proudly and as devotedly as any pioneer ever viewed his flintlock hanging over the mantel as his children slept, and dreamed."

May 13, 1965. "This trial, Murphey thundered to the jury, 'is nothing more than a conspiracy to smash the Ku Klux Klan!' (If such a conspiracy exists, put me down as an applicant for membership in it.)"

June 27, 1967. "Perhaps we should sign that mutual defense pact with Israel—if only for our own self-protection."

Finally, I want to sum up my praise of Mr. Buckley by offering a last quote from him and suggesting the reason it is true is that fewer people than ever before believe as he does.

"Every day, in every way, things are getting worse and worse."

Frances L. Miller

'Mad Housewife' is real

During an ugly but honest dialogue between Jonathan and Tina just before their ill-fated party in "Diary of a Mad Housewife," Jonathan snaps, "My God, Tina, you've got everything twisted." In a Tar Heel review recently the film was also accused of distorting reality. But Jonathan and the reviewer are wrong. "Diary of a Mad Housewife" is so real that any woman who has had anything to do with housewifery (and some men also) will wince at its perceptiveness.

It is true that Jonathan is a ready-made villain, but this is obviously the result of Richard Benjamin's over-acting, stressing every line, milking the audience for every "laugh" as if this were high school drama rather than serious cinema. As the film progresses, Benjamin's acting mellows, however. The viewer who is sensitive to Tina's predicament will not hate Jonathan per se but realize how much of his obnoxiousness is based on the role expected of him in society and on his lack of confidence that he can meet it.

Eleanor Perry's script frequently expresses his insecurity, climaxing in the scene over the hot milk near the end. We could accept any of the lines if Benjamin had not forced them upon us so loudly and quickly in the opening scenes; but after all, to Tina, who hears them morning after morning after morning, year upon year, they are more real and less shocking.

Perhaps we are not yet ready for "Diary of a Mad Housewife." Reviewer after reviewer has asked why Tina remains in her situation, and the fact that few of them come up with any answer shows an incredible ignorance of the position of women in our society. The movie would have been truly simplistic if

it had enumerated the reasons why Tina did not slam the door.

Why can't a situation be both grotesque and real? That is exactly what the movie is telling us—that millions of women are living in grotesque situations (most worse than Tina's) which would be considered inhuman if experienced by men. Therefore they are not real, these individual and separate situations, hidden even from each other, so that the men who see Tina's oppression as a human being when it is highlighted on the screen, do not recognize it in their own homes.

The audience gets close-ups of Tina's hopelessness; it is not necessary to view one's wife so closely.

As a Female Liberationist, I thought this no heady stuff—just a break-through in a medium that is probably one of the biggest influences on youth and, as such, has been allowed to be sexist far too long.

"Diary of a Mad Housewife" tells it like it is, whether the "mad" means insane or angry (and usually it is a mixture of both). Maybe the part of the audience who yawns is using sophisticated boredom as a coverup for the nasty truths—that women are social failures unless they make marriages with men like Jonathan? That housework is dreary, unrewarding, and tiring; that women who got BAs at Smith over ten years ago have no job qualifications; that even with a job, female BAs make no more than men with eighth grade educations; that women who leave their children are social pariahs; that good child-care is rare and expensive; that women who desert their husbands do not get alimony (after all, what has Jonathan done?); etc.

Far too little has been said about the character of George (well played by

Frank Lagella). There are plenty of Georges around, waiting for women discontented in one role to try another. It is perfectly clear what sort of person he is from the two early party scenes—contemptuous of women, viewing them only as objects; cruel; glorying over his actions, his triumphs at putting others down.

Why does Tina have an affair with him? Because he is the only alternative offered; and, unlike Jonathan, he demands nothing of her.

Carrie Snodgrass is a complex Tina, trying to prepare herself for the inevitable cast-off mistress role by taking a practical, reasonable line towards her lover, but women have not been trained to love that way.

As Everywoman she hopes that George will prove different underneath, that he will be capable of relating as a human to her humanity. But of course it doesn't work; she is violently discarded and returns to a man who will keep her around even if he ignores the person in her while exploiting her mind and body for his own needs.

Obviously neither Jonathan nor George is innately evil; they were formed by their society. But they are the ones with the psychological and economical power to change things peacefully for the benefit of both sexes. It is unlikely that they will do so, however, because the short-term benefits which they derive from oppressing women are too precious to them.

See "Diary of a Mad Housewife." Have the honesty not to yawn. And remember that Tina has a really good life—an eight-room apartment on the Park, two children, a husband, a lover. Think about the other women.