

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

Monday, December 14, 1970

95A experiment found successful

Members of the Political Science 95A class voted Friday the course should be offered again next semester with an unlimited enrollment.

The class also voted that the course's study of relevant contemporary issues, its program of guest speakers and the practice of using undergraduates as seminar leaders should be continued.

In effect, the class judged the experimental course, started this year by Skip McGaughey and Tom Denyer, a success.

And the class' opinion is one the Political Science Department should take into consideration when the course's instructors ask that it be continued next semester.

Though the course format is by no means perfect—as the instructors will openly admit—it has proved to be successful in opening students' eyes to issues relevant to them and in helping students learn to run their own classes.

Attendance in the class' so-called "town meetings," in which the more than 1,000 students enrolled in the course meet three times a week, has not been as high as the instructors would have liked. But it has been as high as most large lecture classes taught on this campus.

And attendance in 95A's weekly seminars has been surprisingly high with some groups meeting much longer than the regular one hour.

Students have proven they will do course work without having to be coerced by their professors. Most students have been handing in the papers required for the course on time.

Students have also proven they will take a more active interest in their course work when given the opportunity to take part in developing the course's format.

Political Science 95A has challenged students with new ideas this semester through addresses by speakers from all extremes of the political spectrum. And through its speaker program it has enabled students to make their own decisions and judgments about these ideas.

It is one of the first courses on this campus that has made students think about relevant political views.

More than 1,000 students have deemed Political Science 95A a success in its first experimental semester. The Political Science Department cannot ignore their opinion by deciding to deny other students the opportunity of taking the course.

League's compromise accomplishes nothing

Atlantic Coast Conference officials Friday attempted to solve the 800 rule controversy with a compromise.

The compromise, aimed at placating objections to the rule by the University of South Carolina and Clemson, only delayed any confrontation between opponents and supporters of the 800 SAT score requirements.

In an effort to keep USC and Clemson from leaving the conference immediately, ACC officials agreed to allow schools to recruit students who score as low as 700 on their college boards provided their projected quality point average is 1.75 or better.

Clemson has rejected the compromise, and USC will probably follow.

Clemson president Robert Edwards said Friday he saw only three alternatives for his school—to accept the modification "which we won't do," withdraw from the conference or "go about the business of organizing a new conference."

One of the basic rules of politics is "compromise only to get what you want."

Clemson and USC are following this rule, but ACC officials seem to deny its existence. The initial vote on the USC-Clemson proposal to drop the 800 rule was defeated by a 4-4 vote, but the vote on the compromise passed with little objection.

USC and Clemson, however, do not want a compromise.

The officials of the conference put forth their compromise in hopes of preserving the traditional membership of the conference, forgetting that one of the strongest traditions the ACC has is one of a concern for academics as well as for athletics.

That lapse of memory will not prevent a confrontation among league members on the entrance requirements a year from now.

It will only make the confrontation more damaging to the conference.

Lana Starnes, Dr. Takey Crist

Cunnilingus can spread VD

Question: Can venereal disease be contracted by cunnilingus and fellatio or only by intercourse? I need to know before Christmas vacation. —signed, Concerned.

Dear Concerned: Frankly we're confused as to what's so important about Christmas vacation. This is something you should have known about before you began such sexual practices. Yes, in answer to your question. Normally the gonococcus, which is the organism responsible for gonorrhea, and treponema pallidum, which is responsible for syphilis, are transmitted by sexual contact. However, these venereal diseases can also be contracted if people are careless in handling bloody instruments and needles. All it takes is the right disease and mucus membrane to mucus membrane contact.

Incidentally, even though syphilis and gonorrhea are mentioned, other diseases have been classified as venereal diseases including chancroid, lymphogranuloma venereum, and granuloma inguinale.

If you're not going to do anything before you go home for Christmas, we suggest you get a blood test, which can be obtained free of charge at your local Health Department.

While we're on the topic of venereal disease...No, Frightened Young Girl in Cobb Dormitory, you can't get venereal disease from a dirty toilet seat.

Question: I'm confused as to how to take my birth control pills. It is the fifth day or the seventh day after my period that I start the pill. —signed, Confused.

Dear Confused: That's a simple one. The first time you start taking the pill wait until the fifth day of your period and then start taking one tablet a day for 21 days. You wait seven days and start again. Actually all you have to remember is three weeks on, one week off.

If you're on the 21 day cycle, there's nothing magical about the last seven tablets. They could be iron, vitamin or sugar tablets. They're simply included in the pack to give the girl something to do every day. So therefore, if you are taking pills which come 28 to a packet just remember to take one pill a day for ever. That is, if you don't want to get pregnant.

Question: I am really in a spot. There is a good chance that my girlfriend may

be pregnant. There is no excuse for it other than my own negligence, but it is too late now. Please tell me what I can do.

I know we can't get married for many reasons, so an abortion is what we would like. She won't be 18 until the end of March. We heard about a place in New York that might be good, but it will be expensive. Also, a girl I knew well, got an abortion legally in North Carolina because her parents got three psychiatrists to say she was psychologically unfit to have a baby. I

don't know what would be best, but we would like to solve the problem without parental help. Please help. —Anonymous.

Dear Anonymous: First of all since you say there is a chance we assume you don't know for sure. Therefore, we suggest that you first have her checked at the Infirmary or the Health Education Clinic and confirm she is pregnant by a pregnancy test and examination by a physician.

If abortion is the answer to her

problem perhaps you would be interested in calling the Clergy Service on Problem Pregnancies, a new state-wide organization formed in early October to provide assistance in obtaining contraceptives and therapeutic abortions. That number is 919-967-5333.

You can call the Health Education Clinic on Tuesday mornings from 8:30 to noon at 966-2133 or 966-2134 for further information.

(Address all letters to Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist in care of The Daily Tar Heel, Student Union.)

Carl Freedman

Impeach Nixon? Why not?

Only one American President—Andrew Johnson, the Southern bigot who, immediately after the Civil War, attempted to destroy any chance the Negro might have had for genuine emancipation—has ever been impeached, and he, for a number of complex political reasons, was not removed from office. Impeachment and removal from office is, therefore, essentially unprecedented in American politics and is not a course of action that should be advocated in a thoughtless, cavalier way. One would not like to place oneself in the company of such people as the Birchites, who, in opposition to former Chief Justice Earl Warren, screamed the battle cry of "Impeach!" as a substitute for rational discussion.

The impeachment of President Nixon is, however, a proposal that has not been limited to the Birchites' left-wing counterparts—the lunatic Weathermen-Yippies—but, on the contrary, has begun to attract serious discussion. As respected and professional a political analyst as Jack Newfield has suggested this course of action and at least one major national magazine, Scanlan's, has editorialized strongly in favor of the idea.

I am not quite ready to place myself in the company of Newfield and Scanlan's. I

have no reservations about Nixon's culpability, but I do have serious doubts about the tactical wisdom of an impeachment attempt. It would be certain to fail, and might well be counter-productive, generating public and Congressional sympathy for the now rather isolated President.

However hopeless the impeachment cause may be, the truly significant fact is that a logical, coherent case can be made for it. By invading independent nations and levying war without Congressional declaration, Nixon has committed acts in blatant defiance of the Constitution. (It is true, of course, that Nixon is far from the first President to defy the Constitution in this way; but historical precedent is no legal sanction for over unconstitutionality.)

Nixon has deliberately shirked his chief illegal obligation—enforcement of the nation's laws—by his frequent refusals to move against school segregation.

And Nixon, by his indictment of men like the Chicago Eight, (who Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst admitted were hauled up as frankly political prisoners) has effectively announced the repeal of the First Amendment by executive order.

Such illegal acts by the nation's No. 1 citizen are highly significant. But they

are, I think, only some of the factors that have contributed to the Administration's general stance of stubborn irresponsibility, and it is this stance that, as much as individual criminal actions by the President, have lead sober men to advocate so drastic a course as impeachment.

Take, for example, the controversy surrounding Nixon's Charles Manson statement. First of all, Nixon cavalierly brushed aside America's jury system by announcing that the yet to be tried Manson was guilty. Shortly thereafter, Attorney General Mitchell, who had been sitting by Nixon's side as the statement was made, said that he had been aware of the President's error but had thought it had form to correct him; protocol, it appears, is deemed more important than justice. Then, a few weeks later, Mitchell denied that the whole incident had ever happened at all.

When the official lies of the Administration are not even consistent with one another, Presidential leadership has clearly gone out the window—just as clearly as when Nixon, while chortling "They hate that," flashed a peace sign at student demonstrators in the hopes that they would respond by throwing politically valuable rocks at his car. This story has a sequel too: when the students failed to give Nixon the kind of response he had hoped for—as the police chief of San Jose has testified—he solved the problem simply by telling the press otherwise.

Is it any wonder that impeachment looks so attractive? The political adversaries of the first President Johnson must have had similar feelings, but, on strictly legal grounds, they could muster up nothing more impressive than Johnson's defiance of the rather dubious, and hastily passed, Tenure of Office Act. In Nixon we have a President who seemingly treats the Constitution as part of a leftist conspiracy, or, at any rate, finds it easy enough to ignore.

The impeachment talk really underscores the deterioration of Presidential credibility since the days of Jack Kennedy. Kennedy often did things that inspired strong opposition in both liberals and conservatives; even the constitutionality of some of his actions is perhaps questionable. But he never struck the kind of irrational pose that makes serious dialogue with an Administration impossible. He never drove his political opponents to the state of frustration where radical solutions like impeachment seem the only way to restore reason. Even Lyndon Johnson, in many ways a worse President than Nixon, declined to opt for the Alice-in-Wonderland type of aura that Nixon has surrounded himself with.

Yes, there can be no doubt that Nixon has written a new, fascinating chapter in the history of the American Presidency. In the hands of Lewis Carroll such a chapter would have been funny; in the hands of Franz Kafka, it would have been simply absurd. But in the hands of a working American politician, it is nothing short of tragic.

MR. BEGO

LOOKS AT THAT NEBULOUS MEDIUM OF SCHOLASTIC EXCHANGE

known as grades

FOR EXAMPLE, PHYS. ED. 41 I HEAR YOU GOT THE LOWEST GRADE IN THE CLASS.

YEAH, IT WAS ONLY A 98.

THE REALLY HARD ONES ARE RESERVED FOR EGGHEAD SPECIALISTS IN GREEK AND CHEMISTRY

STUDENTS REVEAL THEIR ATTITUDES THRU SEMANTIC SUBTLETY:

I GOT AN "A" IN THAT COURSE.

VS.

HE GAVE ME A "D" IN THERE.

Robert Wilson

Deans give pessimistic view of students

(Editor's Note: The author of this column is governor of Morrison Residence College.)

In the November issue of the UNC Alumni Review, James Cansler, Associate Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of Women Katherine Carmichael gave the "outside world" the opportunity to understand the student mass at UNC. I doubt anywhere else in the United States could you find two university administrators coming together in one capsule report to publicize such a totally pessimistic attitude toward the students of their campus.

I am proud to present what I consider to be the "highlights" of their professional opinions.

Dean Carmichael suggests, "In part, the revolt of the student is doubtless due to his portrayal of himself as a noble savage, dissatisfied with the hypocrisy about him, and blind to human weakness."

The student mass, she feels, is

"frightening in his rabid societal demands." She suggests that "he distrusts those who are beyond his tribe. The student mass tends to have a respect for his own design, but no respect for law and order as such, and may project its failure upon the police."

"It is questionable how honest the student mass is; but it is dedicated," she explains. "...Nevertheless, the student mass continues naive and have none of the sophistication of the labor union...Furthermore, activity is more fun than solitary study. It may even be questioned whether or not the individual student is as much interested in his demands as he appears to be when he moves in mass."

Miss Carmichael introduces her opinion of the end of this past decade as the "cult of the ugly," in which she includes the dirty, meanly dressed, and the foul word. "...Undoubtedly such factors indicate an escape from the real world into the infantile juvenile world." Her insight into the future of Chapel Hill includes a haven of hippie communes,

attacks from the radical left and hostility toward government and the University administration.

No fault can be found for the student as an individual. He is still as "wholesome, pleasant, polite" and "reasonable" as ever. But Miss Carmichael's office is not concerned with each individual; decisions must be made which affect the so called "student mass." Would a person with her attitude dare give the UNC coeds more freedom? Would she even consider their opinions before making decisions?

Dean Cansler takes a more direct and more firm stand against the student mass. He speaks of his "suspicion of representational government as a whole." He tries to illustrate how the student mass has completely turned away from any Student Government for its decisions. On this he bases his conclusion: "Clearly...it is impossible for the Administration to work effectively with student groups who cannot speak for, make decisions, or otherwise represent their larger constituency."

The Dean adds, "There is little we can do together, because the Administration is 'enemy' and students are distrustful of our every move and motive." Dean Cansler finds "a clearly discernible increase in paranoia in students" through a regrettably growing distrust of authority in general and of the University administration in particular, according to the Alumni Review.

I wonder why certain students have called the Administration "the enemy"? Could it be because these students knew the thoughts of Dean Cansler and Dean Carmichael?

If in the history of UNC anyone ever drew lines on a battlefield separating students and administrators it is Dean Cansler now. And he has begun to gather forces. In a publication reaching all dues-paying alumni, as well as newspaper articles across the state, he points out six shifts in attitudes of the students that the administration must try to put up with. But, never fear, the administration will keep the University running smoothly.

They will just make certain the students don't have a part in the decision making. This action can be justified, of course, because a few students cannot represent the entire 18,000. And if it becomes necessary to humor the students, they can choose some randomly selected decision making agency, say the Student Affairs office or the committee to choose the Chairman of the Infirmary, and place a few student "representatives" there. (Of course, the Administration forces will outnumber the Student forces 8 to 3 or 10 to 2.) The Administration will lose no battles.

The University has always been worried about its public image. We student leaders are supposed to speak cautiously at civic clubs, entertain alumni, take a trustee to dinner and inform the legislators. Thanks to Dean Cansler and Dean Carmichael in their article, "Today's Student: A decade-long look at evolving attitudes in Chapel Hill," we need no longer be worried about our image. We have ten years to live it down.

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.