

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

Harry Bryan, Editor  
Saturday, May 8, 1971

## Student response encouraging

The UNC Young Republican Club passed a resolution Wednesday night supporting continued student funding of The Daily Tar Heel.

Thursday night Student Legislature passed a similar resolution.

Both resolutions were in response to a bill recently introduced in the North Carolina Senate by Sen. Julian Allsbrook that would prohibit compulsory funding of The Daily Tar Heel.

The staff of the DTH is encouraged by the two resolutions and welcomes similar support from any other student organizations or individual students.

The General Assembly must be shown that students do not object to funding the newspaper out of Student Activity Fees for the several years it will take to make the DTH financially independent, a goal that the present staff is currently working to achieve.

As was pointed out in a previous editorial, a referendum to discontinue student funding of the paper was defeated last spring, 4,817 to 1,078.

This year that same referendum would probably be defeated by an even bigger margin.

What students must realize is that if the General Assembly does vote to cut off funding for the DTH, we will be forced to sell

newspapers on a subscription basis that would cost each student much more than the approximately \$2.40 he will pay for the paper next year in student fees.

And the paper would probably remain on a subscription basis forever.

However, if funding is continued for the next few years, the DTH will be able to become financially independent through increased advertising, and the paper will be free for everyone.

And it will probably remain free to everyone forever.

It might also be pointed out that in the two weeks since the Insight on homosexuality was printed, the DTH has not received a single letter that considered the articles obscene or pornographic.

One of Sen. Allsbrook's basic arguments was that students should not be forced to read such material. Obviously, no student objected to the articles, or at least no student felt strongly enough about it to write within two weeks.

Sen. Allsbrook and his colleagues in Raleigh should take into consideration the fact that The Daily Tar Heel has the support of the student body—and that no one felt the homosexuality articles were obscene—when the bill comes to a vote.

Ken Ripley

## Soul Food: taking time to think

Now that the year is drawing to a close, it seems we've got so many papers, finals, and take-home exams facing us that there just isn't much time to think.

Much less is there time, it seems, to think about such things as life, death, personal identity, love, religion, and God. When we get embroiled in the "tyranny of the urgent," it is often hard to do much besides read, write, eat and—occasionally—sleep.

During the year, though, a lot of people do think about such things. For some, the quest for spiritual understanding is very personal. Their beliefs are their own, and they go their own way. Others find personal meaning in different religions on

campus—Christianity, Meher Baba, various forms of mysticism.

There are those who find what they want by rejecting religion and searching for meaning to life in other ways. Some seek it through pleasure, living only for themselves. Others seek it through political involvement, social work or campus projects.

Then there are those who don't think much about spiritual matters at all. It isn't that they wouldn't be interested, or even necessarily that they don't want to know about themselves, their relationships with other people, or God.

They just don't happen to think about it. They aren't against religion or for it. They're lukewarm.

"I know your works," the Bible says.

"You are neither cold or hot. Would that you were cold or hot! So, because you are lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew you out of my mouth."

"For you say, I am rich, I have prospered, and I need nothing; not knowing that you are wretched, pitiable, poor, blind, naked."

The Bible, obviously, is quite blunt about the dangers of being lukewarm. Even the person who hates God, who is "cold" to Christianity, is better off than the person who just doesn't care.

Why? Because the guy who is fighting God is thinking, is struggling to find meaning somewhere, is reaching out for some understanding of the world around him. He may be "wretched, pitiable, poor, blind, and naked," but he knows he

is. He may rebel against religion, but he is at least very much alive. He is, above all, feeling.

The person who is "hot," who is trying to find a relationship with God, is feeling, too. He inherits the promises of God for "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control," but he engages in that struggle to help others when you want to be helped. As he learns to relate his faith to his life, to trust God in all situations, he does suffer, hurt, know disappointment. But he finds that out of suffering does come maturity and understanding. He, too, is very much alive.

But the person who is lukewarm, who doesn't think much beyond the confines of everyday living, is missing out. He may think he's doing all right and that he needs nothing more, but he is depriving himself of the maturing struggle, the enriching growth that comes with trying to understand and confront man's spiritual nature.

To be truly alive is to feel, to question, to search for answers and meanings. Maturing does not just happen. We mature only as we allow ourselves to experience life. We grow, become truly alive, only as we learn that we are wretched and blind and incomplete—and as we do something about it. We commit ourselves to change, to faith or belief. And we reap the results of our commitment.

We can go through life lukewarm, without any commitments and with complete indifference. We can get a job, make money, and grow old. But to remain lukewarm is to be spiritually dead.

During the past three years, Soul Food has been at the center of several stormy controversies. It has received both praise and scorn, admiration and contempt.

There have been columns that people have liked, and they have told me so. There have also been columns that no one has liked, including me. Undoubtedly, next year will be much the same.

I have not asked people to agree with me about religion and Christianity. I ask only that we think about these things, that we stir a little bit from our schedules and see if there isn't more to life than what we have.

If Soul Food has caused one person to think, to budge from his lukewarmness, I am well content.

THERE IS SOMETHING I HAVE GOT,  
IT'S A SOMETHING YOU HAVE NOT,  
Na Na Na Na Naa Na!



### The Daily Tar Heel

79 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell . . . . . Managing Ed.  
Lou Bonds . . . . . News Editor  
Rod Waldorf . . . . . Associate Ed.  
Glenn Brank . . . . . Associate Ed.  
Mark Whicker . . . . . Sports Editor  
Ken Ripley . . . . . Feature Editor  
Bob Chapman . . . . . Natl. News Ed.  
March Check . . . . . Night Editor

Bob Wilson . . . . . Business Mgr.  
Janet Bernstein . . . . . Adv. Mgr.

### Letters to the editor

## DTH reader refutes Hitler criticism

To the Editor:

The letter attacking the picture with the caption, "Hitler would have been proud," was so absurd that it should not go by without rebuttal.

Mr. Fox compared the activities of the Washington protestors to those of Hitler's Brownshirts, a group of "drug addicts, homosexuals and criminals." Mr. Fox said that Hitler used the Brownshirts to destroy and disrupt the constitutional government and implies that the "May Day Tribe" are trying to do the same thing in Washington.

Mr. Fox, the Brownshirts destroyed and killed in the name of a military dictatorship which would, when it came to power, wage a horribly unjust and immoral war which would cost the lives of millions. No one did, or could, stop the Brownshirts and Hitler.

The "May Day Tribe," as you call them, were in Washington to disrupt a government which is now waging an immoral and unjust war which destroys hundreds of innocent lives daily. Why?

Because no one has the guts to stop Nixon and his co-horts. The Brownshirts practiced war; so does the U.S. Military. The Washington protestors came with the banner of peace for the people. Any effort remaining non-violent is justified as a tool in ending this perverted conflict.

Mr. Fox's logic is a good example of the shallowness of thought of those that support the war or condemn war protestors. People are murdered daily just because this government won't admit a mistake, and all you can say is, "keep your mouth shut, don't worry about it, stay at home."

Think about it, Mr. Fox. Think very hard about it.

Robert Welch  
219 James

### D.C. activity hit by reader

To the Editor:

"The government would just not let

the protestors do the non-violence thing."

I suppose it's non-violent to "junk" cars—other people's cars—by deflating their tires and rolling them into the path of oncoming traffic. It's "non-violent" to keep others from going to their jobs . . . to throw rocks, broken glass and nails into the street—a hazard to both cars and pedestrians.

Thousands of people commute to Washington to work. The traffic situation is appalling at best. What sympathy could the protestors hope to gain by making a bad traffic situation worse?

Nixon is doing the best he can to get our boys home and end the war. He can't do it overnight but he is trying. What's the point of rioting when something is already being done about the situation one is rioting about?

In light of the facts, the protestors look like a bunch of no-minds just out to cause trouble.

Leslie Schneider  
26 Rogerson Dr.

### Visitation bill attacked

To the Editor:

The proposed bill before the N.C. Legislature by Wake Democrat Coggins has all the emotional appeal of the former Speaker Ban.

He will receive widespread support from the same reactionary forces that defeated liquor-by-the-drink, abortion legalization, and have kept North Carolina the backward state it is today. Hypocritical extremists keep milk prices the highest in the nation while subsidizing low cost cigarettes.

The proposal to ban visitation should strike close to the hearts of all you apathetical dorm rats who are the least bit heterosexual. GET INVOLVED. Write your representative in the N.C. Legislature. If you plan to stay in Chapel Hill for the foreseeable

future—REGISTER & VOTE.

It's interesting to note that big-monied Chapel Hill realtors favor this legislation to aid the apartment grab and sustain a 25 per cent increase in rent. The only way to beat these SOB's is at the polls.

Arlan P. Garvey  
Carrboro

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.

George Blackburn

## Education moving in the wrong direction

In his speech to the Faculty Club this past November, Attorney General Robert Morgan advised that the University must find a way of "re-establishing a cohesiveness within our society, based upon mutual respect and sympathy among our people."

This is, perhaps, the central issue facing every modern institution and one which has plagued the creative arts for some time. The tendency to subjectivism in recent Western culture has destroyed the social foundations of government, religion, and art. This was, perhaps, the inevitable consequence of man's intellectual progress and the struggle for dignity by the masses in Western society during the Modern era. However, the immediate result—social fragmentation—is not one with which men can long be satisfied.

In 1836, the French novelist, Stendhal, attended a performance of Moliere's comedy "The Bourgeois Gentleman." During the performance, half the audience laughed at M. Jourdain, the would-be gentleman, while the other half found Dorante, supposedly the well-bred hero, ridiculous. The result was Stendhal's proclamation that "Comedy is impossible in 1836." Whereas under the

old regime the various levels of the literate public were forced to associate with each other at court and thus gained a common sense of 'sociability,' French society since the Revolution had lost this common understanding and had thus made the comedy of manners impossible.

Stendhal turned to the novel which could create its own social context and thus avoid a reliance upon 'common sociability' that had formerly allowed the author to assume that he held a given number of social ideas in common with his readers (i.e. had formerly allowed the author to assume 'reciprocal sympathy' between himself and the reader upon which the author might base his presentation of an action with reasonable certainty that his reader would understand his point if not agree with it.)

One might conclude that the increasing psychologism and subjectivism of the novel is literature's encounter with the devolution of Western society in which there seems to be less and less foundation for association between individuals. Like the concentration of the visual and plastic arts upon their basic elements—line, color, form—unable to presume these and deal in terms of the

superstructures forged of these elements in classical art, what remains of social literature has been concerned with establishing or discovering some irrefutable foundation for social conduct, a 'finality of love' or some such principle, as an alternative to the utter loneliness threatening the future.

Educational institutions during the last two centuries have undergone a similar submission to subjectivism (in so far as any social institution can do so) while pursuing atomistically a new foundation for sociability. The Merzbacher Reforms of two years ago abandoned the presence of a central educational program for our University according to the growing demands of students to be allowed to do their own thing. This is merely one of the final phases of the fragmenting process toward subjectivism which began with the assault on classical education at the close of the eighteenth century. These reforms culminated in the overthrow of religion and the humanities as the foundation of "liberal education" in the 1850's.

Since that victory of utilitarian education and the substitution of professionalism for humanism (an empirically risky sort of notion) as the

excuse for university, educators have been increasingly reticent to assert that all students ought to be required to be familiar with the humanities; any more so than with the natural sciences, and now reticent to require that all be familiar with anything at all in particular. The result has been the specialized student; plans for independent study and an end to all requirements are merely further steps upon the same road.

Our development since the eighteenth century has been a progress, and one not merely in technology. The negation of the individual eventuated by rationalism and the solipsism inevitable to a purely empirical metaphysics have been existentially resolved—modern man is becoming more and more confident that both the individual and social aspects of ethics, the factual and rational aspects of thought, the physical and spiritual dimensions of reality are ontologically grounded in the imperatives of human being. Western man has proved that he can neither live negated by universalism nor isolated by subjectivism.

I would suggest that the apparent "loss of control" which liberationists are currently lamenting, the feeling that our

machines and bureaucracy are taking over, is not the result of the dehumanization of man. The widespread dissatisfaction without cultural situation reveals that our present state is not the result of having become inured to dehumanized society. Our "loss of control" is only apparent and is the result of subjectivization not dehumanization.

Allen Tate compares the modern man of action with the modern man of letters: "While the politician, in his cynical innocence, uses society, the man of letters disdainfully, or perhaps even absentmindedly withdraws from it . . ." This is true not merely of different men but of single individuals as well. Our public social actions are not united to our private convictions for we have feared to act upon so empirically unsound a thing as value—nothing has been so dreaded as the charge that one is forcing one's morals (supposing one still has the need for them) upon another. Modern men have been in Hamlet's dilemma; lacking the certainty needed to act, we have mused upon the dynamics of static being, simple existence. But, as with Hamlet, the realities of a real life are forcing us to assume responsibility.

Chancellor Sitterson opened the year by asking the entering freshman class, "Is 'doing one's own thing' sufficient?" And answered decisively, "I think not." This is the decision that men are making, and its consequences will be reflected by our institutions even as they reflected the classical and empirical assumptions of previous orders. If our curriculum is to be updated, it ought not merely to be brought from 1850 to 1918, it should come to 1971, to the dawning post-dissillusionment era we are approaching. The social function of education will not be to indoctrinate students with an historical theory such as that I have adumbrated here, but merely to provide a common vocabulary of learning so that their own discourse about the significance of our situation will be voiced in an intellectual lingua franca rather than isolated in the professional jargon of the atomized disciplines.

By re-establishing the humanities as the center of education for all students, the Babeling tendency of multiversities (their institutional subjectivism through departmentalization and specialization) will be overcome. Education will realize the individual and social nature of man.