The Michigan Daily

Eighty-Eight Years of Editorial Freedom

420 Maynard St., Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Vol. LXXXVIII, No. 35 News Phone: 764-0552

Edited and managed by students at the University of Michigan

Students need more space

THE ISSUE is space. There are two kinds of real estate being discussed student organizations, and floor room and equipment for fine arts and various crafts.

Former Michigan Student Assembly (MSA) head Scott Kellman and University Activities Center (UAC) leader Steve Carnevale have been asked by the Regents to bring proposals to this week's Regents meeting to help ease the crunch in arts and crafts space.

The need for space for theater groups, arts and graphics, conference and meeting space, and general room for lounges and meeting places was brought to light during the deliberation over the razing of Waterman-Barbour gym during the early part of the year.

Dozens of talented performing groups on campus are now forced to rehearse in cramped quarters or pay rent to use the League Studio. Also, dazzling costumes and props are damaged and destroyed because of inadequate storage spaces.

Currently, UAC holds photography and arts classes in the basement of the Union under unsafe and uncomfortable conditions.

Students are welding and spray painting in close quarters in the Student Activities Building.

But perhaps worst of all, there just isn't any where to go on a lazy afternoon. Other campuses around the country have commons, lounges, rathskellers a "common meeting place—with elbow room—where all are members," as the builders of the Union originally intended 50 years ago.

Kellman and Carnevale have proposed that the Regents use the coliseum, build a new building next to the coliseum, or give back to the students space in buildings around campus like the Student Activities Building (SAB), the Union, and the Burr building. Space that is funded by tuition assessments that was once, and ought to be now, used by and for students.

THE OTHER type of space is offices. The Regents will not be discussing office space this week, but a decision or statement about recreational, educational space would affect the future of office allotments to student groups.

Various ethnic and political organizations have charged that offices have been assigned on the basis of political and racial preference. They have a right to demand an office, a center of activity for their group if they will use it productively.

But there shouldn't be a conflict over offices. If the University considered it important that organizations be allowed a meeting place, thee is plenty of room in the SAB, the League, the Union, and other pieces of property around campus to provide for all serious committees, clubs, associations, alliances, and sects that desire a room to call their own.

The side effects of CBs

"We interrup this program for a special report," says the voice on the TV. Walter Cronkite appears. Just as he begins to speak, however, the picture waves. "Breaker 1-9 get me a handle on that, good buddy," comes from the set.

Unsuspecting persons are being affected by the CB craze, and some don't like it. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) received 135,000 complaints last year, and an FCC spokerperson said 80 per cent were about CB radios.

TELEVISION sets are not the only electronic devices affected by CB's. Complaints have been filed with the FCC by churches whose electric organs have picked up CB jargon durng sermons. Citizens, whose electric garage doors have been mysteriously opening and closing have also complained.

According to the Cronicle of Higher Education, former Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina had to halt the Watergate proceedings and silence amateur radio broadcasts from a Senate office because the microphones were humming with CB conversation.

The problem is so widespread that a House of Representative subcommittee has scheduled a hearing to try and clear up the situation. Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), a CB buff, has drafted a bill that would require an anti-interference device built into all CB radios.

INTERFERENCE is a problem because all electronic devices operate on frequencies and these are often very close together.

Federal regulations limit the amount of wattage (power) in CBs. The 23 channel models are allowed five watts and the 40 channel units are allowed four watts.

"The legal CBs are not the problem," says Don Elmore, manager of Audioland in the Briarwood Mall, "it's the souped-up models that are illegal and are causing the interference."

Elmore says Ann Arbor has a severe interference problem simply because there are so many CBs, and attributes the high number to Ann Arbor's proximity to the highways.

A LINEAR is the device that boosts the wattage of CBs. Many Ann Arbor stores, including Radio Shack and Audioland, will not sell them.

An FCC spokesperson explained that a linear is not illegal, but it is illegal to connect them to a CB radio. "Linears are sold for ham radios," he said, "but they are being abused by CB operators."

Linears come in different sizes and can boost the wattage of a CB by 1000 watts. At some times during the day, CBs with linears can reach from Detroit to Texas, as the beams transmitted bounce off the layer of sky known as the ionosphere.


"Those who use linears are ruining the air waves for others," the FCC says. "An illegal CB jams the channel it is operating on and prevents others from using it."

THE FCC IS virtually powerless against "pirate" CB users. Occasionally, FCC agents will go into a town and make an example of it by using sophisticated detection equipment to locate illegal CBs, "but the process is expensive and the fine (usually $50 and confiscation of the CB), is not severe enough to discourage users of illegal CBs," says the FCC.

Purchase Radio of 227 Hoover St. sells linears, but will ask for a ham radio operator's license before it will sell it.

"That protects us," says Roy Purchase, "linears are for ham radios, and we sell them for that purpose only." Linears cost from $50 to $500 depending on the wattage they produce.

If a neighbor's CB is making your television go crazy, your stereo play poorly, or your garage door open unexpectedly, it seems for now it's just tough luck . . . good buddy.




First Amendment rights hurt if porn bill passes

THE QUESTION of government regulation of the sale of pornographic materials has once again arisen. Since the 1972 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, which left the definition of obscene materials up to local standards, the Michigan Legislature and various city governments have attempted to define what those local standards are, and use that definition to cover the sale of pornographic materials. A state pornographic law passed under these circumstances was found to be too broad and vague, and too difficult for the state Supreme Court to interpret. Two weeks ago the state Supreme court found local anti-pornography laws to be illegal and unneeded in the case of a theater owner convicted under an East Detroit anti-obscenity ordinance.

Thus the stage was set for new anti-obscenity legislation, for with local ordinances illegal and the state law no good, Michigan was left with no law to regulate pornography.

Work is expected to start this week on that new law. At the moment the Michigan House is considering a bill which would regulate the sale of pornographic materials to minors. But what is worrisome is that the House Judiciary Committee is reportedly ready to start work on a bill which would cover the sale of pornographic materials, and their distribution, to adults.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT here is that the bill regulating the sale of these materials to adults be not passed. A new bill covering the sale to minors is needed, but the bill for the adults is a gross infringement of our First Amendments rights. It is the inherent right of all adults to be permitted to read, see, and buy pornographic materials whenever they so choose. One does not try to alleviate the ills of a society by censorship, but by allowing the free flow of ideas, any ideas. By passing a bill regulating the sale of pornography to adults, another example of government attempts at forms of censorship comes to light.



Letters to The Daily

unintended sexism

To The Daily:

I very much enjoyed the article entitled "Nobel to 3 Americans" but I find it very disgusting that you mentioned that Dr. Yalow is the mother of two children and do not state the family status of Drs. Schally and Guillemin. It is obvious that she was singled out because of her sex. Having been familiar with Dr. Yalow's work for many years, I can certainly appreciate her vast contributions to the field of radioimmunoassay. She, as well as the two men honored, won the Nobel prize because of her scientific work and not because she is a parent.

— Harriet L. Behm

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The fact that Dr. Yalow is the mother of two children, appeared in the Daily in error. Although the Associated Press often mentions a woman's marital status in a story, it is our policy to remove all such references unless it is pertinent to the story because we consider it a sexist practice (since men's marital status is almost never mentioned). We apologize for our error in the Nobel story.

•

reactionary editorials

To The Daily:

This is in response to two of the most reactionary editorials that you have had the audacity to print in recent weeks. I am referring to "Lowering out-of-state fees will make 'U' costs soar" and "Release of pay hike good, whether selfish, sympathetic." With regard to the first, leaving aside the fact that it is selfish, petty, provincial and thoroughly unworthy of a university of this one's supposed standing, it grossly ignores one simple fact.

You base a good deal of your argument on the payment of taxes by in-state residents, crassly ignoring the fact that there are a large number of 'out-of-state' students especially among the graduate and law students, who live in Ann Arbor and elsewhere in Michigan year-round, work here to support themselves and who pay the same state income tax as the 'residents.' Many of these people have applied for residency to avoid the crippling high out-of-state rates, nearly impossible to pay while supporting oneself and going to school. Many of those people have applied for residency, almost universally getting rejected, although some have gone so far as to attempt to put downpayments on a house in order to establish their 'permanence.' If you don't believe me, ask around; or ask me, I can give you a few names of 'out-of-state' students who might be able to tell you their stories of the quest for residency. I would suggest that you direct your fire, when complaining of in-state costs either at Lansing for their insufficient level of support, or else at the probable cause of that lack of support, the administration of this university, which through year-long court battles with the campus unions, a general lack of foresight and one of the most expensive bureaucracies of any university in the world, has managed to squander a good deal of the funding given them.

With regard to GEO, by your general mud-slinging you have done as usual a great disservice to one of the most important organizations on this campus. I have only recently begun to get active in GEO myself, but a lot of hard work by a number of people over the course of the summer has rebuilt this union to probably a stronger internal structure than it ever has possessed. Furthermore the fall recruitment drive is going well, over 35 departments have representation, on the Stewarts' Council and the most recent stewarts' phone chain contained 60 active names, exclusive of the executive officers. As far as it being "obvious . . . that GEO does not have the genuine support of its constituency," I can say that my department, German, has already over 60 per cent of the GSAs signed up as dues paying members, who are getting increasingly active. It is the same in other departments. GEO may have suffered a setback last fall, although the university certainly had a hand in that, bargaining in bad faith and calling it hard-nosed bargaining, but we are building a union which will protect the welfare of all graduate students and fight to provide better academic conditions for all students on campus.

You, on the other hand, already taking a stand against your fellow students from outside of Michigan, are now placing yourselves firmly in the camp of management, (though you may feel very liberal and objective sitting in your offices) as you attack one organization most deserving of your support, and through it, every labor union on campus. Which side are you on?!

— David Lechner

Your rights are . . .

QUESTION — How does a child become emancipated?

ANSWER — Emancipation before a young person reaches the age of majority can only be granted by a court of law or by the operation of law under certain circumstances, such as a child marriage or a membership in the armed forces.

A child may, however, under other conditions, become emancipated in whole or in part by implication, consent, agreement, or fact, even without permission or approval of a court.

QUESTION — How, and under what conditions, will a court declare a child emancipated?

ANSWER — Historically, emancipation was a privilege granted to parents, not children. A parent could, and still can, petition a court for a declaration of emancipation so that he could be released from his legal obligation of support, maintenance, and education of the child.

Today, in most states, parents still must consent to a judicial degree of emancipation, even though in some cases courts will consider outrageous behavior of parents toward children (such as abandonment of parental duties) to constitute implied consent, thereby emancipating children even though formal or express consent was never granted.

In determining whether a child is to be emancipated, a court (or a jury) will consider factors such as the age of the child, whether he lives at home, and whether the child is free from the authority or control of his or her parents. Most important, however, are financial considerations such as the child's employment and source of income, his ability to spend money without parental permission, whether the child pays room and board if living at home, whether the child pays his own debts, and whether the parents have listed the child as a dependent for tax purposes. It is important to remember that in most cases the right to obtain a judicial declaration of emancipation is a right which belongs to the parent rather than the child.

QUESTION — Does a teacher have a constitutional right to proselytize in the classroom?

ANSWER — It is doubtful that a teacher has such a right, at least at the elementary and perhaps at the secondary levels, where students may be particularly susceptible to the influence of their teachers. As the Supreme Court has said: "A teacher works in a sensitive area in a school room. There he shapes the attitude of young minds towards the society in which they live. In this, the state has a vital concern."

Thus, the courts have been "keenly aware of the state's vital interest in protecting the impressionable minds of its young people from any form of extreme propagandism in the classroom." For example, a federal court upheld a decision not to renew the contract of a high-school social studies teacher where there was substantial evidence that the teacher had abused his position by using his classroom "as his personal forum to promote union activities, to sanction polygamy, to attack marriage, to criticize other teachers and to sway and influence the minds of young people without a full and proper explanation of both sides of the issue."

Of course, the Constitution does not shield from discipline a teacher who uses his classroom for partisan political purposes. The more questionable the relevance of a teacher's discussion to the subject matter of his course, the easier it will be for a court to find that he has unacceptably intruded his personal views into the classroom.

It can reasonably be argued that a teacher has a constitutional right to express his personal view if relevant to the subject matter, provided he refrains from seeking to win student converts but fairly presents all sides of the issue. Indeed, a teacher who avoids answering a student's direct question about the teacher's personal opinion may well forfeit the respect of his class. It is also conceivable that a teacher who is disciplined because he has propagandized for an unpopular view might successfully challenge such action on equal protection grounds if he could show that the school authorities permitted teachers to propagandize for orthodox views.

•

The questions and answers above have been excerpted from two American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) handbooks — The Rights of Young people, and The Rights of Teachers, by Alan Sussman and David Rubin respectively.

The Michigan Daily

Eighty-Eight Years of Editorial Freedom

420 Maynard St., Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Vol. LXXXVIII, No. 35 News Phone: 764-0552

Edited and managed by students at the University of Michigan

Students need more space

THE ISSUE is space. There are two kinds of real estate being discussed student organizations, and floor room and equipment for fine arts and various crafts.

Former Michigan Student Assembly (MSA) head Scott Kellman and University Activities Center (UAC) leader Steve Carnevale have been asked by the Regents to bring proposals to this week's Regents meeting to help ease the crunch in arts and crafts space.

The need for space for theater groups, arts and graphics, conference and meeting space, and general room for lounges and meeting places was brought to light during the deliberation over the razing of Waterman-Barbour gym during the early part of the year.

Dozens of talented performing groups on campus are now forced to rehearse in cramped quarters or pay rent to use the League Studio. Also, dazzling costumes and props are damaged and destroyed because of inadequate storage spaces.

Currently, UAC holds photography and arts classes in the basement of the Union under unsafe and uncomfortable conditions.

Students are welding and spray painting in close quarters in the Student Activities Building.

But perhaps worst of all, there just isn't any where to go on a lazy afternoon. Other campuses around the country have commons, lounges, rathskellers a "common meeting place—with elbow room—where all are members," as the builders of the Union originally intended 50 years ago.

Kellman and Carnevale have proposed that the Regents use the coliseum, build a new building next to the coliseum, or give back to the students space in buildings around campus like the Student Activities Building (SAB), the Union, and the Burr building. Space that is funded by tuition assessments that was once, and ought to be now, used by and for students.

THE OTHER type of space is offices. The Regents will not be discussing office space this week, but a decision or statement about recreational, educational space would affect the future of office allotments to student groups.

Various ethnic and political organizations have charged that offices have been assigned on the basis of political and racial preference. They have a right to demand an office, a center of activity for their group if they will use it productively.

But there shouldn't be a conflict over offices. If the University considered it important that organizations be allowed a meeting place, thee is plenty of room in the SAB, the League, the Union, and other pieces of property around campus to provide for all serious committees, clubs, associations, alliances, and sects that desire a room to call their own.

The side effects of CBs

"We interrup this program for a special report," says the voice on the TV. Walter Cronkite appears. Just as he begins to speak, however, the picture waves. "Breaker 1-9 get me a handle on that, good buddy," comes from the set.

Unsuspecting persons are being affected by the CB craze, and some don't like it. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) received 135,000 complaints last year, and an FCC spokerperson said 80 per cent were about CB radios.

TELEVISION sets are not the only electronic devices affected by CB's. Complaints have been filed with the FCC by churches whose electric organs have picked up CB jargon during sermons. Citizens, whose electric garage doors have been mysteriously opening and closing have also complained.

According to the Cronicle of Higher Education, former Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina had to halt the Watergate proceedings and silence amateur radio broadcasts from a Senate office because the microphones were humming with CB conversation.

The problem is so widespread that a House of Representative subcommittee has scheduled a hearing to try and clear up the situation. Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.), a CB buff, has drafted a bill that would require an anti-interference device built into all CB radios.

INTERFERENCE is a problem because all electronic devices operate on frequencies and these are often very close together.

Federal regulations limit the amount of wattage (power) in CBs. The 23 channel models are allowed five watts and the 40 channel units are allowed four watts.

"The legal CBs are not the problem," says Don Elmore, manager of Audioland in the Briarwood Mall, "it's the souped-up models that are illegal and are causing the interference."

Elmore says Ann Arbor has a severe interference problem simply because there are so many CBs, and attributes the high number to Ann Arbor's proximity to the highways.

A LINEAR is the device that boosts the wattage of CBs. Many Ann Arbor stores, including Radio Shack and Audioland, will not sell them.

An FCC spokesperson explained that a linear is not illegal, but it is illegal to connect them to a CB radio. "Linears are sold for ham radios," he said, "but they are being abused by CB operators."

Linears come in different sizes and can boost the wattage of a CB by 1000 watts. At some times during the day, CBs with linears can reach from Detroit to Texas, as the beams transmitted bounce off the layer of sky known as the ionosphere.


"Those who use linears are ruining the air waves for others," the FCC says. "An illegal CB jams the channel it is operating on and prevents others from using it."

THE FCC IS virtually powerless against "pirate" CB users. Occasionally, FCC agents will go into a town and make an example of it by using sophisticated detection equipment to locate illegal CBs, "but the process is expensive and the fine (usually $50 and confiscation of the CB), is not severe enough to discourage users of illegal CBs," says the FCC.

Purchase Radio of 327 Hoover St. sells linears, but will ask for a ham radio operator's license before it will sell it.

"That protects us," says Roy Purchase, "linears are for ham radios, and we sell them for that purpose only." Linears cost from $50 to $500 depending on the wattage they produce.

If a neighbor's CB is making your television go crazy, your stereo play poorly, or your garage door open unexpectedly, it seems for now it's just tough luck . . . good buddy.




First Amendment rights hurt if porn bill passes

THE QUESTION of government regulation of the sale of pornographic materials has once again arisen. Since the 1972 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, which left the definition of obscene materials up to local standards, the Michigan Legislature and various city governments have attempted to define what those local standards are, and use that definition to cover the sale of pornographic materials. A state pornographic law passed under these circumstances was found to be too broad and vague, and too difficult for the state Supreme Court to interpret. Two weeks ago the state Supreme court found local anti-pornography laws to be illegal and unneeded in the case of a theater owner convicted under an East Detroit anti-obscenity ordinance.

Thus the stage was set for new anti-obscenity legislation, for with local ordinances illegal and the state law no good, Michigan was left with no law to regulate pornography.

Work is expected to start this week on that new law. At the moment the Michigan House is considering a bill which would regulate the sale of pornographic materials to minors. But what is worrisome is that the House Judiciary Committee is reportedly ready to start work on a bill which would cover the sale of pornographic materials, and their distribution, to adults.

WHAT IS IMPORTANT here is that the bill regulating the sale of these materials to adults be not passed. A new bill covering the sale to minors is needed, but the bill for the adults is a gross infringement of our First Amendments rights. It is the inherent right of all adults to be permitted to read, see, and buy pornographic materials whenever they so choose. One does not try to alleviate the ills of a society by censorship, but by allowing the free flow of ideas, any ideas. By passing a bill regulating the sale of pornography to adults, another example of government attempts at forms of censorship comes to light.



Letters to The Daily

unintended sexism

To The Daily:

I very much enjoyed the article entitled "Nobel to 3 Americans" but I find it very disgusting that you mentioned that Dr. Yalow is the mother of two children and do not state the family status of Drs. Schally and Guilleman. It is obvious that she was singled out because of her sex. Having been familiar with Dr. Yalow's work for many years, I can certainly appreciate her vast contributions to the field of radioimmunoassay. She, as well as the two men honored, won the Nobel prize because of her scientific work and not because she is a parent.

— Harriet L. Behm

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The fact that Dr. Yalow is the mother of two children, appeared in the Daily in error. Although the Associated Press often mentions a woman's marital status in a story, it is our policy to remove all such references unless it is pertinent to the story because we consider it a sexist practice (since men's marital status is almost never mentioned). We apologize for our error in the Nobel story.]

•

reactionary editorials

To The Daily:

This is in response to two of the most reactionary editorials that you have had the audacity to print in recent weeks. I am referring to "Lowering out-of-state fees will make 'U' costs soar" and "Release of pay hike good, whether selfish, sympathetic." With regard to the first, leaving aside the fact that it is selfish, petty, provincial and thoroughly unworthy of a university of this one's supposed standing, it grossly ignores one simple fact.

You base a good deal of your argument on the payment of taxes by in-state residents, crassly ignoring the fact that there are a large number of 'out-of-state' students especially among the graduate and law students, who live in Ann Arbor and elsewhere in Michigan year-round, work here to support themselves and who pay the same state income tax as the 'residents.' Many of these people have applied for residency to avoid the crippling high out-of-state rates, nearly impossible to pay while supporting oneself and going to school. Many of those people have applied for residency, almost universally getting rejected, although some have gone so far as to attempt to put downpayments on a house in order to establish their 'permanence.' If you don't believe me, ask around; or ask me. I can give you a few names of 'out-of-state' students who might be able to tell you their stories of the quest for residency. I would suggest that you direct your fire, when complaining of instate costs either at Lansing for their insufficient level of support, or else at the probable cause of that lack of support, the administration of this university, which through year-long court battles with the campus unions, a general lack of foresight and one of the most expensive bureaucracies of any university in the world, has managed to squander a good deal of the funding given them.

With regard to GEO, by your general mud-slinging you have done as usual a great disservice to one of the most important organizations on this campus. I have only recently begun to get active in GEO myself, but a lot of hard work by a number of people over the course of the summer has rebuilt this union to probably a stronger internal structure than it ever has possessed. Furthermore the fall recruitment drive is going well; over 15 departments have representation, on the Stewarts' Council and the most recent stewarts' phone chain contained 60 active names, exclusive of the executive officers. As far as it being "obvious . . . that GEO does not have the genuine support of its constituency," I can say that my department, German, has already over 60 per cent of the GSAs signed up as dues paying members, who are getting increasingly active. It is the same in other departments. GEO may have suffered a setback last fall, although the university certainly had a hand in that, bargaining in bad faith and calling it 'hard-nosed bargaining,' but we are building a union which will protect the welfare of all graduate students and fight to provide better academic conditions for all students on campus.

You, on the other hand, already taking a stand against your fellow students from outside of Michigan, are now placing yourselves firmly in the camp of management, (though you may feel very liberal and objective sitting in your offices), as you attack one organization most deserving of your support, and through it, every labor union on campus. Which side are you on?

— David Lechner

Your rights are . . .

QUESTION — How does a child become emancipated?

ANSWER — Emancipation before a young person reaches the age of majority can only be granted by a court of law or by the operation of law under certain circumstances, such as a child marriage or a membership in the armed forces.

A child may, however, under other conditions, become emancipated in whole or in part by implication, consent, agreement, or fact, even without permission or approval of a court.

QUESTION — How, and under what conditions, will a court declare a child emancipated?

ANSWER — Historically, emancipation was a privilege granted to parents, not children. A parent could, and still can, petition a court for a declaration of emancipation so that he could be released from his legal obligation of support, maintenance, and education of the child.

Today, in most states, parents still must consent to a judicial decree of emancipation, even though in some cases courts will consider outrageous behavior of parents toward children (such as abandonment of parental duties) to constitute implied consent, thereby emancipating children even though formal or express consent was never granted.

In determining whether a child is to be emancipated, a court (or a jury) will consider factors such as the age of the child, whether he lives at home, and whether the child is free from the authority or control of his or her parents. Most important, however, are financial considerations such as the child's employment and source of income, his ability to spend money without parental permission, whether the child pays room and board if living at home, whether the child pays his own debts, and whether the parents have listed the child as a dependent for tax purposes. It is important to remember that in most cases the right to obtain a judicial declaration of emancipation is a right which belongs to the parent rather than the child.

QUESTION — Does a teacher have a constitutional right to proselytize in the classroom?

ANSWER — It is doubtful that a teacher has such a right, at least at the elementary and perhaps at the secondary levels, where students may be particularly susceptible to the influence of their teachers. As the Supreme Court has said: "A teacher works in a sensitive area in a school-room. There he shapes the attitude of young minds towards the society in which they live. In this, the state has a vital concern."

Thus, the courts have been "keenly aware of the state's vital interest in protecting the impressionable minds of its young people from any form of extreme propagandism in the classroom." For example, a federal court upheld a decision not to renew the contract of a high school social studies teacher where there was substantial evidence that the teacher had abused his position by using his classroom "as his personal forum to promote union activities, to sanction polygamy, to attack marriage, to criticize other teachers and to sway and influence the minds of young people without a full and proper explanation of both sides of the issue."

Of course, the Constitution does not shield from discipline a teacher who uses his classroom for partisan political purposes. The more questionable the relevance of a teacher's discussion to the subject matter of his course, the easier it will be for a court to find that he has unacceptably intruded his personal views into the classroom.

It can reasonably be argued that a teacher has a constitutional right to express his personal view if relevant to the subject matter, provided he refrains from seeking to win student converts but fairly presents all sides of the issue. Indeed, a teacher who avoids answering a student's direct question about the teacher's personal opinion may well forfeit the respect of his class. It is also conceivable that a teacher who is disciplined because he has propagandized for an unpopular view might successfully challenge such action on equal protection grounds if he could show that the school authorities permitted teachers to propagandize for orthodox views.

•

The questions and answers above have been excerpted from two American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) handbooks — The Rights of Young people, and The Rights of Teachers, by Alan Sussman and David Rubin respectively.