

# 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

Tuesday, April 27, 1971

## Renwick's charge is not justifiable

Hayden B. Renwick, assistant director of undergraduate admissions, condemned Student Legislature last week for cutting the Committee for the Advancement of Minority and Disadvantaged Students (AMDS) out of the budget for the 1971-72 year.

"If the administration and the student body are seriously committed to the disadvantaged

students in the state, there is no excuse for not funding the AMDS," he said.

Renwick is correct up to a point; the AMDS and its main program—Project Uplift—have done an admirable job in the few years they have been working to bring minority and disadvantaged students to this campus, and it should be continued.

However, he does not realize that it is not up to the students on this campus to fund the program. It is up to the State of North Carolina and the Consolidated University.

The money Student Legislature has at its disposal each year is made up of the Student Activity Fee that every student pays in fees and funds the Legislature may collect through any money-making programs.

That money, as indicated by its name, is not supposed to support programs the University and state should be financing. It should be spent on programs in which students paying the fee can participate.

The AMDS is not an organization that benefits the student body. However, it is an organization that benefits the state and the university.

So if Mr. Renwick wants to make his charge of bias or discrimination at someone, let him point it at North Carolina and the Consolidated University where it rightfully belongs.

### 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.  
John Gellman ..... Photo Editor  
March Cheek ..... Night Editor

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

### Rod Waldorf

## 'Ya wanna job, sweetheart?'

Peterson was a guy of the old school—with a blue pencil stuck behind his right ear, hair cropped very close—so close it never needed a comb—and a cigar poked between his teeth. Not a big fat cigar, but a somewhat medium thin one, with a long grey tip of ash which always dumped over on his work.

"How'd you like to work for me, sweetheart?" That was the first thing I heard him say, his teeth clenched around that ugly cigar, pumping my hand. "We can use some extra help around here on weekends."

Turned out that was all the help he had on weekends—him, me and another fellow a year and a half my senior fresh out of the Army, named Bob.

That was my first newspaper job, working all day Saturday putting out the Sunday morning edition of what was usually an afternoon operation. The biggest edition of the week—just Peterson, me and the guy named Bob.

My first journalistic effort, written just before I went in to meet Peterson, was a review of the local community theatre's production of "Guys and Dolls." That review is what got me my job, and my first by-line. Been in love with those by-lines ever since.

"Your name; ego. That's one of the reasons you're in this business," Peterson said about 11:15 one Saturday night in March. "That name in print. Call the beach and get a wrap-up on the Easter crowds. And find out something about that sunrise service in the morning." That last part was lost in the chugging drone of

the teletype machines. Peterson would always walk away just before he was quite through telling you what he had in mind for you to do. He never said exactly what he had in mind, just babbled something general and expected you to take it from there.

I think he pictured himself as an editor on a big city paper, as he says he once was, and our little dinky of 10,000 circulation was all he had now. And we, Bob and I, were his staff of alert and competent reporters, ready to drop everything on a moment's notice, jump in our cars with a photographer and race to the scene of news in the making—usually a fire over on Walnut Street or an auto accident on the bridge. But Peterson sent us out as if it were the destruction of the Capitol.

One time there Peterson was reading "Instant Replay" by Jerry Cramer. For two weeks that book made a lump on Peterson's rear, coming out, I guess, when he disappeared at 8 p.m. for dinner. Then, for the next two weeks, Peterson acted like Vince Lombardi. I think he really believed he had become a Lombardi, just from the way he acted toward the rest of us. And we all agreed.

By this time the "we" had grown by one—John-o had come back from the paper in the North he had been with for the last two years. And Peterson had someone to make an example of. Yes he had.

About 6 p.m., Peterson would be in the newsroom with a large brown grocery bag under his arm. Two six-packs of beer

### Letters to the editor

## Minority students need aid

To the editor:

Dear Chancellor Sitterson:

In our last discussion, some two months ago, I acquainted you with the funding problems of AMDS. As the Daily Tar Heel article of April 21, 1971 indicated, those problems are still with us. In addition to my discussion with you, I have spoken with Dr. Gaskin, Mr. Cashwell, Dr. Jones, and Mr. Renwick. The situation remains much the same as it was when we last spoke. AMDS has been cut out of the Student Legislature Budget for 1971-72. Student Legislature has, in the past, been the chief supporter of AMDS, financially. Without a replacement for those funds, approximately \$5,000, Project Uplift will cease to exist. The basic reason put forth by Student Legislature for cutting funds was that recruitment should be a joint venture, involving students, faculty, and administration. As such, funds for the program should come from all three segments of the University community.

In the past, Student Legislature has been responsible for two-thirds of the required appropriation. It is time that the rest of the University make good its commitment to open wide the doors of higher education to all the people of North Carolina.

In practical terms, we are pleading for you, Chancellor Sitterson, to use the powers of your office to attempt to mobilize funds from any sources at your disposal. In addition, we ask that you establish a permanent office of student recruitment, under the auspices of the Office of Admissions. This new office could be advised by Mr. Renwick, and co-ordinated and staffed by either students on work-study or volunteers. By creating an Office of Student Recruitment, you would be institutionalizing the role of student recruitment, thereby moving us out of an ad-hoc situation.

The tone of this request may sound pleading. Indeed that is what we are forced to do. Without your help, this letter will be the epitaph for professional student recruiting on this campus. We fervently hope that you will not allow this university to step back and close a door which has begun to swing open.

Jim Hornstein

Co-director

Committee for the Advancement of Minority and Disadvantaged Students

## James' brother feeling guilty

To the editor:

"Dear Doctor please help me, I'm damaged..." should be Mr. Taylor's first 'song' perhaps followed by something more in his vein [sic] like "A Rose and A Baby Ruth". Ignoring jubilee, which might be a good idea, everyone is entitled to his own personal taste in music. Mr. Dickey, me and even you, surprisingly enough. Any reputable entertainer would get a good chuckle from a well written piece of sarcasm and would let the quality of his performance and talent speak for itself without resorting to an inane rebuttal that further demonstrates his lack of taste and illustrates how out of touch he is with today's college student. Or could it be that Mr. Taylor is feeling a little guilty about riding on his brother's coat-tails and reputations? Hurt City, huh Alex?

Sharon Fisher  
217 Joyner

## Student stores: age adds value

To the Editor:

With further reference to Christy Carpenter's letter, I submit the following:

1) My interest lay in a fourth-hand book which had gone through three high-liter-colour editions. The last price was clearly marked as \$1.25. Under the blue rays of truth the new price was \$1.75. How come? Simple! The 1971 price of the book (not a new edition, however, just a new printing) is some dollars more than the original price of this old printing. Hence if the mark-down is, for example, 30 per cent of listed price, Student Store reckons it at 30 per cent of 1971 price, no matter the age of the book itself. Compare this with the Intimate's policy where the price decreases with each resale. That is, the fourth-hand price equals the second-hand price of a 1971 printing.

2) At such times when the price of a brand-new book goes up, Student Stores go around and stick the new price on all the books already in stock. These are the

little gold labels you often see. Just by sitting on the shelves the books have increased in value, although presumably they were paid for at the old price. Question: Are textbooks bought back at 50 per cent of the 1971 prices, or at 50 per cent of their original prices? I suggest the motto above the entrance read: "Ask not what the Student Stores can do for you but what you can do for the Student Stores."

For the sake of my blood pressure, I have decided not to patronize the Student Store textbook department and to satisfy my book needs elsewhere.

Jacques Faigenblum  
School of Public Health

## Art theft brings free photo offer

To the Editor:

Upon hearing the news a few weeks ago of a photo exhibit to be held by the fine arts festival, I was thoroughly pleased that at long last I would be able to put in show some of the work that I have done.

I remember enthusiastically telling some of my photographer friends about the show, encouraging them to participate. It seemed strange to me then to hear their comments on being reluctant to enter because of a fear that someone would "rip off" their prints. "Ridiculous," I said, "Who would be gross and craven enough to swipe somebody's work? Besides, how could he just walk out of the gallery with a photograph?" I went ahead with my plans and submitted my prints.

Then, not four days after the show had opened, Johnny Lindahl told me that one of his prints had been stolen. Someone had been low enough after all and it was not only possible to walk out with a print, it could be done with impunity and relatively little sweat.

Sunday, I found that after almost two weeks of being on show, one of MY photographs had been stolen. Some low cretin had done exactly the same thing to me, even though he had to carry out of the building a really LARGE print and certainly couldn't have been TOO unobtrusive about it.

This is naturally of precious little use, but the thief if he is reading, I wish to say: The picture of Jane Fonda that you have stolen is of considerable value to me, not only because to replace such a large

print will be expensive in material cost, but because I have had the print for almost a year, have shown it to many, many friends, and have had many compliments on it.

I LIKED having it around and was proud of it. There were many hours of time involved in printing the photograph, trimming it, retouching it, and mounting it.

I would like very much to have it back and would be more than happy to GIVE you a smaller print of the same shot if you will just have the rocks to return my picture. Please. There will be no questions asked, believe me.

To the Student Union, I wish to say that in the future it might seem advisable to afford some protection to such exhibits. I should have had the brains to take my photographs down after the first stealing incident.

Remember, you brave soul you, there'll be no questions and you can get another print FREE.

Thomas H. Cox  
1927 Granville West

## Jubilee critic dislikes date

To the Editor:

I find it amusing to read about the recent hassle concerning the Jubilee groups, but I too must join with the critics. I have no beef with the music—I just believe that the Union erred in planning Jubilee in conflict with the May-Day demonstrations in Washington. I personally feel that the Union should cancel Jubilee plans and direct its money and efforts toward the Peace Movement, but this will not occur because of the pseudos who run the Union Jubilee Committee. So I therefore urge all members of the Woodstock Generation to bypass Jubilee in order to participate in something more meaningful than a weekend of self-gratification. Come to Washington and join in something important—our struggle. If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem. If you go to Jubilee rather than to D.C., you're selling out. Stand up and fight if you really care. The People must make the Peace. How can you have music when you have war? Please—come help us get it together in Washington. Power to the People, Right On!

Robert Griffith  
600 N. Greensboro St.



### Evans Witt

## Busing won't ruin schools in long run

...with all deliberate speed.  
—Brown vs. Board of Education, 1954

For almost 17 years desegregated school systems have been the law of the United States. And, for those 17 years, school boards, administrators and parents have broken that law.

Early last week, the Supreme Court re-affirmed the principle of equality of education which was established in 1954.

Nixon's two "strict constructionist" appointees joined in the unexpectedly unanimous decision on the four cases, including the Charlotte-Mecklenburg case.

Busing was one of the extraordinary methods the Court approved of, if

necessary, to eliminate state-imposed segregation.

Immediately upon the announcement of the decision, the demise of American public education was darkly predicted as a result. "White parents will pull their children out of school and put them in private academies" was the forecast.

But, somehow, such cries of outrage are simply subtle echoes of the middle 1950's after the Brown decision.

Only in the 1950's, people had the nerve to say they did not want their children to go to school with Negro children. They admitted they were prejudiced. Those who accepted the decision of the Court in 1954 and the second Brown case in 1955 and attempted to enforce the law of the land

were called Communists and "nigger-lovers."

The people and motives haven't changed since the 1950's—only the words and the rhetoric has. Now they are concerned that the quality of the education that their children receive will drop. They were never concerned with the quality of the education which the black children had been subjected to.

These opponents of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg decision cry that busing their children will damage their educational possibilities and yet they are willing to withdraw their children from these schools and place them in hastily set-up and poorly run private "segregation" academies. These parents will probably have to drive their children

a good distance, perhaps farther than the children would have had to travel by school bus, to attend these schools whose sole "advantage" is that they are all-white.

It is true that the effect of this decision will be another painful transition period for schools that remain segregated due to lingering evidences of the dual school system.

It is true some children across the South and across the country will be riding buses to schools which are not the nearest ones to their homes.

It is true the quality of education in the public schools of America will suffer during this transition period.

But such problems, enormous initial purchase costs and continuing operational

expenses are the unfortunate price which must be paid for the inferior education of black school children for many years.

And the effects of the decision will not be the disintegration of public schools which has been hysterically prophesied, just as it was in 1954.

Busing students will not seriously and permanently damage the minds nor the intellects of those children who must attend other than their neighborhood schools. In the 1969-70 school year, 39 per cent or some 18 million school children rode buses to schools which were not located in their own neighborhoods.

The Burger Court did not even call for the busing of students to achieve a specific racial balance or ratio. In fact, the Court commented it would strike

down as unconstitutional any such ruling by a lower court.

What the Court did call for was the adherence to the law of the United States, the elimination of state-sanctioned school segregation.

The school boards of the country are charged to develop plans "that promise realistically to work and...to work now."

The problem is that many parents and school authorities still refuse to obey the law.

Unfortunately, the children who want the education are the ones who will suffer from the hysterical ravings and hasty actions of their parents and "educators." It is the children who suffer most from the lingering prejudices of their parents.