

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
Wednesday, October 6, 1971

Required housing study a good idea

A study of the sophomore and junior transfer housing requirements has been ordered by the administration, according to James O. Cansler, assistant dean of student affairs, and will be done by UNC Residence Life Director Robert Kepner and the Committee on University Residence Life (CURL).

Considering the complaints students made over the housing requirement last year and this fall, we wonder why Cansler waited so long to order such a study. But the idea is still a good one, despite the fact that it comes about one year late.

Kepner said Tuesday the issue will be discussed next week at a meeting of the residence life committee, and plans concerning how the study should be carried on will probably be finalized at that time.

In determining how to go about the study, Kepner and CURL should allow a number of UNC students to participate — more students than just the seven who already serve on the committee — and they should be given an active role in deciding what recommendations are to be made to the UNC administration.

Every residence college governor, at least, should be made a part of the study committee.

Among the questions the committee should attempt to answer are:

— If the administration considers residence in University-owned or approved housing an "educational experience," just exactly what are sophomores and junior transfers getting out of it that they haven't gotten already?

— What effect does moving out of the dormitory and into a house or an apartment have on a student's grades? (We're willing to bet that grades get better when a student moves out of the dorm and away from the noise, as long as he studies as hard.)

— How much more expensive (or cheaper) is dormitory life compared to living in a moderately-priced apartment and preparing one's own food. (We're willing to bet it's more expensive.)

As said before, the idea for a study of the policy is a good one and its report should prove interesting — as long as the University is committed to the well being of its students, rather than the financial gains it has made by forcing students to live in its dormitories.

Ecology becoming dangerous?

from The Charlotte Observer

The Food and Drug Administration has just popped a nice bubble that had been sent aloft by environmentalists. FDA says recycling paper is not all that good. Recycled paper used in food packaging has caused unacceptably high levels of a toxic chemical in some foods.

And only the other day the FDA said there could be worse things in detergents than phosphates.

Well, we've been trying hard but we're getting confused.

We encouraged the return of the humpback whale. We quit our population explosion. We opted for green trees and against cement. We oiled up the bike that had been accumulating rust.

But our ecological zeal seems to be outpaced now by official confusion. We suspect that, having delayed so long, the FDA now will find itself backtracking on other pollutants.

Before long it may tell us that botulism is lurking in our litter bag.

On Either Side of the Mushroom

by Woody Doster and the Student Health Service

Question: Many students are taking amphetamines to stay awake for studying. How do these drugs affect learning and studying?—Signed, P.G.

Dear P.G.: In part you have answered your own question. Amphetamines are stimulants that increase energy levels and the ability to work. Seemingly, capacity to work increases. However, there are several drawbacks to using amphetamines in study situations and examinations. Under the influence of the drug, a person may feel that he is doing extremely well, but when his work is examined, errors may be frequent and indeed what he has written may be nonsensical.

In short, even as the capacity to do work increases with the use of amphetamines, so do the number of errors in the work. Secondly, after prolonged use of amphetamines, a student often suddenly "crashes" as the drug's effects wear off during or just prior to an examination. His feelings of high energy and productivity give way to drowsiness, dullness and sometimes

depression, again adversely affecting his work.

Question: What is MDA? Is it legal?—Signed, Curious.

Dear Curious: Methyleneedioxy amphetamine (MDA) is a hallucinogen which was first synthesized and tested more than ten years ago. It is related chemically to amphetamine, metamphetamine (speed) and mescaline. Possession in North Carolina of any amount of this drug is a felony. First time offenders can receive not more than five years imprisonment and/or not more than \$5,000 fine.

Question: A friend of mine told me its simple to beat the "possession" rap by the police. He just carries small amounts of drugs and swallows them if there's threat of arrest. Isn't it possession even if you've got the stuff in your body?—Signed, Y.B.

Dear Y.B.: Your friend is right. Most states, including North Carolina, do not have a law against internal possession of drugs. Of course, it should be obvious that swallowing unknown amounts of potent drugs, including those not ordinarily taken by mouth, can be very dangerous.

Question: Are there any medical uses for marijuana?—Signed, D.H.

Dear D.H.: No, none that are "currently accepted." In the past, however, as early as 2700 B.C. in China and 100 B.C. in India, and much later in the west, marijuana was used for treatment for many medicinal problems including various gastro-intestinal, gynecologic and psychological disorders. Pain relief and "positive" psychological effects seem to have been its major therapeutic properties. Before the passage of the Marijuana Tax Act in 1937, it was sometimes prescribed by doctors in the U.S.

Recently, marijuana has become more readily available (legally) for medical experimentation. Data from experiments, and conclusions regarding beneficial versus harmful effects of marijuana will determine its "acceptance" for medicinal use.

The laws will determine availability.

Question: I think my roommate is on drugs but I don't have any proof. How can I tell?—Signed A.L.

Dear A.L.: You can't. Even for an expert it is difficult and sometimes impossible to tell if a person is a drug

user. Needlemarks along veins may be an obvious way of telling. However, these marks may be the result of laboratory procedures. Inappropriate behavior may be caused by drugs, but could be the result of some emotional crisis. Physical signs such as dilated pupils, redness of the eyes, chronic sniffing and slurred speech may be present but aren't specific to drug use. In summary, the best way to tell is to ask him.

Question: Is marijuana as conducive to lung tissue using the electron microscope "precancerous" changes characteristic of cigarette smoker's lungs are not present in the lungs of long-term, marijuana-only smokers. Further experiments will be necessary before we can be sure that marijuana does not cause lung cancer.

Dear D.G.: No one knows. Experimentation with marijuana is in a relatively early phase. It has frequently been claimed that chronic use of marijuana results in a high incidence of asthma, bronchitis and other respiratory problems.

Concerning cancer, a recent study of lung tissue using the electron microscope "precancerous" changes characteristic of cigarette smoker's lungs are not present in the lungs of long-term, marijuana-only smokers. Further experiments will be necessary before we can be sure that marijuana does not cause lung cancer.

The Other People

Women granted week of their own

It's Women's Week at UNC. That simple statement says a lot about this university: if women are granted one week of their "own," who is getting the other fifty-one?

It's an Olde Story here at UNC. One not worth repeating, except that we always do. Consider the scenario from the year 1921, when women were first admitted to the university.

A female student on this campus was REQUIRED to sit in the back of the classroom, not speak until spoken to, and leave the room after all the males had left. The dress code REQUIRED her to wear "ladylike" attire, including a hat and gloves. It was REQUIRED that she have an escort if she went stepping out after sundown.

See how simple life used to be? Discrimination was a nice, clean surgical operation. Women were considered inferior, and the rules clearly reflected this. Today, we have grown subtle. We've learned to use kid-glove sophistication in putting people down. Aren't we clever? Women are now one-third of the

university community. Most of the blatantly anti-female rules have been tastefully erased from the book. But polite put-downs are not an improvement. They only make it more difficult to identify, attack, eliminate the problem. They only make it easier to ignore. When a woman recognizes her second-class status, she can then be called hyper-sensitive. Paranoid. Aggressive. And who ever liked an aggressive woman?

As hackneyed as this story has become, the university does discriminate against women: as students, as non-academic employees, as faculty. Statistics could be trotted out, as in the past. Accomplishing as little. But these HEW forms of discrimination are only the proverbial tip of the iceberg. Admissions policies may make us angry, but they don't wear us down. They don't stare us in the face every day. They don't grate on the psyche.

You've come a long way, baby. BABY. (There's a starter.) Yes, you don't need to sit in the back of the room anymore. The

professor wants you right up in the front row, preferably wearing a short skirt. Yes, you can speak out in class. But don't go expecting your words to be taken seriously.

We've abolished those nasty old dress codes. How enlightened. But your jeans better be neatly pressed, and bearing the "Male" label. You can wear whatever you want, just so you "look good" ... in the standard hip-collegiate fashion. And you'd better believe that they're watching. Judging. Comparing. So dress as you like, but dress to please.

No, there is no rule saying women students need an escort to go out at night. No rule is needed, beyond the "informal" rules of the deadly game that everyone is playing. Sure, a woman can go out by herself (if she dares) or with other women. But everyone KNOWS that this just means she couldn't get herself a man.

Women at this university are not considered students so much as decoration. Recreation. Subjects for observation. Objects of intimidation.

Satiation or frustration. They shouldn't trouble their pretty little heads about book-learning. Everyone knows that a smart woman never shows her brains.

So now we have Women's Week. To the weak, goes the week. A few speakers speak and discussion groups discuss. A token is offered to make everyone feel better. Is this the old scenario rewritten for 1971?

Women's Week can end up being an exercise in cooptation. In hiding a genuine problem under a furled brow of "concern." And ignoring it. Back to business-as-usual. ("Your credentials are fine, but can you type?")

Or Women's Week can fulfill the intentions of its planners. It can be a beginning. A recognition of the limitations imposed on women, the contortions required of women to "make it" in this university, and avoid "being made."

So Women's Week is accepted gratefully, if skeptically ... so long as you let us know just who is getting the other fifty-one.

Letter

Writer made appeal to human rationality

To the editor: "Elitism won't cure pollution." Thanks for the pearl of wisdom, Mr. Marsh. Seems to me I said something like that in The Daily Tar Heel recently, over and over and over again.

From September 21 to 25, the DTH ran the most radically anti-elitist series of articles conceivable, concerning student cars at Carolina and their ultimate effect upon the world. I wrote the series. Several days later, James T. Marsh of the Economics Department accused me of the "ranked elitism and class bias."

These same articles were characterized throughout by an appeal to the enlightened self-interest of Carolina students. Repeatedly, I tried to convey to them my belief that it was in their best (i.e. selfish) interest not to be driving 9500 cars, because they could not, in fact, afford them. Incredibly, Mr. Marsh accused me of viewing "social problems as moral situations, to be overcome by good thoughts and good deeds."

Although I have a criticism for every sentence in Mr. Marsh's letter, space limits my response to two particularly absurd charges.

Concerning elitism: I am a person who believes that if substantial evidence exists that a family's ownership of a second car threatens the future well-being of mankind, that family should be deprived of their luxury. If this includes a few people on the "South Side of Chicago," so be it. I am not trying to deprive anyone of "a decent standard of living and perhaps also a little tinsel," as Mr. Marsh phrases it. But I strongly suspect that he is.

I would laugh at Mr. Marsh and tell him he's lost his hold on reality, but I know better: his arguments are precisely those of a selfish elite which consciously undertakes whatever distortion of the issues is necessary to protect their privileges, and to mislead the American people from their real interests.

Mr. Marsh does NOT share my belief that all mankind is entitled to a decent living standard, even if this prevents some from having a "second car." But does he say this? No, he distorts the picture with his false implication that my attack on American wastefulness was aimed at the nation's poor (it obviously was not), with

his treatment of these poor as the wretched of the earth, and with his studied oversight of the great mass of truly impoverished humanity.

Mr. Marsh, if my beliefs (i.e. that the increasing interdependency of all mankind has rendered extremes of inequality intolerable) are too radical for you, please say so. If crude distortion of another's position is your only weapon, you don't belong in our Economics Department.

Concerning what Mr. Marsh calls my "basic approach," I stand accused of appealing to emotionalism and altruistic impulse, of failing to recognize that "pollution and resource depletion are problems" whose solution requires "a faith in man as a rational being who follows his best interest in any given circumstance." And so on.

Yet I carefully stated that, "the goal of this series is to convince Joe Carolina that the need for a reordering of priorities is his need, that he is among those who will benefit if he abandons his determination to operate his own car in Chapel Hill. The idea is to convince him that he cannot really 'afford' his car."

I don't dispute that many of my arguments had a moralistic ring to them, but never did I fail to emphasize above all the ultimate implications of the Carolina student's wastefulness for himself, for his children and for his country — presumably things which matter greatly to him. Obviously (except to Mr. Marsh), my appeal revealed a faith in human rationality and enlightened self-interest.

Bob Lenski
Chapel Hill

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.

Doug Hall News Editor

Lou Bonds Associate Ed.

Lana Starnes Associate Ed.

Mark Whicker Sports Ed.

Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Paddi Hughes Adv. Mgr.

Lou Bonds

Some couples had fun on dates

Not too many years ago, my grandfather sat me down to lecture on "dating in the old days."

"Lemme tell you, I remember when I first started dating your grandma, Bessy," he would begin. "Expensive old girl to date. Near drove me into the poorhouse. I walk five miles across town to pick her up. Five miles on foot mind you. Then we'd walk five miles back across town to the ice cream parlor and I'd get her a cone.

"When I walked her back home, maybe we would stop and spoon a little bit," he would say with a giggle. "That was the best part."

My father's version varied somewhat in description.

"I dated your mother in college when the hops were tops. We would go to the dance which I bought tickets to or a movie playing at the theatre. Sometimes we would go to parties and have a few drinks before I took her back to her dorm in my old '39 Ford."

"I'll admit that a few times I mixed her drinks a little too strong," he reminisced. "That was to put her in a better mood of course."

I noted the stories had a striking

similarity to each other in their framework.

Bearing that in mind, I have already prepared a lecture on dating for my offspring.

"Dating has always been sort of a game, son. There have always been two teams, a playing field, a scorecard, some rules, and various plays for winning.

"The rules changed slightly during my dating years from those of my grandfather and father. They were less rigid in a sense and were affected by popular issues of the day.

"Women's liberation probably played an important part. Women began getting tired of playing the same old game. Waiting each Friday night for a phone call from the guy in Physics class became a drag. After all, why should women be barred from a social life just because some timid clod didn't have the nerve to ask her out.

"Sexual attitudes changed somewhat, son. People were less afraid to talk about the subject and some were even able to talk about it intelligently. So the lines that men have handed girls for years began to sound a bit trite.

"The dating rules had always said after the movie or the party or whatever, it was

time for the guy to make his move. Lines such as 'would you like to come up to my room to see my etchings' and the ever popular 'I just moved into my apartment and need your opinion on some curtains' were fading out.

"New lines replaced the old ones. Most of them just had the words changed. Some were more direct and there was less piddling over the subject matter. But the intended result of a date usually remained the same.

"I say 'usually' because some people decided to change the entire structure of the dating institution. In fact, they decided to do away with it altogether.

"They felt that two members of the opposite sex could actually get together just to be friendly and have a good time (yes, kid, I KNOW you consider sex as having a good time). But these people thought a couple could get together for a beer or just conversation without having to go through phone calls, ticket buying, dressing up, picking up, leading up and making up. They didn't bother too much with impressing one another. These couples didn't plot, they didn't plan—they just let things sort of go along naturally.



... and gosh, mom!
they're going to have
the Ralph Nader
speak here!
and gosh!
they've even got
an invisible
university
here, someplace....