

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
Friday, February 23, 1893

Keep the forms coming, Charlie

The infamous UNC bureaucracy machine will begin to crank up in less than two weeks when preregistration for spring semester begins.

Printers with ink-stained faces have been busy for weeks preparing the massive number of forms that will be filled out between now and the deadline for signing up for pass-fail courses early next semester.

And the lines that will be weaving in and out of South Building and other departmental office buildings are probably already beginning to form.

First, there's the lines and the mad rush to make appointments with advisers. Students who haven't made it to their eight o'clock classes since the first week of the semester are always up at 7 a.m. the day appointment books are first open.

Then there's the lines of people waiting to get forms allowing them to take the courses that are normally closed out quickly, such as Health Education 33.

Then there's the wait to see advisers and then registration forms that must be filled out, followed by the lines at Hanes Hall when they must be turned in.

After the preregistration rush, there's registration itself.

With more forms, more lines, classes on students' schedules that they hadn't signed up for, etc.

And finally, there's drop add, one of the more famous time-killing, feet-pounding, frustrating experiences an unlucky student must cope with.

But at least when drop-add is completed, it's all over except for signing up for pass-fail courses, which, of course, is worth the effort. All over until preregistration for fall semester begins.

Probably everyone will admit that the whole thing has gotten out of hand, that something different is needed. No one, however, seems to be able to come up with a solution, and probably never will.

But at least the printers are happy.

Now maybe students can go to the game

Alas! Alas! President Nixon turned down Duke University President Terry Sanford's invitation to attend the UNC-Duke game Nov. 20 in Durham.

The President is a graduate of Duke's Law School, and when visiting Charlotte last month to attend ceremonies honoring Billy Graham, Nixon said he wanted to return to North Carolina for the game.

But, alas, it seems he has got

other plans and won't be able to come.

Though we're sure his esteemed presence would be truly memorable, it's probably best that he not come after all.

From the way his men treated college students with just slightly long hair in Charlotte, if Nixon did attend the game, probably 75 percent of the students at Duke and UNC would be banned from Duke Stadium.

Charles Jeffries

Demise of the BSM is not at hand

The recent developments in the Black Student Movement regarding the resignations of two of its most important officers would lead the casual observer to believe that the demise of the organization is at hand. But to the more careful observer this assumption would be the furthest from the truth.

To assume such because the group has lost the services of two of its most able members is to assume that the rest of the members are incapable of carrying on the ideals and goals that have been undertaken thus far this year.

Ron Wesson and Bruce Sampson were indeed valuable assets to the BSM, but their resignations will not slow down the effectiveness of this machine to be the voice of the black student here in this sea of white faces.

As Wesson said himself, "Ours is a struggle, we have to keep on until we win or are defeated, and we will not be defeated."

Defeat at the hands of one's enemies in the light of a change in leadership is most disappointing. But to gain strength from this change and to become even more effective is a blessing. It will be up to the new leadership to bestow this blessing upon the struggle.

The BSM stands to learn much from this development last Tuesday. For one, it will learn that to lead is an ability that all black people possess, not the property of an elite minority within the race.

The organization faces a test, one which will tax the strength of the BSM to continue its present programs and to

create new ones as proposed by the new leadership.

Furthermore, the BSM has been given the opportunity to discover the talent of one of its members who has for a long time been ignored, not because of his lack of interest, but because of his ability to work so hard yet manage to keep out of the limelight.

Jimmie McRae, Wesson's successor, has diligently and quietly been one of the main cogs in the operations of the BSM, and now he has been given the chance to show that he is capable of manning the operation and harvesting some of the fruits of its labor; mainly the opportunity to help the black student and be recognized for what he has and will do.

As a sophomore, Bruce Sampson has been illustrative of what can be achieved

in the BSM in such a short time. In that time he became editor of the BSM's Black Ink, which was only a year old when he took over.

Allen Maske, Sampson's successor has a similar story of achievement, because he too is a sophomore. And, by being just a second year student, this will enable Maske commit himself for the next three years to informing the black student on campus and help train the next editor of the Black Ink.

The next move of the BSM toward unifying the black student on campus, making his stay here more relevant and helping him to maintain his identity is merely speculative. Yet the quality of the two new cogs in the BSM machine leave little doubt in the success of those endeavors.

Letters to the editor

Martyrdom not for the U.S.A.

To the editor:

In Mr. Weatherly's "masochistic" U.S.A., ("whipping boy" article), martyrdom is certainly not an American characteristic like apple pie and the gun next door. This country will never be subjected to martyrdom, for it crusades for no one but its military and industrial elite. The people who suffer are those under the wheels of the American vehicle; not those at the helm.

He accuses Communist China of world domination goals; but perhaps honesty (if there were any in U.S. diplomacy) on his part would demonstrate that China's "threat" as "public enemy number one" is to American world domination. The People's Republic may not be totally cooperative as a member of the U.N., but it deserved its seating if the organization is to be internationally representative.

It is correct that adherence to U.N. declarations is seldom, yet when was "the last time that the U.S. voluntarily agreed to a U.N. decision that would not be in its best interests," to use Mr. Weatherly's word choice.

His negative term, "impotent nationality," concedes his image of American world domination. If prestige and potency are the U.S.'s prime objectives as a member of a world organization, or even independent of others, then what democratic ideals does America espouse. Hypocrisy in the philosophies of spokesmen, i.e. Mr. Weatherly, underlines the actual U.S. directives. He "admits" that this country is interested solely in prestige, power, and what it can rip off from others.

In a concluding premise, he states that aid be given to "those countries who have proved their worthiness and loyalty." His humanitarian ineptness does not consider starvation, misery, disease, and poverty of the world's other people—in their place American supports the militarism and dictatorships of Greece, Spain, Cambodia, Vietnam, Guatemala and countless others.

The U.N. is cited for its inability to bring peace in Vietnam, the Middle East and other countries. Yet, if honesty is still an American virtue, then analysis of these bastions of American involvement would reveal where this "whipping boy" nation was when peace was tried—with its hand on the bomb releases, its thumb on the people, and its ass sharing the thrones.

Dan Brown
Chapel Hill

Gilliam's word not reassuring

To the editor:

I would like to make a few observations on the article "Pub Board Fires WCAR Head." First, I would like to point out that Charles Gilliam cited "the many problems connected with having a nonstudent for the job," and in that "having a nonstudent deprives a student of this opportunity." Mr. Gilliam's concern for the student in this instance is

most touching. Thus his appointment of Murry Poole as the new Station Manager is somewhat puzzling to me.

I went by both the Union Information Desk and the Office of Records at Hanes Hall and was unable to find any record of Murry Poole as a student. Furthermore, Mr. Poole has almost no knowledge of how a radio station operates. His first contact with any radio station began on September 1, 1971 and then in the office of Business Manager. He does not know how to run a radio show nor does he have any idea of how to organize a new staff to operate the station.

Charles Gilliam also stated that the resignations of the staff and management would not hurt the station's operation. This is very reassuring but I can't help wondering why the station was off the air from 1 a.m. til 1 p.m. today. Could it be that the students who were willing to devote their full energies to their jobs have resigned in protest of Mr. Gilliam's actions?

John C. Brim
222 Winston

Rand philosophy is not bankrupt

To the editor:

Some people never learn until it's too late, and apparently Mr. Richter is one of these.

Mr. Richter picked the right word to describe Ayn Rand's philosophy, elitist! However, her philosophy is anything but bankrupt as any look at today's world situation will more than adequately prove, assuming of course, that the one doing the looking has the ability and intelligence to distinguish blacks and whites from the many shades of grey.

Mr. Richter speaks of these "business-minded" fellows as having little "regard for their fellow human beings." Either he is being deliberately obtuse (stupid perhaps?) or, worse, he is deliberately misrepresenting what Miss Rand says. I'll attribute this to ignorance since I like to give people the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Richter, just what is wrong with rugged individuals? And, I might add, if you're familiar with Miss Rand's characters, how do you explain, "Eddie Willers," "Pop Harper" or "Quentin Daniels?" Well, enough of this to know that Mr. Richter knows not of what he speaks when he states that Miss Rand leaves all but her "rugged individuals" to fall, "unattended," along the wayside.

Mr. Richter, I certainly did not contradict myself by asking "Who, by God, would have a better right to make those decisions of production than those men who produce?" For one who has intimate knowledge of decision making in industry or any other branch of "production," Mr. Richter's assertion would immediately be branded farcical.

I do have first-hand knowledge, having spent nine years in public work, the last five of which were on the management and supervisory level. Yes, Mr. Richter, I saw the truth of my statement both as a

worker and ultimately as office manager and paymaster for two production plants of a major industry.

Mr. Richter also makes the assertion that individuals are unable to acquire necessary capital to begin production, presumably in an individually owned business. There are two things, among many possible ones, I would cite for Mr. Richter's edification. 1) The statistics of the small business bureau and 2) the other being somewhat more graphic, a company began, expanded by, guided by and solely owned by one man, along with all of its subdivisions — Carolina Biological Supply Company — now the largest biological supply company in the world, thanks to the guiding genius of its founder and president, Dr. Thomas Edward Powell, Jr.

Mr. Richter cites the Nader Reports and Lockheed as examples of the thieving "rich stealing from the poor." I say again, that were Mr. Richter familiar with Miss Rand's works he would immediately see this stereotyped and personified by the people such as Jim Taggart, Orren Boyle and Cuffy Meigs. While we're on the subject of stereotyping, I'll go off on a little tangent of my own and state that it's equally simple to see current-day examples of Lillian Rearden, Kip Chalmers, Wesley Mouch, Floyd Ferris and Dr. Robert Stadler balanced against characters such as Francisco D'Anconia, Ragnar D. Midas Mulligan and, of course, John Galt. For you, Mr. Richter, and all of those like you, I reserve the personification used by Miss Rand in an earlier work in the character of "Ellsworth Toohey."

In point of fact, Mr. Richter, your description of "the thieving rich stealing from the deserving, productive poor," taken in context is a contradiction in terms. Check your premises, Mr. Richter, for whenever you have a contradiction, one of your premises must be wrong, if you have a valid argument. I'm sure, however, you have neither a valid argument nor correct premises.

Here, again, I remind you to Aristotle. The Second-Come will occur before you prove his basis for all logical argument wrong: A is A.

One final question, Mr. Richter, and it is: What would be your verdict for "Night of January 16th?" I'm sure I know but I don't think you have the nerve to admit it.

Les Wagoner II
324 Avery House
UNC-CH

Wage and price freeze violators

To the editor:

(Open letter to the Division of Price-Fixing, Office of Emergency

Preparedness, Washington, D.C.)

I would like you to investigate some violators of the wage and price freeze regulations. Specifically: (1) U.N.C.-C.H. Laundry Department. Last month, tried to get them to wash-dry & fold my laundry for a week. The price quoted was over \$1.60, about \$2.20/pound. On and before August 10, when last used this type of service, the price was \$0.83, about \$1.10/pound. This increase of approximately 100 percent is clearly in violation of the law, as well as gouging the low-income student such as myself.

(2) Servomation-Mathias (a subsidiary of Servomation Corporation.) Although it's hard to make comparisons with their prices over the summer since no full meals were available during the summer term on campus, their prices seem higher than last year when I used their service daily, and the quality of the food has certainly declined even if their prices haven't changed—again an effective price increase, gouging students on the assumption of monopoly.

Hence, after sampling three meals by the Food Service, I now fix my own food. Similarly, I now do my own laundry. It has clearly become impossibly expensive to live on this campus. It's enough to make a student get married, for in-house capability of auxiliary services such as those above, at lower cost. (Economic analysis provides the reason. In amoral Chapel Hill, the traditional noneconomic reasons for marriage have been eliminated. When booklets are distributed to minors telling elephants what do with butterflies in graphic detail and young people revel in "Sex Day"—Oct. 7—why bother getting married?)

William Jackson
Carol Hall

Alumnus lauds Tar Heel band

To the editor:

Much credit should be given to Major Yesulatis and his execution of Band Day. Second, kudos to the Tar Heel Band in the best display of showmanship and school spirit in many years—they are doing an excellent job for a generally thankless crowd, e.g. no mention or recognition in the weekly program.

Last of all, the cheerleaders are the best that I have ever known Carolina to have and the innovative head cheerleader ranks with Billy Arthur, Kay Kiser, and Dick Starnes recently as being one of UNC's best.

K.M. Lemons
Class of '69



Nixon-Mills Welfare bill unfair

HR-1 punishment of poor, not 'welfare reform'

(Editor's Note: The following column was written by members of the New University Conference Women's Caucus.)

Next Wednesday night, Chapel Hill and Durham welfare rights groups are holding a People's Hearing to discuss the Nixon-Mills Welfare Bill (HR-1).

This bill is another in a long series of attempts by this administration to manipulate and control poor and working people. Although Nixon would have us believe that welfare is rapidly eating-up the resources of the country, the truth is that the financial priorities of the state have never been generous to poor people. At present, 38 percent of the federal budget is allocated to the military and foreign aid, while only 1.9 percent goes to public welfare.

Supporters of HR-1 call the bill

'welfare reform,' but actually HR-1 is for welfare recipients what the freeze on wages is for workers — a bad situation getting worse. The bill guarantees \$2400 a year to a family of four, an amount lower than what recipients are already getting in 45 states. There is a family maximum of \$3600 per year regardless of the number of dependents. No special needs or food stamps are provided for under the bill. More important, certain groups of people now covered will no longer receive any sort of help. These groups include unemployed male heads of households, singles, students and childless couples, regardless of subsistence needs or emergency.

According to a recent survey conducted by HEW, less than 1 percent of the people on welfare are able-bodied men, and all of these men have to be registered at state employment agencies in order to receive any help. Other statistics include: 24 percent are elderly, 8 percent are disabled, 1 percent are blind, 50 percent are children, 3 percent are incapacitated parents in the home, and 13 percent are mothers. One fifth of the welfare mothers are in job training or already employed, but are making so

At a time when overall unemployment is at 6.1 percent and unemployment among blacks is at 10 percent, Nixon

wants to solve the 'welfare problem' by forcing recipients to work. Nixon, in his speeches to sell HR-1, has perpetuated the myth of the lazy welfare 'cheater' who refuses to work and is living easy off the tax-payers' money. But who, in fact, are these 'cheaters'?

According to a recent survey conducted by HEW, less than 1 percent of the people on welfare are able-bodied men, and all of these men have to be registered at state employment agencies in order to receive any help. Other statistics include: 24 percent are elderly, 8 percent are disabled, 1 percent are blind, 50 percent are children, 3 percent are incapacitated parents in the home, and 13 percent are mothers. One fifth of the welfare mothers are in job training or already employed, but are making so

little money that they still qualify for welfare. Under this bill recipients are required to accept jobs with pay as low as 75 percent of the minimum wage. Thus Nixon's 'reform' increases competition among the poor for low-paying jobs. Over the last few years low paid workers such as municipal and hospital employees, have been organizing. The work requirements of HR-1 undermine their union strength.

HR-1 also takes some hard-earned rights away from welfare recipients. There is no requirement for hearings to be held prior to termination or reduction of benefits, and no judicial review is permitted for any decisions made by HEW or the Department of Labor. States may impose a residency requirement on supplemental assistance despite the fact that the Supreme Court

has held such requirements unconstitutional.

In the past, welfare seemed to attempt, even if inadequately, to respond to the needs of female heads of household with children. Nixon now counts these women among the 'cheaters' and has written into HR-1 punitive clauses aimed at these women. If HR-1 goes through, AFDC (Aid For Dependent Children) will be eliminated and mothers will be supervised by the Department of Labor. A welfare mother is denied the right to choose to stay at home with her children. If her children are age three or over, she must accept a job, regardless of the adequacy of available day care. HR-1 is especially directed towards mothers and pregnant women under 19 years of age — the first priority group to be considered for jobs or training.

All in all, HR-1 is not welfare reform, but a systematic punishment of the poor, complete with monetary penalties for minor failures to comply with the bureaucratic apparatus. The areas of objection raised above are just a few of a long list.

Indeed, the welfare system is a complex problem, but some people understand it better than others. The National Welfare Rights Organization has made proposals for a more just welfare system, including a guaranteed annual wage of \$6500 for a family of four. The people who know most about welfare are the welfare recipients. Anyone who wants to learn more about the proposed welfare system should go to hear them at the People's Hearing for HR-1, November 10, at 7:30 p.m., New Town Hall, Chapel Hill.