

Desegregation dilemma

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

The exact meaning of the above passage often evades federal and state administrators responsible for implementing this provision of civil rights law. When officials at the two levels disagree in their interpretation, critical re-examination by both parties is inevitable.

And so William Thomas of the Atlanta office of HEW has called for a review of the Revised North Carolina State Plan for desegregation of higher education. Thomas contends that the decision of the Consolidated University of North Carolina to locate the proposed veterinary school at N.C. State University (and not at A&T State University) violates the desegregation plan by failing to give equal resources to a predominantly black institution. If the proposal does not violate the revised desegregation plan, according to Thomas, then the plan needs revising again.

The Consolidated University contends that to build up to A&T so it can accommodate the vet school would duplicate programs already available at N.C. State and thereby perpetuate a dual system of higher education that the civil rights legislation is supposed to end.

The legally required segregated system of the 1950's has yielded to a *de facto* system of "racially identifiable" institutions—schools which can be classified as black or white according to the race of the majority of students. The ultimate goal of HEW and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the elimination of the dual system of black and white schools. At the same time, however, civil rights proponents want to ensure predominantly black schools of resources and attention equal to that received by predominantly white schools.

The dilemma facing the University seems almost unresolvable: while dismantling a dual system the University must

also pay homage to the dual nature of the system by maintaining predominantly black schools at a level equal to that of predominantly white schools.

Maintaining the present approach cannot resolve the dilemma. Black schools are vestiges of the dual system; they are not politically powerful enough to get the same resources that white schools enjoy.

Closing down black schools and mandating that all schools have an almost 80-20 ratio of whites to blacks would resolve the dilemma but at great loss to the black community. North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University has been a part of North Carolina higher education since 1891. A&T and other black schools have become part of the black cultural experience just as Duke and Wake Forest have become a part of the community of North Carolinians who prefer private to public education. To eliminate black schools is to eradicate a large part of the black educational experience.

To ensure that no one is "denied the benefits of" full educational resources without destroying a valuable segment of the black community, the University must build up black schools so that these institutions can offer high quality facilities and instruction. With more resources, black schools may be able to attract both black and white students and permit an evolution toward desegregation as defined by racial ratios.

To that end the placement of the proposed vet school at A&T, the source of the newest controversy, would enhance the resources and reputation of a black school, enabling it to seek national prominence and both black and white students, while replacing some of the mediocre educational resources offered to many black students in North Carolina.

letter to the editor

The courts on marijuana

To the editor:

Five Davidson College students were recently arrested for "manufacturing marijuana." These students are without exception sane, mature individuals. They are of above average intelligence and far from socially maladjusted.

Each might ask, like Solzhenitsyn or Kafka's K. (in *The Trial*): "Why am I arrested?" And the resonant voice of the law will answer ominously: "For manufacturing marijuana." And the youths will endure the judicial ritual of the American court system.

The time has come to consider the constitutionality of the issue. The time has come for the marijuana laws in North Carolina and the United States to be shown up as the farces they are. For growing a strain of the cannabis plant—a plant whose history goes back 5,000 years, a plant which undoubtedly was in the Garden of Eden—these young Americans are

now under arrest.

Driveling Congressional dialogue, unscientific data, and an artificially manufactured media scare by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics (under Harry Anslinger) combined to make possession of preparations of the cannabis plant a federal offense. Despite opposition from the American Medical Association and despite the availability of volumes of carefully documented research (by the British government and the U.S. Army to name a couple) concluding that marijuana is relatively harmless, the legislation passed.

And despite volume upon volume of objective data compiled by scientists, sociologists, and lawyers since that time documenting the fallacies of popular marijuana myths and emphasizing the unjust treatment "offenders" must undergo, the

basic tenets of the laws remain prejudiced, parochial, and downright unconstitutional.

In a country whose judicial system purports to seek justice at any cost, does it not seem ironic that five students, arrested for growing a plant which has never been proven to be harmful, should face imprisonment and fines of up to five years and \$5,000 respectively?

The municipal officials in the town of Davidson and the county of Mecklenburg now have the chance to say to America and to the higher courts: "These students are guilty of nothing more than life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness!" Some local judge will have his opportunity to say: "Not guilty because of the unconstitutionality of the Marijuana Tax Act of 1937 and thus all marijuana legislation since that time!"

The time has come.

Anson Vincent

Cole C. Campbell, Editor

Elliott Warnock, managing editor

Jim Grimsley, associate editor

Harriet Sugar, associate editor

Ralph Irace, contributing editor

Lynn Medford, news editor

Greg Porter, features editor

Jim Thomas, sports editor

Initialed or unsigned editorials represent the opinion of the Tar Heel. Signed columns and letters represent the opinion of individual contributors.

SG priorities wrong; Chapel Hill or Hilton?

Student Government's new promise to deliver is turning into a miscarriage.

Bill Bates' cost-efficiency platform seems meaningless in the shadow of the new Summer Life program he introduced and guided through the Campus Governing Council. In the spring both Bates and the CGC favored large cuts in the overall budget in order to secure a surplus. Numerous campus organizations dedicated to cultural, intellectual and educational affairs watched their budgets being pared in the name of economy. Now in the summer Student Government has decided to squander \$3,500 of its surplus on coffee and donuts and more free flicks.

This is not to say that the entire Summer Life package is worthless or unnecessary. Weekend checking, longer weekend hours for the Carolina Union and Friday night movies are all good ideas. None of them should require student fees.

Because of his large constituency, the Student Body president has great powers of persuasion. This power could have been used to urge the Carolina Union to experiment with weekend free flicks. Spending limited student monies to duplicate a Union function, even in the name of experimentation, is to substitute money unwisely for negotiation and jawboning. It would seem that Student Government treasurer Mike O'Neal is trying to duplicate his Campus Program Council (which provided movies to dorms) within his new office.

As for coffee and donuts and other goodies for socials, grumbings about the use of Graduate and Professional Student Federation funds for departmental parties should have indicated that students do not want to see their fees devoured in social settings. Even if students clamor for edible returns, the president ought to guide opinion away from a Chapel Hill ice machine and bubblegum mentality. Student

"deliver"—which implies that Marcus Williams' brand of administration did not and cannot deliver.

Marcus Williams is personally indignant at the strong implications of gross administrative waste during his term of office. "You can't sacrifice quality for dollars and cents," Williams has said.

"They brought up this thing about how not using letterhead is



funds should provide for more than beer kegs and party hats. Active and effective organizations expanding student consciousness and culture must not suffer at the hands of Suite C vendors.

Politics, even on a college campus, breeds a strange continuity. The progression of leaders appears as a chain with no tangible links.

Consider the presidency of the UNC student body. Marcus Williams is succeeded by Bill Bates. Marcus Williams is a black who categorizes himself as a "progressive liberal." Bill Bates is a white who extols fiscal conservatism.

There has been much journalistic ballyhoo over an alleged swing to the right on the college campuses. *New Times* called it the "straightening of America" as opposed to Charles Reich's *Greening of America*, an offshoot of the activism of the '60s.

The question on the Carolina campus is whether or not this jump from progressive liberal to fiscal conservative reflects such a straightening or is merely a piece of circumstantial evidence. Bill Bates strode into office on a cost-efficiency platform. Bates intends to make Student Government

cheaper than using it," he added, intimating that the quality and class of the operation are closely related to the results. At any rate, the cost of stationery seems a trivial concern in establishing Student Government priorities.

The difference in these two administrations is in their definitions of "deliver." Bates ran and won on a "cut-the-budget" platform.

Williams strove for practical student services, ranging from student input into the Chapel Hill bus system and bicycle registration to the student health internship.

Our purpose here is not to evaluate the accomplishments or determine the quality of either administration, but to delineate the change of vision in Student Government. If this apparent change is indicative of the priorities of the Bates and O'Neal administration, then Student Government is moving in the wrong direction.

In charting the direction of Student Government, we are faced with the same question Williams and Bates could argue at length, the same question stuck on the tips of a host of tongues as salivating students peruse the "coffee-and-donuts" provision of the Summer Life bill: Do they deliver?

Remember the tuition hike?

What with Summer Life, the beach, beer parties and sitting by the pool, there aren't many students worried about legislation pending in Raleigh concerning the tuition hike. The spotlight on the state house has dimmed somewhat over the past weeks.

But legislators are notorious for slipping controversial legislation by a sleeping public, however, and if we the students of this university don't want to wake up next fall with tuition jacked up a couple hundred bucks, we'd better keep our eyes and our letters directed toward our glorious capital. The devil does his best work in the dark.