DAVID STACKS, Editor

MICHELE MECKE, Managing Editor MICHAEL WADE, Associate Editor GARY TERPENING, Associate Editor

MARTHA WAGGONER, News Editor EDDIE MARKS, University Editor CAROL HANNER, City Editor KATHY CURRY, State and National Editor

REID TUVIM, Sports Editor SUSAN LADD, Features Editor LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor ANDY JAMES, Photography Editor DINITA JAMES, Weekender Editor

Tar Heel

87th year of editorial freedom

A valuable minute

We recommended in this space last Friday that Carolina students vote "no" on a proposal that the Graduate and Professional Student Federation be guaranteed 15 percent of the student activities fees paid by graduate and professional students. The referendum containing the proposal is today, and we would like to restate our arguments and remind students of the opportunity to vote.

The GPSF request for a small bit of financial autonomy is based on the notion that graduate and professional students have wants and needs different from those of undergraduates. Academically and socially, this notion is not unfounded. But financially, graduate and undergraduate students tend to share the same obligations. What differences do exist are reflected in the \$2 less per semester that graduate and professional students pay in activities fees.

Proponents of the GPSF referendum also argue credibly that graduate and professional students should have control over at least part of their fees—in this case 15 percent. While we cannot dispute the equity of the proposal, we must point out that economic constraints facing the Campus Governing Council overrule guaranteed GPSF

And again we wish to point out that GPSF claims of being a government are not valid, at least now. President Roy Rocklin has done an admirable though unenviable job of making GPSF a political voice in the student legislature. But the apathetic constituency that Rocklin inherited when he became president continues to remain indifferent despite his dedicated efforts.

Another point needing reiteration is the apparent CGC attitude toward graduate students' needs. Although graduate and professional students are one-third of the student body, GPSF requests for departmental funding have been squelched consistently because of inadequate budget preparation. Council members assuming office after the Feb. 13 elections should work to ensure fair and adequate funding for GPSF.

But the most important point is that the referendum today affects all Carolina students, not just those represented by the GPSF. It only takes a minute to vote—and to many, that minute might turn out to be worth a lot of money.

Budget priorities

President Carter has called his 1981 federal budget "prudent and responsible." It is just that—a prudent budget in terms of his hopes for re-election, and one that is likely to be responsible for prolonging the nation's battle against inflation.

The \$615 billion budget for fiscal 1981 calls for a \$15.9 billion increase in defense spending as a response to the Soviet Union's aggression in Afghanistan and the threat to U.S. interests in the Middle East, which represents a 3.3-percent increase when adjusted for inflation. But like the president's political strategy during the past two months, the budget places comparatively little emphasis on problems at home.

Energy spending, for example, increased less than half a billion dollars, from \$7.7 billion to \$8.1 billion—despite President Carter's statement that energy still is a top priority for his administration. The budget allows little new spending for social programs— but it would increase expenditures for traditionally Democratic voters such as minorities and inner-city dwellers by \$7 billion, mostly for subsidized housing, education and job training. Those costs, which President Carter says are designed to protect the poor against inflation, also are likely to protect him from even more severe criticism by his Democratic opponents.

Perhaps the hardest-to-swallow aspect of the president's proposed budget is the expected increase in the tax burden for most Americans. As inflation pushes personal incomes into higher tax brackets, individual tax burdens are expected to grow much more rapidly than personal income. And President Carter has planned on a mild recession during the first half of 1981, accompanied by continued double-digit inflation and a rise in unemployment that could throw a million more people out of work.

The budget predicts a deficit of \$15.8 billion, which would be the lowest in seven years. President Carter claims that federal spending would increase only 9 percent from its 1980 level, and that it would be virtually the same as 1980 spending after adjustment for inflation. But federal spending in the 1980 fiscal year is projected to exceed the deficit set in the budget by \$32 billion. The strong possibility of a 1981 deficit much greater than what the administration estimates is disturbing because the current 13.3 percent inflation rate already is the highest since World War II price controls were removed in 1946. The political priorities so evident in the proposed 1981 Federal budget seem likely to make Americans more aware of some of President Carter's domestic failures—and their own vulnerability to them.

The Bottom Line

Pop for pay

Are you hard-working college students looking to pick up some extra money? Forget selling encyclopedias or waking up at some ungodly hour to deliver newspapers. This is big time.

E.R. Squibb & Sons Co., based in Princeton, N.J., pays people to take drugs, in some cases for up to eight days. Talk about an extended high....

But don't worry, the pill popping is conducted under tight control, and there are certain restrictions. "The sessions are a ball, man," said one unemployed participant, happy to collect his \$750 paycheck for a wild time. "The meals are great and so are the nurses."

Squibb & Sons is an international pharmaceutical firm which set up its own testing center at the Princeton House, a

division of the Princeton Medical Center. It tests drugs ranging from skin cream to

The firm's executives say the dangers are minimal and most of the drugs are already on foreign markets, where safety guidelines are far less stringent than those of the federal Food and Drug Administration. Some assurance. One official was quoted as saving, "We haven't screwed up anybody yet."

"It's not bad if you can't find a halfway decent job," another participant said. "But it got to be a drag, hangin' around playing pool all day." Tough life.

But there is one catch: Squibb will only let men take the internal drugs. Sorry ladies, looks as if you'll have to settle for

testing Oil of Olay. And that's the bottom line.

What is a 10? Inner beauty counts, too

By JANE MORLEY

Right now I'm a 6. I look in the mirror and see a 6. Well, maybe the eyes are an 8, but my totality is a 6. When I lose 10 pounds I'm a 7, but that's tops. 7. Above average—but far from perfect. I've accepted my fate; I'll never be a 10. I'll never have a face or body like Bo Derek's. And all those little braids won't make a bit of difference for me.

I read somewhere last week that those braid jobs take the greater part of three hours to do, cost anywhere from \$80 to \$300 and last about a month before they must be taken out. The article said that the hairdo, called the "Bo," might make a 9 into a 10, but that it certainly would not make a three into a four. I thought that maybe those little braids and seashells might, just might, make me into an 8, so I tried them. To do it not only took my hands, but also the hands of four of my five housemates, and when the "Bo" was finished (two hours and a number of beers later), I had backslided to a mere 4. Oh

Perhaps you have seen 10 or the pictures of its star, Bo Derek, in this month's issue of Playboy. Is she a 10? What is a 10? I asked 50 men these questions the other day in Wilson Library and the Undergraduate Library. My sample included men ranging from freshmen to graduate students. Thirty-one said Bo was definitely a 10; seven said she was a 9; six said she's an 8; and two said she was a 6. Interestingly enough, four refused to rate her on the grounds they "don't rate women on such a superficial basis."

Hum.... The responses to my question "What's a 10?" were varied and interesting:



"The consummate woman."

"When you see it, you know it." "It can't be grasped; if I met a 10, I know that she wouldn't let me grasp her."

Quite a few men, however, said inner and outer beauty were equally important and intelligence counted, too. They said they had to know a girl before they could really rate her.

Then I asked a comparable sample of women, "Who's a male 10?" The responses ranged all the way from Paul Newman, Burt Reynolds, Dustin Hoffman and Robert Redford to John Travolta and Klaus Kinski (He was Count Dracula in the film "Nosferatu.")

Twenty of the women were offended by 10 and felt it was essentially a sexist statement. A very pretty girl I talked with felt that the film presented a beautiful woman who had no depth, an image which maintains an unfortunate stereotype: "A 10 can't be both pretty and sensitive." Many women said rating has no place and no importance, but that women do it, too, and that it's a fairly automatic response to rate a man when you see

I asked them: "What's a 10?" "A man with a good-old-boy smile." (What's a "goodold-boy" smile? Who has one?).

"There's a lot on this campus-I wish I knew some of them." (Yeah, me too.)

"There isn't one."

"Base sensuality."

"No 10s." "Not many male 10s." (Come on girls, let's not be so

It was pretty interesting to hear all these opinions, and it was especially refreshing to find, for the most part, that men and women were fairly realistic about the whole issue of rating. Inner and outer beauty count. So do smarts-you have to know the whole person. Rating is superficial, but it's automatic, and everyone does it. One man's 6 is another man's 10. In the end it's all subjective and basically harmless.

I ran into a friend of mine just as I had finished my survey, and after telling him of my findings, I asked him, "David, what's a 10?"

"You are, Jane."

Like I said, one man's 6 is another man's 10.

Jane Morley, a 6, is a graduate student in library science from Charlotte.

BRADA

letters to the editor

Accountability not a factor in GPSF vote

To the editor:

Rhonda Black raised an interesting point in her column on the GPSF referendum, (No..., DTH, Feb. 2). She said that if the GPSF referendum passes, the GPSF would not be accountable to the Campus Governing Council, or to anyone else, for its funding. Well, she's absolutely right! But then, why should we

What special wisdom does the CGC have that makes them a better judge of how we should spend our own money than ourselves? The GPSF, as the representative government of the graduate and professional students at UNC, is accountable to those students, since they are the ones who are paying the

> Roy Rocklin GPSF president

Outnumbered

To the editor:

Eight years ago, the UNC Chancellor, the Student Body President and the President of the Graduate & Professional Student Federation worked out an agreement to assure the return to graduate & professional students a just portion of their student activity fees. When student government was reorganized and the Campus Governing Council was formed, the CGC members honored this agreement, and a fair portion of these students' activity fees were returned to them.

The practice of CGC allocation of funds to the GPSF for distribution to the graduate departments has broken down. The non-G&P members of the CGC have lost sight of the fact that some of the fees paid by graduate and professional students are to be spent on activities that primarily benefit them, just as some fees are spent on activities that primarily benefit undergraduates.

The CGC has reduced the CPSF budget every year for the past five years. Outnumbered in the CGC, graduate and professional students have been unable to stop this erosion of their funding. The GPSF is more than capable of properly spending their funds. In the spirit of the continuing development of more equitable student government at UNC, we have initiated a referendum to assure a just allocation of graduate and professional student funds. We urge all students, both graduate and undergraduate, to vote in favor of this

> Charles Pappas GPSF vice-president



Grad needs answered

To the editor:

The GPSF contends that the referendum today is a result of the failure of the Campus Governing Council to meet the needs of the graduate and professional students. We believe the record shows that CGC has done all in its power to adequately provide for the needs of the GPSF

Last April during CGC budget hearings, the GPSF submitted a budget which the CGC felt was inadequate. Therefore the GPSF was asked to draw up a more detailed budget in hopes that their programs could be justified and better evaluated by the council. They did this and received a substantial amount of what they asked for. For example: they were funded completely in the category of speakers fees which the council felt held highest priority in their budget due to the large benefit to students concerned. On the other hand, the category of Student Awards was not funded because the council thought that this was very narrow in scope and benefit and was spread very disproportionately among the departments. Thus the Council felt that the four departments petitioning this money should shoulder that responsibility.

If one were to look at the current GPSF budget and what CGC has appropriated, one would realize that CGC has answered to the special needs of the graduate students. It may be a hassle to budget and petition for money, but this is the only way that the Campus Governing Council can evaluate each organization's programs, services and events and ensure that the benefit to students justifies the money appropriated. This process also avoids duplication of programs among organizations and ensures that these organizations do not spend money on items forbidden in the treasury laws.

GPSF should not be exempt from this process by simply stating that they have different needs and that these needs are not being met by CGC. The Campus Governing Council has attempted to meet their needs but GPSF must remain accountable to the student body by

participating in the budget process. We urge all students to vote NO in today's referendum.

> Cynthia Currin CGC Representative District 8

> Dianne Hubbard CGC Representative District 9

Letters?

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes columns and letters to the editor. For prompt publication, submissions must be typed triplespaced, typed on a 60-space line and signed. The writer's address should be included and each column should be accompanied by the writer's year, major and hometown.

Young remains strong on human rights

By JAMES ALEXANDER JR.

There couldn't be a better time than right now for former Georgia congressman and United Nations ambassador Andrew Young to do what he has become best known for: speaking his mind. With the current political developments in Europe, the drastic changes in U.S. foreign policy and the start of the 1980 presidential race, the very vocal and candid Young certainly could find no reason to be short on words during a press conference before his Memorial Hall appearance last Wednesday as guest lecturer for the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial lecture series.

Young not only took the opportunity during his visit to campus to voice his views on issues of worldwide concern, but commented on current social and domestic issues confronting Americans as well. Known as a strong advocate of human rights around the world. Young did not hesitate to talk about the direction the United States is taking in this area, both at home and abroad.

Here at home, Young said, the civil rights movement of the 1960s, which saw American blacks fight openly for racial equality, has made tremendous strides in maintaining the basic human rights gained from this movement. The civil rights movement, he said, has "almost succeeded itself out of existence" because of these great strides.

"If you look at it, we (the United States) are no less committed to civil rights in the '70s and '80s than in the '60s, Today, we must protect the rights of all people," Young said. "Overwhelmingly, you are now beginning to see the things we fought for. We have been extremely

successful in achieving them." However, Young cautioned that these achievements

have been more social and political than economic. And, he said, the new direction of the civil rights movement is to gain economic equality for Americans. An increasing number of black elected officials in government and the growing number of blacks being appointed federal judges is one example of the progress of the civil rights movement, Young said.

Young was in Greensboro Friday to help commemorate the 20th anniversary of the 1960 sit-in protest at F. W. Woolworth's by four N.C. A&t State University students. The sit-in contested blacks not being allowed to sit or be served at public lunch counters. Young said the 1960 sit-in was a pivotal point in American history because it futhered the principle of non-violent protest and was the grassroots of many other social-change movements, like the women's movement and Ralph Nader's consumer movement.

"What happened in Greensboro 20 years ago saved this nation. Because those students adopted non-violent methods of social change, we were saved from being like Northern Ireland or Iran," Young said. "Orderly protests conducted within the framework of our legal system are important in the survival of blacks and whites in this nation."

Having served as one of the highest ranking blacks in any presidential cabinet and having been tabbed by many as the unofficial spokesman for American blacks. Young often has been compared to the late Martin Luther King Jr. Young fervently disagrees with the notion of a charismatic black leader, and said American blacks do not need one central spokesman.

"We don't need any one leader. What we need is a tremendous diversity of leadership in the black community," Young said. "I believe we could provide more services and rights to the people this way."

As expected, Young has once again come out in support of President Jimmy Carter for re-election in 1980. He was one of Carter's most consistent and feverish black supporters during the last election. Young not only cites Carter's appointing of black judges and cabinet members, but approves of the President's handling of diplomatic crises as well.

Although he is behind the president in any move he makes dealing with the Soviets and Iran, Young expressed his desire to avoid an Olympic boycott. It is also a human right for the athletes who have trained vigorously to be able to participate in the reputable international competition, regardless of the world situation, Young said.

"I hope it can be avoided. There ought to be some place and some time when nations of the world can get together in spite of their differences," Young said. "In ancient Greece, they stopped wars for the games."

Despite the tense world situation, Young said, he doesn't believe there is going to be a war because it is "just too important to contemplate" and "far too dangerous." However, he remains in support of some universal 18-month volunteer service corps for all Americans between the ages of 17 and 25. Prior to answering the call to serve as U.N. ambassador, Young was in the process of introducing such a bill into Congress.

Saying that billions of dollars are being spent on "death and destruction," Young said that other problems of a serious nature such as worldwide hunger, population control and economic stability are being

James Alexander Jr., a junior journalism major from Concord, is editorial assistant for The Daily Tar Heel.