

SUB muddles along

by sharon deck

What some students have called the "colossal ineptitude" of the Student Union Board seems to be the result of first-of-the-year disorganization rather than of infighting or administrative pressures.

The grumbling began when the short film *Unfolding* was scheduled for a Friday night showing and then abruptly cancelled. When the SUB directors previewed the film, billed as a movie about love, they discovered that it fell instead under the category of "art film" or "skin flick," depending on one's orientations to explicit movies.

At first, the Board decided to show the film anyway, and included in the advertising a statement about the possible offensiveness of parts of the movie.

When they remembered, however, that young children often attend the movies, and that some people may not have seen the warning about the film's contents, they decided to delete the film from the program. According to SUB publicity director Mary Willis and films director Bill Holder, the movie will be shown later in the year, as part of an erotic film or art film series, when viewers will be aware of the sort of films they will be seeing.

Administration officials took no part in the decision to cancel the film. Neither Verne Parrish,

University Center director, nor Dennis Rash, dean of students, viewed the film before it was cancelled.

In fact, SUB directors claim that administrative interference in SUB activities is practically nonexistent. The former University Center director, Jon Thomas, exercised much more control over Board activities than Parrish does. Thomas signed all contracts and thus had veto power over what speakers, bands, or films appeared on campus.

According to Holder, it was Thomas who vetoed a concert by the Grateful Dead, simply because he did not like the group's agent.

This year, SUB chairman Randy Russell signs all contracts; Parrish serves only as adviser to the Board. This increased autonomy may be the cause of the disorganization that has plagued the Board thus far this year. "Since Thomas was the program director, we didn't know how to deal with agents or draw up contracts," SUB treasurer Sally Allison said.

This inexperience with contracts became evident when the SUB was forced to halt the showing of movies at Smic Smac on Sunday nights.

During the summer, the Board voted to show movies at the restaurant after they had been shown on campus. Later, they discovered that the movie contracts stated specifically that

the films could not be shown off campus without payment of a higher fee. The University would have been open to possible lawsuits if the Smic Smac showings had not been discontinued.

Some students have also complained about the new SUB policy of charging admission to campus movies. Holder claims that the charge will enable him to improve the film program. For the first time this year, the SUB is showing a movie every week, and sometimes has two movies a week.

For the best films, the SUB must pay a rental fee of \$.70 per student. By charging students \$.25 per movie, the SUB need spend only \$.45 per student from their own funds, thus leaving more money to rent more films.

Although both Ms. Willis and Holder admit that the Board has been disorganized so far, they feel that the situation is improving. "We are a relatively new organization," Ms. Willis said. "Any new organization must look for answers."

Holder noted that the publicity, which was bad last year, has already improved immensely. He said that the Board is also doing a better job in keeping the facilities clean. He cited Gary Fee's organizational job at the recent Nitty Gritty Dirt Band concert, where smoking and litter were kept to a minimum, as an area in which the Board has shown improvement.



journal photo/max street

Studying or what?

Budget hassles plague BSU

by sharon deck

Controversy over the Black Student Union budget enters its third week today, as the BSU prepares to submit its third budget in as many weeks to the Finance Committee of the Student Legislature.

Two weeks ago, the BSU asked for appropriations of \$9486. Over \$2000 was requested for office expenses (the BSU at present has no office), and \$7150 was requested for eleven BSU-sponsored programs to be held throughout the year.

According to Finance Committee member Steve Pitt, most committee members thought this sum was "outrageous." The committee rejected the budget and asked the BSU to submit a lower budget and to draw up a list of priorities to allow the committee to decide which items could be eliminated if it were necessary.

A week later, the BSU presented a new budget of \$7095. Almost all of the office items had been deleted from the request. Funds for two BSU programs scheduled for September were also deleted, since the monies could not be obtained in time.

All other items were placed in a number one priority, which meant that the Finance Committee had to either accept or reject the entire budget. Committee chairman Boone Wayson had suggested that the committee deal with each item separately, but some of the 25 BSU members present objected.

As a result, committee member Hugh Pace moved to reject the entire budget. Two members voted for the motion, one voted against, and two abstained. Wayson told the BSU members that they could submit another budget at any time, as long as the request was for less than \$7095.

At this point, the meeting was officially over. BSU Minister of Information Fred Dillahunt remarked that the issue was much too important for committee members to abstain and rebuked them for riding the fence. Committee member J. C. Meadows then said that Dillahunt was the cause of his abstaining, and that Dillahunt had ruined the whole budget for him by refusing to deal with each budget item separately.

Because the meeting had been tense and tempers were short, a brief shouting match ensued. Committee members have termed the exchange everything from a "discussion" to a "fight," but there was no violence and the exchange ended almost immediately.

The BSU plans to submit another budget either tomorrow or next week, but Dillahunt declined to say how much money would be requested.

"We don't plan to set priorities," Dillahunt said. "That would be a noose around our necks. All the monies that we will request are needed."

Wayson said yesterday that the committee's main objection to the budget was that it would take too large a chunk of available Student

Government funds. The committee, which allocates all SBG funds to student organizations, had between \$31 thousand and \$35 thousand at the beginning of the year. About \$6000 has already been allocated. The \$7000 that the BSU wants is therefore about 25 per cent of all remaining SBG funds.

"Our committee must look at all organization budgets," Wayson

said. "We are open to all organizations for money, but we have to have to have some money available to other organizations."

The only stipulation that the committee imposes is that every item in a budget must be justified. Some committee members feel that the BSU has not given adequate justification for some of the items. Most honorariums for speakers, for example, are at least \$200, and some, such as that for Mrs. H. Rap Brown, are as much as \$500.

Dillahunt denies that the honorariums are inflated. The fees are not out of line with those of other speakers, he said. "Most of the money goes to reimburse the speakers for transportation and time off from work." He did say that if the budget were restructured, some of the speakers may be cut out of their plans.

Wayson said that if the honorariums in the new budget still seemed too high, he would personally look into the fees to see if the BSU estimates were accurate.

Another objection is a question about what Wayson termed the validity of the budget. "An organization could possibly receive \$7000, but there are fewer than 200 blacks on campus, and the BSU has only 40 active members. They are planning black programs with black speakers and a black emphasis. Their program may not be benefiting the other 500 students."

Dillahunt feels that this is an unfair criterion for judging the budget. "We have never closed our doors to whites," he said. "If whites wish not to attend, it is their choice. We have no control over white interests. The budget shouldn't be based on that consideration."

Dillahunt would not say that the BSU is meeting difficulty because it is a black organization, but he did say that he thought the BSU was getting a runaround from the SBG and the Student Union Board.

"This would probably happen to a lot of groups, but being black makes you wonder if whites would be treated in the same way," he said.

"We got the impression from the committee discussion that they say they're not trying to interfere with our internal activities; but they are putting many stipulations on things like where some activity will be held," Dillahunt continued.

A side issue, which has very little to do with whether the budget will be approved, is the question of whether the Student Legislature should allocate any money for lectures or entertainment, usually the province of the Student Union Board.

The Finance Committee feels that no SBG funds should be used for these purposes. In fact, they gave the Orientation Commission funds this year for entertainment only on the condition that the Commission find other sources of entertainment funds next year.

The BSU maintains that since the club's activities consist of lectures and entertainment, and since the SBG is supposed to provide funds for an organization's activities, that SBG funds can properly be used for this purpose.

Even if the forthcoming BSU budget is approved by the Finance Committee immediately, it will still be two weeks before the BSU receives any funds. The budget must go to the Student Legislature for approval, and Legislature bylaws require that such a request be tabled for a week before any action can be taken.