

# CDS Working to Overcome Dining Hall Problems

The Feb. 7 Daily Tar Heel article describing student body president candidates' views on Carolina Dining Service ("Dining Dilemma") raised a number of excellent points. The Board of Directors, which meets weekly to set CDS hours, menus and pricing policy, has struggled with each of the issues. It might help frame the debate if we looked at some of those issues in more detail.

First, though, it is important to understand that CDS is operated for the University by Sodexo-Marriott under what's called a fee-based contract. This is different from most universities, where any profits that are left after operating expenses are deducted from revenues go to the contractor. In that situation there might be a real incentive for the contractor to squeeze every possible dollar out at the bottom line, because that dollar goes into its own purse. At Carolina, however, Sodexo-Marriott is paid a flat fee with incentive components related to cost control, sales goals and customer satisfaction goals. What's left over after expenses have been deducted from revenues goes entirely to pay off the loan for the Lenoir Dining Hall renovation.

The dining service contributes only about one-third of that payment, with the rest coming

## RUT TUFTS POINT OF VIEW

from vending and from student fees. Vending revenue is now fairly flat, and Carolina has not been able to get state funds for dining services since the 1960s. If the dining service contribution drops, then the student fee component would have to increase in order to make the loan payments. It is this consequence that affects every decision made about CDS and which hindered Student Body President Nic Heinke's very strenuous efforts across the summer and through the fall to get more service hours at Chase Hall.

Second, the geography of the campus poses a particular challenge for dining. On North Campus, we have the majority of class and student services buildings, housing for about 3,000 students and a seriously overcrowded Lenoir Hall. On South Campus, there is a bedroom suburb where everyone commutes north during the day and returns to an overcrowded (and hopelessly outmoded) Chase at night. Efforts to keep Chase open over the last decade have cost tens of thousands of dollars, which in turn

strains CDS's ability to pay the loan on Lenoir. It's in addressing the South Campus problem that we have, I think, the greatest opportunity to solve many of the issues raised by presidential candidates and before them, CDS customers. From 1991 to 1999 the number of meal plan holders has grown from 400 to 3,900, without any sort of mandatory board plan. Housing has committed to adding significant, quality residential space to South Campus. Enrollment growth promises to add more undergraduates, the primary users of board dining, and campus growth is increasingly happening south of the Bell Tower. These factors have led to a strategy, still in its infancy, of replacing Chase with a facility slightly to the north, in what is now the Ram's Head parking lot.

The concept being explored includes building a two-story parking deck on the site of the current Ram's Head surface parking lot, with the top of the deck not holding cars but rather being part of a new greenway linking North and South campuses, with one or more buildings along the deck containing a 600-seat board facility and a real grocery store — as opposed to a convenience store such as the South Campus Mini Mart. While such a dining facility would only be a little closer (a seven-minute walk from

the Pit, as opposed to 11 minutes to the current Chase) it would be much easier and more pleasant to reach.

During the day, students on North Campus could go to Ram's Head to avoid the Lenoir crush, and at night, the expanded capacity (600 seats vs. the current 400) would ameliorate the crowding problem in Chase. As a side note, if the deck project is fully realized, it could also include student recreation space, Student Stores retail space and a police community substation.

The most innovative ingredient in this mix would be the grocery store. Grocery store chains purchase huge volumes of merchandise, most directly from manufacturers, which they then sell at low prices. On the other hand, CDS purchase volume is very low, and merchandise must be obtained from wholesalers that supply convenience stores; thus, CDS charges convenience store prices. In some cases, CDS pays almost as much for an item as a chain grocery store charges its customers. Our goal is to tap into the grocery world and thus be able to offer grocery store prices.

In the longer run, as more daytime activity moves to South Campus and possibly additional residence capacity is added in that area, we should achieve the critical mass necessary to

create more than just a bedroom community there. Such a community would certainly need additional food service, possibly in the form of board dining, but more likely in a retail manner that looks more like Mainstreet Lenoir or even like Franklin Street, with individual vendors, such as Taco Bell, but with a complete menu as opposed to the scaled-down "express" versions prevalent on most campuses.

In other words, many of the criticisms raised by the candidates were on the mark. The campus needs more dining space, South Campus needs more hours of food service, the pricing problems inherent in convenience stores like the Mini Mart needs to be solved and students need more variety in the kinds of food service available. CDS is having its most successful year, but clearly there is room for improvement. We welcome the debate on how to best go about achieving this improvement, look forward to continuing the effort with student government to do so, and encourage those of you who have specific issues or suggestions to bring them to any member of the Board of Directors, which can be reached through the student government offices.

Rut Tufts is director of auxiliary services.



# Column Inappropriate, Offensive to All Women

## TINA YUEN AND SCOTT WARREN POINT OF VIEW

This is in response to David Povill's attempt at journalism titled "Men Are From Mars, Women Are Just Plain Stupid," which appeared in the Diversions section Feb. 17. Let us begin by saying we have two bones to pick: one with the author and one with the DTH editors who allowed this smear against all women to appear in print.

Without even reading the text, we were already incensed. The title itself is completely inappropriate, and by calling all women stupid, Povill attempts to undermine and erase the fact that women make up more than 60 percent of the student population at UNC.

Stupid, we think not! In fact, women's enrollment into higher education has been on the increase in recent years. In our opinion, it was "stupid" for Povill to waste his time writing this column.

As the title makes no sense and doesn't even pertain to the content of the article. Povill's blatant sexism is purely disgusting and revolting. He barely hides his hatred of all women by calling them the "weaker sex" and shamelessly endorsing the degradation and objectification of women.

He actually applauds the "Man Show" for its effort to "offend women as much as humanly possible," and he continues by adding, "Why? Because it's about time men reclaimed our sexuality."

What! Where has Povill been living all of his life? Under a rock, apparently. If he has not noticed, in all the television shows, music videos, pornography, movies, print ads, magazines and just plain society in general, our concept of sexuality is totally male-based.

We live in a milieu that reveres male sexuality and directly oppresses women's ability to define for themselves what it means to be sexual by reducing them to the common denominator.

Women, in this culture and in Povill's column, are still considered the sexual properties of men even with women's advances in the last half of the 20th century. In other words, in order to take women seriously, you must first take women sexually.

Even though Povill seeks to exalt male sexuality and masculinity, his comments are detrimental to men. He writes from the perspective that all men think the same way he does and to view women any differently would mean being ridiculed.

If a man does not share the same ideas about women, then he is obviously not a "real man." His column ought to enrage men as well as

*"(Povill) barely hides his hatred of all women by calling them the 'weaker sex' and shamelessly endorsing the degradation and objectification of women."*

attack.

The day after Povill's column was met with silence and passive acceptance by the community.

The difference between Povill's column and Fennell's column, besides their content, is that we accept the denigration and objectification of women as normal (just watch MTV for 30 minutes and you'll understand what we mean).

The mentality is that the advances in gender equality are a joke, whereas fraternities are not regularly attacked because they are held to be sacred and unaccountable entities on campus.

Should we all condone this behavior and congratulate the DTH and Povill for speaking their minds? Should we as a campus and community uphold these ideas of sexism?

We will not, and we know the readers of the DTH will not either. We also hope that you support women's empowerment and our right not to have to see hate literature in our student newspaper.

Tina Yuen is a first-year pharmacy student. Reach her at [furies@email.unc.edu](mailto:furies@email.unc.edu).  
Scott Warren is a junior history and German major. Reach him at [dwarren@email.unc.edu](mailto:dwarren@email.unc.edu).

# CAA: Communist Organization?

## WESLEY WHITE POINT OF VIEW

OK, that's it. I've had enough. After holding my peace for the better part of three years, I can no longer remain silent.

What is it that's got me riled up? The Carolina Athletic Association, of course. Or as it is known to its members, the Communist Awareness Association. That's right, with the re-election of comrade Tee Pruitt, UNC students are faced with another year of "fair" bracelet distribution.

Congratulations, Tee. By the way, Davis Library called; it needs its copy of the Communist Manifesto back as soon as possible.

That's right folks, the CAA has taken the American spirit and the American way of life out of basketball ticket distributions here at UNC.

How, you might ask. This occurred when somebody had the bright idea to model the ticket distribution system used for Garth Brooks concerts.

Bracelets! This is Carolina basketball, for crying out loud, and this bracelet system is a joke. When the kids line up on Saturday mornings to get their tickets, it can be logically equated to the people who stood in line in the former Soviet Union, waiting for their daily allotment of bread and vodka.

Stalin, Lenin and Marx are high-fiving each other even as I write this. Whatever happened to working for something, to earning it? Practically every time I brave this system and attempt to get tickets for a game, I

get stuck in Section 250, Row ZZZ of the Dean Dome, which pretty much means I'm sitting at the south end of Durham. Being a die-hard fan, I still scream and yell during the game, but nobody can hear me. On the other hand, at this same game, sitting in Section 110, Row A, is a person who's wondering what inning we are in, how many strikes Ed Cota has and why the players keep bouncing the big orange ball when it would be so much easier to just pick it up and run.

Pathetic! This communist bracelet system doesn't reward the real fan, it all depends on luck and "fairness." Nobody has to work for that seat in 110. Oh, but Pruitt and the CAA would argue otherwise.

From its headquarters on campus, or the Kremlin, as it's known, the propaganda machine claims there is "hardship" involved when it comes to getting tickets. They say it's hard for the students to meet at 6 a.m. in front of the Smith Center. But now there has been talk of moving the time up to 8 a.m. or later. Wow, that's a real hardship. Why doesn't the CAA just come right out and admit that it wants to make these distributions as easy as possible.

Here are a few suggestions. They could set up hot tubs at different places in line, and all the students could soak while waiting in line.

They could even have the dance team serve chicken wings, pizza and beer. That's the least they could do for these poor kids who had to get up so early after sleeping all night in their warm beds.

That's much harder than camping out all night, right Tee?

No matter what the outcome over the cries for better student seating, it still follows that if students really have to work for their tickets, they are going to appreciate what they get even more.

Translation: Louder fans. Other schools, such as Dook, allow camping out, and I can guarantee that the kids who get tickets at these schools appreciate them a lot more. You see, they earn them — they go out, give some effort and are rewarded.

America was built on people trying to get ahead, pulling themselves up by their boot strings, and working for what they wanted. The ticket distribution system goes against all that. In trying to be fair, it turns out to be a detriment and obstacle to many avid basketball fans.

Getting basketball tickets is not a right for students, it's a privilege. A privilege that should be earned.

It looks like that's not going to happen for yet another year, but have faith, the Soviet Union collapsed, maybe the CAA will, too.

Wesley White is a junior history and economics major who'd like to nominate John Wayne for CAA president next year.

# Matthews' Election a Victory for Mediocrity, Smaller Vision

## CHRISTOPHER BROOK POINT OF VIEW

From the same state that voted for Ronald Reagan, consistently elects Jesse Helms and will, no doubt, support George W. Bush this year, I should have expected nothing more from our student body president elections last Tuesday.

One candidate, Erica Smiley was enthusiastic, intelligent and dynamic in her personality and goals. The other candidate, Brad Matthews, was about as dynamic as tree bark.

Tuesday's student body president election results were unfortunate as the University is a great institution of higher learning that should strive to transcend the mediocrity that Matthews exemplifies.

Watching Brad Matthews run for president was about as exciting, and controversial, as watching the grass grow. Here are some very sexy Matthews quotes. "I want to change

the mentality of student government. It needs to be exposed to different kinds of thinking." "Students should come first." "Going to people is accessibility, not making them come to you."

Not only are these supposed "platforms" inane, but they are also strikingly vague. I mean, what voting student is not going to believe "students should come first" at a university? Even more troubling than this is that Matthews outlined no real program through which to accomplish these sound bites.

When Matthews did get specific in his goals, which was rare, the result was purely political gravy. Perhaps you heard about Matthews' plan to extend free Internet access to all off-campus residents at Carolina. Matthews

promised not only to do this, but to get to work on it his first day in office. Now, that is a great idea. However, inspection of this promise reveals its true nature. I was informed by Matthews' campaign folks that while working on Nic Heinke's Cabinet this year, Matthews formed a contact with an Internet company to get this Internet extension. However, if Matthews had this contact while in Heinke's Cabinet, then why did he not work to help University students by immediately instituting this Internet access?

The answer to this question is simple. Brad Matthews does not truly care about helping University students so much as he cares about helping himself. If Matthews had instituted this free

Internet access while working for Heinke, then he would not have had a big campaign issue to run on. In short, Matthews' lack of sincere selflessness is even more alarming than his lack of backbone.

Agree with her or not, you have to admit that Erica Smiley is a candidate who deserves respect for tackling challenging, even controversial issues, which is more than can be said for Brad Matthews. While in Student Congress, Smiley pushed through legislation supporting the lifting of U.S. sanction against Iraq and putting a moratorium on the death penalty. These are moves which are bound to put some people off, but demonstrate her strong personal core beliefs.

Similarly, during her campaign Smiley came out in support of gay rights, minority rights and United States Students' Association. Again,

gutsy moves which show that she had concrete beliefs on important issues that she would put her weight behind. This ability to stand up for what you believe, no matter how unpopular, should be commended.

Unfortunately, Smiley's unique stance on many issues made her a focal point for malicious ridicule, not commendation. Smiley was the victim of numerous suspicious prank phone calls and equally suspicious rumors about her candidacy. I myself was told by many people they had heard Smiley was going to try to shut down fraternities and institute a Black Panther mentality to student government. Even more unfortunately, these suspicious rumors circulated throughout the campus, and many people believed them.

Worst of all, I think these slanderous comments ultimately resulted in Brad Matthews' election. In the end, Erica

Smiley was victimized for essentially being a candidate far superior to Brad Matthews.

I love the University, and that is why the election so deeply saddened me. We are an institute of incredible people and we deserve an equally outstanding student body president to lead us. Erica Smiley is outstanding, and Brad Matthews is not. Having said that, I have no doubt that Matthews will be an excellent president in the incredibly limited scope he envisions the position to have. After all, it would appear all you need to be a great student body president is a weather vane, to see which way the political wind is blowing.

Christopher Brook is a sophomore political science and history major from Raleigh. Reach him with questions and comments at [cbrook@email.unc.edu](mailto:cbrook@email.unc.edu).