

# Momism, Segregation And The Neglected Students

"All government,—indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every human act,—is founded on compromise and barter."—Edmund Burke.

It seems apparent that the Division of Student Affairs is dead-set upon initiating its pampering "supervised counseling" program in Cobb Dormitory next semester.

Thus we reiterate: This monistic coddling and supervision is not commensurate with the University's liberal tradition—a tradition which puts the student on his own and makes for independent and self-reliant citizenry.

We don't like the trend. Even more alarming is the division's statement:

"It is anticipated that regular Interdormitory Council rules will apply until Cobb residents determine their own."

The primary function of the Men's Interdormitory Council, as stipulated in the Student Constitution, is:

... to make rules affecting conduct of men in dormitories."

Student self-government will be reduced to a state of anarchy if each individual dormitory is allowed to make its own rules, regardless of central IDC regulations. Such a disunified organizational scheme is reminiscent of the shifting and uncertain United States government under the Articles of Confederation.

Director of Student Activities Sam Magill has said that the administration promulgated the plan due to chaotic conditions in Men's dormitories which were not conducive to study. Magill said further that students had been explaining their poor scholastic averages to parents by saying they just couldn't study in noisy dormitories.

We believe this is, of course, rationalization. But if there is general dissatisfaction with dormitory disciplinary conditions, the Interdormitory Council should be informed; and it should realign and strengthen its organization.

The administration shouldn't just step in and tread on student autonomy. The least it could do is to allow dormitory residents, through the IDC, opportunity to express their opinion on the University's new supervised counseling proposal.

The Division of Student Affairs is also implementing its plan for segregated housing in the fall. Contrary to all non-discriminatory traditions, the entire football team will be housed in Cobb Dormitory.

As we have said before, it is infinitely beneficial that all students be allowed freedom of association—whether they be athletes or freshmen or seniors. Yet the administration persists in establishing this new preferential and discriminatory quartering system.

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

- Editor: NEIL BASS
- Managing Editor: BOB HIGH
- Associate Editor: NANCY HILL
- Sports Editor: BILL KING
- News Editor: WALT SCHRUNTEK
- Business Manager: JOHN C. WHITAKER
- Advertising Manager: FRED KATZIN
- NEWS STAFF: Graham Snyder, Edith MacKinnon, Ben Taylor, Patsy Miller, Sue Atchison, Manley Springs.
- EDIT STAFF: Whit Whitfield, Anthony Wolf, Stan Shaw.
- BUSINESS STAFF: John Minter, Marian Hobeck, Jane Patten, Bucky Shuford.
- SPORTS STAFF: Dave Wible, Stu Bird, Ed Rowland, Jim Crowner, Ron Milligan.
- Subscription Manager: Dale Staley
- Circulation manager: Charlie Holt
- Staff Photographers: Woody Sears, Norman Kantor, Bill King.
- Librarians: Sue Gichner, Marilyn Strum
- Night News Editor: Boh High
- Night Editor: Woody Sears

It has been intimated that University officials don't especially care for this segregated housing pattern, but fear that a member of the University's coach staff will appeal over their heads—to influential alumni—if they don't allow his athletes preferential and segregated housing.

We like a willing team as well as the next guy. Pressure from the general public demands that college athletics be elevated to a professional status.

But when a coach begins re-vamping University traditions and co-opting the administration into establishment of discriminatory housing, then the tail is assuredly wagging the dog in our higher educational organization.

In short, we don't like the administration's new brand of momism and segregation. But we recognize, like Edmund Burke, that government is founded on compromise.

Thus we will compromise if dormitory residents favor the University's new coddling and discriminatory trends.

But dormitory residents should be allowed to express their sentiments before such a far-reaching dual proposal is instituted.

The Daily Tar Heel makes these suggestions to the Division of Student Affairs:

(1) That dormitory residents be allowed to express their feelings on the dual "supervised study" and segregated housing proposals through their vocal vehicle—the Interdormitory Council.

(2) That especially fine traditions—such as non-preferential housing—not be compromised to please one megalomaniac individual.

Until students are allowed opportunity to express their sentiments on the new absurd proposals, we suggest that they take advantage of this provision in the statement released yesterday by the Division of Student Affairs:

"No student must live in the dormitory if he doesn't wish to participate in the program."

There has been a serious reversal in University policy.

It is especially despicable that administration officials would even consider implementing such a far-reaching new system without consulting the student body proper.

Momism and segregated housing are far from commensurate with the liberal traditions for which this University has ostensibly stood for so many years.

Cobb Dormitory should stand as vacant and quiet as an empty mausoleum until the administration takes its new fantastic proposal to the students.

## Laurels For Achievement

Are we to be so concerned with what cynics call the 'Silent Generation'?

Five outstanding coeds were tapped into the highest women's honorary on campus yesterday. Former student body President Bob Young and Yackety Yack photographer Truman Moore were recognized for excellence in student government and publications respectively. Miss Dot Pressly was awarded the Jane Craig Gray Memorial Award for "ideals exemplified." 63 students have been taken into the Order of The Old Well for "service and accomplishment" on a point basis. The School of Pharmacy has made 11 awards for academic excellence. Ninety students have been inducted into Phi Beta Kappa. Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity has received the R. B. House Trophy as the outstanding fraternity on campus.

What better tribute to an enterprising generation of students.

The Daily Tar Heel extends heartiest congratulations to them all.

### WISE AND OTHERWISE:

## Semesters And Weekends To Keep Us Pure

Whit Whitfield

Since the fall of 1953 and the return of the semester system the subject has become a perennial gripe among students.

Some people are not aware of the real reasons for the change

According to The Daily Tar Heel of that fall, the two main reasons for the change were:

The students were not deriving the full benefits of their education under the old quarter system, and the facilities of the university were not being used to the best advantage on the five day system.

Now these are very plausible reasons for the change.

Because the latter reason is more nebulous, we shall consider it first. The facilities of the university, broadly interpreted, include the classroom buildings, laboratory equipment, and specialized equipment. It would seem that under the quarter system the facilities would be used by more student more often than under the semester system even with Saturdays excluded.

The former reason, however, has many favorable ramifications which are more easily understood. What is meant by "full benefits" would be something like this:

Under the semester system a student acts in this capacity six days per week instead of five on the quarter system. Saturday classes prevent many people from leaving campus on the weekends that otherwise would. This, in effect, makes a prison of sorts, especially for those who live so far away that a thirty-six hour trip is not feasible.

At the same time it is a boon to the campus stores and Lenoir Hall, not to mention the downtown merchants. Besides the extra day in which restaurants and cafeterias make money, the clothing stores get sales that would otherwise go to hometown merchants.

That this is more expensive to the students is not as important as the advantage in being here as full-time students, or so it seems to the trustees. Also, let us not forget the money spent by the parents and friends of students who pad the pockets of the university and the downtown merchants.

Not the least important reason for the change was that parents could be reasonably assured that their "children" are not cavorting around the state on weekends, but safe in Chapel Hill away from trouble.

This is very important to us as students whether we realize it or not. It keeps us from the sins of the world, and keeps us pure for our parents when we return home. Now this is an excellent gesture on the part of the Trustees. Let us live up to their expectations.

United States representatives on April 2 brought up the idea that the use of nuclear materials for military purposes be halted, beginning April 1, 1958, and that this measure be enforced by international inspection. According to this suggestion, negotiations would begin September 1, of this year in order to reach international agreement on this plan.

On the same day that this recommendation was presented, 18 of the leading nuclear scientists of West Germany, including four Nobel Prize winners, issued a statement deploring the development of nuclear weapons and advocating an immediate halt to military use of atomic and hydrogen energy. In the words of these men, "Today, the population of the Federal Republic (Germany) could be wiped out by spreading radioactivity through hydrogen bombs. We do not know any technical means of safeguarding large masses of people against that danger."

To these 18 men, nuclear weapons presented a threat to the welfare of humanity. This idea was immediately picked up by the Soviet Union, who cheered the statement happily, emphasizing the harmful effects of radiation and radioactive all-out from the U. S. tests of Christmas Island and from the proposed British hydrogen weapons test in July. Conversely, no mention was made of the unusually high radioactivity reported in Japanese rain as result of recent Russian tests.

Germany, on the other hand, listened to the words of the scientists in near horror because of the implications that such a suggestion would have on the nation's political life. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer spoke the following day, stating that dis-

### "Don't Worry. I Don't Think There's Anything in There"



### SALISBURY COLLEGE PIONEER:

## The Current College Generation: Is It Abreast Of World's Tide?

While Catawba students are engrossed in SGA elections, May Day plans, and baseball games, a committee is meeting in London to discuss the solution to problems which may well affect the fate of the world.

Representatives from the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and Canada have joined together to form the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee. Their aim: to reduce the nuclear arms (both atomic and hydrogen weapons) race and ultimately to turn nuclear science only into peaceful fields.

Not the least important reason for the change was that parents could be reasonably assured that their "children" are not cavorting around the state on weekends, but safe in Chapel Hill away from trouble.

This is very important to us as students whether we realize it or not. It keeps us from the sins of the world, and keeps us pure for our parents when we return home. Now this is an excellent gesture on the part of the Trustees. Let us live up to their expectations.

United States representatives on April 2 brought up the idea that the use of nuclear materials for military purposes be halted, beginning April 1, 1958, and that this measure be enforced by international inspection. According to this suggestion, negotiations would begin September 1, of this year in order to reach international agreement on this plan.

On the same day that this recommendation was presented, 18 of the leading nuclear scientists of West Germany, including four Nobel Prize winners, issued a statement deploring the development of nuclear weapons and advocating an immediate halt to military use of atomic and hydrogen energy. In the words of these men, "Today, the population of the Federal Republic (Germany) could be wiped out by spreading radioactivity through hydrogen bombs. We do not know any technical means of safeguarding large masses of people against that danger."

To these 18 men, nuclear weapons presented a threat to the welfare of humanity. This idea was immediately picked up by the Soviet Union, who cheered the statement happily, emphasizing the harmful effects of radiation and radioactive all-out from the U. S. tests of Christmas Island and from the proposed British hydrogen weapons test in July. Conversely, no mention was made of the unusually high radioactivity reported in Japanese rain as result of recent Russian tests.

Germany, on the other hand, listened to the words of the scientists in near horror because of the implications that such a suggestion would have on the nation's political life. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer spoke the following day, stating that dis-

armament is a political matter and not one to be determined by scientists, even though skilled in their own fields. The complete retreat of Germany from developing atomic weapons would place the country as an easy prey in the path of the Soviet Union. "In other words," as Chancellor Adenauer stated, "that would mean the dissolution of the whole defense wall of the Western world against Russia."

These problems, reflecting conflicting ideas and points of view, cannot be solved easily, even by national representatives appointed by the United Nations. Men responsible for reaching such important decisions must be completely informed on world-wide matters, must keep their minds open to opposing points of view, and must be able to judge for themselves the values of the conflicting ideas.

We, too, must do our part by being aware of international problems and their effects on us and on others. Thousands of miles may separate us from a conference table, but they cannot separate us from the consequences of the decisions made around that table.

### GUEST EDITORIALS:

## A Perspectus Of Publications

### THE MICHIGAN DAILY:

Censorship, particularly of newspapers, books and motion pictures, has become a very controversial subject in recent months.

A wide variety of organizations and "decency committees" has lately arisen to do battle against whatever they choose to define as "indecent" or "obscene."

State legislatures and local law enforcement agencies, often under pressure from these self-appointed guardians of the public welfare, have passed obscenity laws, banned books and closed burlesque houses—for the public welfare. Many of these laws and bans of one sort or another have been declared unconstitutional or unlawful, but this doesn't seem to have dampened the current enthusiasm for censorship.

Censorship properly directed and administered, is useful and often necessary. When, however, a group of self-righteous purists set themselves up to dictate public morality, to impose their own moral codes, their own definitions of "indecent," their own tastes in literature and entertainment on the entire populace they violate the rights of all of us to choose for ourselves what we shall read or see.

Censorship aimed, for example, at protecting children from exposure to indecency is justifiable—children are not capable of properly choosing for themselves or distinguishing products of an author's imagination from reality. Too many censorship groups, however seem to regard the average American adult as an intellectual child who also must be protected from his own indiscretion or lack of discrimination.

Again, censorship of publications which thrive on gossip, tearing down reputations and libeling individuals cannot be argued against. Such publications themselves infringe on the rights and the privacy of others and deserve to be condemned. Scandal magazines—the most notorious of them "Confidential"—fall into this category.

But when self-appointed "protectors of the public morality" take upon themselves authority to "protect" the public from even such contemporary greats as Hemingway, Huxley, Steinbeck, Buck, O'Hara and Orwell, they infringe on the personal freedom of all of us.

Even such extreme censorship would be acceptable were it limited to merely screening and recommendation. There is little room for objection to someone simply suggesting that a certain book or movie would be better not read or seen, or alerting us to the moral evils in our environment.

But too many of our censors refuse to stop there. They endeavor to force us to conform by forcing out of our reach all they consider unfit for our consumption—threatening and organizing boycotts against theatres, publishers and dealers—all without proper justification.

Censorship in its place is a fine thing; censorship, mistaken and misdirected, is as dangerous as that which it seeks to protect us against.

### THE N. C. STATE TECHNICIAN:

The Student Government voted unanimously against a resolution last week which had previously been accepted by the Faculty Senate.

The resolution which the legislative body voted against was the proposed new cut system. Under the new cut system, which the Faculty Senate passed about a month ago, a student would be required to get an excuse from a class from the professor whose class he wished to cut. That is, no longer would there be a central office from which excuses would be obtained. The cut system would be a direct student-professor relationship.

The theory of the new cut system, quite basically, is that the individual professors know best whether a student can afford to cut a class. Another factor may have been that State is getting too big for one person to have to grant excuses for the entire student body.

The Student Government has taken a stand just opposite to that of the Faculty Senate. This, we believe, shows the healthy atmosphere which prevails here at State. When the students dislike and disagree with the Faculty and can stand up as a body and say that they disagree, without fear of reprisal, there exists a situation "pregnant with possibilities of progress."

As for the action the Student Government took on the measure, we are in agreement with it. A student-professor relationship is not the best solution to the problem—it is merely one solution.

There are other solutions which are worth further consideration. The student could be required to get an excuse from his advisor. This might kill two birds with one stone—the student would have a chance to see his advisor more than he now does—and maybe more than about half the students would know who their advisor is that way.

Another solution, which is better yet, is to have each school grant excuses. This could be handled through the dean's office of each school. This would spread the work of writing excuses—which a single person must find extremely boring and laborious—over several people, none of whom would be over-burdened by the duty.

Certainly the problem needs further study. The system proposed by the Faculty Senate overlooks one further point. The student-professor relationship could become all too personal... with the student on the losing end.

### L'il Abner



### By A! Capp



### Pogo



### By Walt Kelly

