

## Proposed Changes In Women's Rules

The long-talked-about changes in women's rules are expected to be made effective some time this week.

After all the lengthy surveys, studies, recommendations and conferences, the final proposals consist of a series of "deletes," "adds" and "replaces" and four major changes in existing policy.

**First:** Closing hours for non-freshmen women changed from 11 p.m. Monday through Thursday; 1 a.m. Friday and Saturday; midnight Sunday, To midnight Sunday through Thursday; 1 a.m. Friday and Saturday.

**Second:** Late permission (2 a.m.) for seniors on the third, sixth, ninth and twelfth Saturday nights of each semester.

**Third:** Change in present rule which states that women students are not allowed to spend the night in a hotel, motel or boarding house in Chapel Hill, Durham, Raleigh or any other nearby town unless accompanied by parents.

To add, Except on weekends when campus late permission has been granted, special permission for such over-nights may be obtained, provided that the student submits a request to the Residence Administration three days in advance of the anticipated function.

**Fourth:** Change in policy of no shorts or slacks except for athletic competition to read. Women students are not to wear shorts or slacks in class, in the library, in administrative buildings, or in University dining facilities. They are requested to use discretion in dress in other areas.

Our reaction to these changes was two-fold, going from disappointment to entertainment.

We couldn't keep back a chuckle when we read "the third, sixth, ninth and twelfth Saturday nights..."

If 21-year-old women are going to be permitted to stay out until 2 a.m. only four times a semester, at least they should be allowed to choose their own nights.

Third, sixth, ninth and twelfth. We were waiting to hear someone yell "Bingo!"

We learned that one reason for this uniform pattern of late nights is the financial burden of paying a receptionist one-dollar to work the extra hour.

That's a good point. There are 17 receptionist desks where women students check in and out. Having these desks occupied the extra hour for just four nights will tally a bill of \$68 per semester.

Of course, we were told, the matter of greatest financial concern in the proposed changes is the total of four extra hours per week — one hour each night Monday through Thursday. This will cost \$68 every week!

We were happy to see the change permitting the wearing of slacks and shorts. But it doesn't make sense to us why, on a 90-degree day, a girl should not be permitted to go into the Pine Room for a drink wearing shorts, or why shorts and slacks should not be permitted in the library.

Our first thought upon reading the proposed changes was that the WRC in suggesting the revisions had allowed the administration to water down its proposals.

We have learned since that this is not the case. The reason a more drastic alteration of women's rules was not attempted — especially in the area of closing hours — is that most UNC coeds don't want later closing hours.

Many of them feel the rules here are very lenient compared to the restriction under which they lived at junior colleges.

They often express the attitude that later closing hours would make it more difficult for them in dating, explaining that when the clock approaches the forbidden hour they may simply say, "Oh, I do wish I could stay out longer, but you know these old-fashioned rules we have here."

But there are some girls on campus who would like to have later closing hours, girls who are willing to accept the responsibility of making decisions on their own.

For these girls, we wish closing hours and other rules could be firmly re-worked. Obviously, they are not going to be at this time.

A great deal of work has gone into the planning of the presently proposed changes. They are, at worst, better than the existing regulations. We hope they will be in effect next week at this time.

## Stripped Of Strips

Many avid readers of Peanuts and Andy Capp have complained to us recently about our running old cartoons.

Here's the story.

The service through which the cartoon strips are syndicated sends each strip one month in advance. During spring break, when the old hands cleaned out their desks and the new moved in, the cartoons for the month of April were misplaced.

When we returned to resume publication after Easter we were left not holding the bag. Therefore, we'll have to run sketches which have appeared before until the strips for May begin.

We will try to dig back further and find some old ones that won't be quite as easily recognized.

We apologize to all our readers for the situation and ask them to bear with us. Remember, compared to the total experiences of a day at UNC, reading your favorite comic strip in the DTH is only peanuts.

## Educational TV Offers The Only Interesting Fare Here

(Editor's note—this is the first in a two-part series.)

By RICHARD KLEIN

The news that WUNC-TV and its sister station WUNB-TV in Columbia, North Carolina, will soon be linked by microwave is exciting. It is another step towards a finer educational television system in this state, and one that is welcomed.

The television fare this year has been a remarkable disappointment. How such big networks as NBC, ABC and CBS presented to the public the cheap comedy and "misadventures" they did is a question to be pondered. Even a more irritating thought is that commercial television intends to repeat this format of programming next year.

Former FCC Chairman Newton Minnow dubbed television "the vast wasteland" a few years ago and some laughed. Now no one is laughing as the wasteland deteriorates. The oasis in the middle of the commercial dribble has been educational television with stations as WUNC and WUNB.

While a certain station will be broadcasting from its network programs such as "Batman," "Long Hot Summer," "Peyton Place" and "The Baron," Chapel Hill's channel four will be showing the Carolina Symposium speakers live and direct, "USA: Artists," "What's New" or "The President's Men." Where is the comparison?

Commercial television, say leading critics, relies on serving the greatest number of people basing their audience on A. C. Neilson ratings—a sample of a few thousand viewers (who possibly are not even viewing) which is supposed to represent millions. Thus instead of showing an important Senate hearing which would likely affect our country's foreign policy, CBS chose only a few weeks ago to re-show an "I Love Lucy" program.

Aware that big problems do exist and

answers can often be furnished—or, at least, attempted—WUNC-TV and WUNB-TV have accepted the challenge of trying to stimulate the mind of discriminating viewers. Rather than take the easy road and play down to viewers, these educational stations exerted themselves and put excitement back into the media.

High production costs and "lack of time" have kept local stations in this state from airing their own work using local talent. Instead these stations take another easy path by "riding the network" or running stale movies or old syndicated material.

Heaven knows what the solution to the commercial television dilemma is for the future. It appears that a change for the better in commercial television may never occur because it is economically sound.

So it is to the oasis one must look for refreshment. In WUNC-TV one can see programs with imagination and creativity — where thought is valued and intelligence appreciated. Anything less than what is presented on WUNC-TV is "second-best" at best.

Some of what educational television broadcasts is not altogether polished. Even after two decades of successful existence, television is still somewhat in the experimental stages. All that television can and will do has not yet been explored.

By its new connection with its sister station, WUNC-TV and its eventual network of stations in North Carolina offers tangible evidence of the high calibre of education the entire state can eagerly expect in a few years.

Former Governor Terry Sanford said in an April 8, 1963 address in Washington and hopes of the nation. Education, put in the bleakest terms, is survival. And education, put in its brightest terms, is life and growth, and happiness.

"Mom, it's not that I don't want to see you next weekend..."



## Letters To The Editor

### Coeds Seek Help

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

We, the undersigned, would like to bring to the attention of Carolina students and North Carolina citizens what we believe to be a significant injustice to the women students on this campus.

Recently, a large modern, private "dormitory" was built to house women students. The cost of living in this dormitory is in the neighborhood of \$495 per semester. Yes, we realize that this includes three meals a day, telephones in every room, and a semi-private bath, but what girl wants to be forced to eat all of her meals at a certain place, or needs the above mentioned luxuries at such an extreme expense?

Perhaps a handful of undergraduate women will be willing to pay this price. However, a freshman or transfer student is going to be surprised when her acceptance notice includes the fact that the only place in which she may live costs \$495 per semester.

We acknowledge the inevitable growing pains of a university. However, why do the women have to bear the brunt of all these growing pains? Our rent goes up because of the increased cost of new men's residence halls. Women are then shoved into Granville Hall as yet another new men's dormitory is being constructed. Our state

legislature provides \$1,000 per student for new men's residence halls such as Morrison; yet, this is supposedly not enough for a women's dormitory.

If women's residences are indeed more costly, why then start admitting women students on an "equal" basis with men if they cannot be housed on an equal basis?

These questions need to be answered and to be brought to the attention of all concerned.

- Jane Russell
- Becky L. Bangartner
- Robin P. Godett
- D. Sandra Lowe
- Barbara K. Hunnicutt
- Maggie Beth Godley
- Linda K. Long
- Linda Thompson
- Dorcas Brigg
- Carol Hess
- Barbara Kahdy
- Nancy Davenport
- Maureen Shannon
- Susie Warren
- Marianne Wall
- Betsy Denny
- Helen Delthco
- Nancy Jacobs
- Judy Stancil
- Linda Tittle
- Aloma M. Fisher
- Jan Ferris
- Ann Miller
- Members of the UNC Physical Therapy Club

### Cool Old Cartoons

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

What's the big idea of trying to pass off old cartoons on us? The recent rash of month-old cartoon strips is somewhat annoying.

When one gets up and has to drag himself to his eight o'clock class, he doesn't particularly like to open the DTH to his only consolation on a dreary morning just to find last month's funnies.

Surely a paper with the stature of that of the Daily Tar Heel can accomplish the most menial of newspaper tasks, namely printing a syndicated daily cartoon strip.

While I'm going to the trouble of being critical, I might as well be constructive. Perhaps one or two new comic strips might add to the DTH now that it has six permanent pages. May I suggest the "Wizard of Id?"



## Letters

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters must be typed, double-spaced and must include the name and address of the author or authors. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be limited to about 250-300 words. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel. Longer letters will be considered for "The Student Speaks" if they are of sufficient interest. However, the DTH reserves the right to use contributed materials as it sees fit.

Let me end by saying that the purpose of this letter is not to air a gripe publicly but to perhaps prompt the DTH staff to better work by letting them know that the public is temporarily disappointed in them.

Richard Page  
217 Lewis

(Editor's note—the head menial of the edit page sadly reports that all the new Peanuts and Andy Capp cartoons were inadvertently thrown out during the recent staff transition. The up-dated cartoons will appear next issue. Doesn't anyone out there care about our editorials?)

### David Rothman

## Ship Tobacco To India? Cooley Must Be Kidding

As every congressman running for reelection knows, one must cater to his constituents' wishes if he wants to return to city of Lyndon Johnson, thick carpets, sexy secretaries, plush committee assignments, and, of course, a heck of a lot of prestige.

The question is: How far does one go to win again?

North Carolina's Rep. Harold Cooley apparently settled the matter very easily when he suggested that tobacco (considered a health hazard in this country) be sent to India "to ease the tension of the starving Indians and relax the nerves so that they can eat the food and assimilate it much better."

Cooley had seemingly discovered that the lungs of the Indians are less prone to cancer than those of the Americans.

Ridiculous? Of course.

And even Cooley's staff knew it.

Cooley confessed last week that someone on his staff struck the statement from the Congressional Record.

Not very conveniently, however, Rep. H. R. Gross of Iowa repeated Cooley's remarks so that they could get into print after all.

The Tar Heel congressman didn't contradict him.

Cooley, who had asked that the tobacco be sent abroad as "emergency famine relief," called his own statement "facetious."

But he also said — as if apologizing for

a serious statement — that U. S. tobacco shipments would enable India to grow food on land it now uses for tobacco and cotton.

Moreover, Cooley himself wasn't the only person apparently detecting snatches of seriousness in the suggestion. Sen. Stephen Young of Ohio explained that the tobacco item had indeed been "tucked away" in the billion-dollar famine relief bill by the representative's "definite touch."

Then Young did the obvious; he called Cooley "a faithful representative of the tobacco interests."

Referring to the tobacco program's being touted as a project to prevent the poor from feeling the effects of starvation, Young said: "This sounds fantastic."

"But," he added, "it's true." Young predicts the tobacco, far from being a gift to the poor, will actually go to "the extremely rich upper classes who never had it so good."

Who's right, Cooley or Young?

That can't even be asked until we find out whether Cooley has been facetious all the way along; perhaps he really agrees with the Ohio Senator, but has a sense of humor.

Cooley is on the Daily Tar Heel's mailing list, so possibly he can tell us the truth after reading this column.

Are you being funny, Congressman?

Are you merely seeking re-election?

Or are you seeking to be re-elected by trying to be funny?