

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

SCOTT GOODFELLOW, EDITOR

It Was A Political Gesture

Student politics were not at their best Sunday night.

At that time Student Party politicians, ordinarily among the most distinguished, engaged themselves with an undistinguished slap at the opposite party. Venerable Student Government expert Arthur Hayes introduced a bill before the party calling for a denial of voting privileges to anyone in the Student Party who is also a University Party official.

Amazing!

The Student Party has made a wide notice of the fact that every member has his own vote in conventions. This is in opposition to the University Party's system of delegate voting. Because of its system, the Student Party has long been known for block-voting, whereby fraternities, sororities and other large groups could make a dramatic impression on the vote counts.

The reason that these groups flood conventions is simply so that they can help to nominate one of their own members, or someone with whom they are sympathetic. That is, they want to have a hand

in controlling the nomination of candidates.

And now the Student Party, under somewhat dubious electoral means, has banned the voting privileges for University Party officers.

Why do the UP officers want to join the SP?

Easy. They want to have a hand in controlling the outcome of the nominations. And this is the same reason which most of the members of the SP allow the so-called block voting.

The liberal, independent principles of the Student Party are known to most everyone. It does not seem right that the party should begin searching out groups with apparently different principles and denying them voting privileges. Certainly there are many in the Student Party who will vote in convention on Monday whose principles are entirely different from those which the Student Party professes.

The move was nothing more than a partisan gesture with no place in the Student Party's fine record of achievements.

Education Needs Tax Relief

On February 6, Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn) introduced a bill into Congress designed to give tax relief to parents and students who pay the costs of college education.

The bill has been introduced regularly in a number of Congresses, but has not passed. This it is co-sponsored by 46 Senators, so it already has widespread support. Furthermore, this year's bill has an amendment which would include coverage for students in accredited post-secondary business, trade, technical and other vocational schools.

The proposal provides an income tax credit of up to \$325 on the first \$1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies. This credit would go to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institute of higher learning.

We strongly support this bill.

In principle, the bill represents a feeling that college education is one of the most important aspects of our lives. It calls for a decision on whether we should treat education costs as we do the interest on a home mortgage, or flood damage, or health expenses.

General Hershey

Blocks Change

Selective Service Director General Louis Hershey is a hard egg to crack.

In his news conference in Durham yesterday afternoon, Hershey was questioned about the proposed drafting methods.

"How about a lottery?"

"It won't work."

Why? "They had a lottery back in 1940 and it didn't work. Also, everyone proposes a lottery, but no one ever says how it would work."

Then the General outlined all his questions concerning lotteries. Every one of them, however, seemed to be a question which could be figured out with a minimum of difficulty by someone who was interested in correcting the present system.

But Hershey was not interested in making any changes. In fact he is one of the few people in the country who is utterly uninterested in draft law revision.

Surely there are good points to be said for the present law, but we find few of the draft-age individuals in the country saying them. And yet nearly all of these individuals support our country's rights of conscription.

'So you're from Peoria . . . Say, do you know . . . ?



In The Mail

Psych Exams Cause...

To the Editor:

The substance of the letter which I submitted to the DTH concerning the situation in the Psychology Department has been grossly distorted by the subsequent letters submitted by Richard Worster, Edward Greenberg and Brian Buxton.

I did not assert that students enrolled in Psychology 26 are coerced in the sense that they have no choice in deciding whether to participate in experiments or to fill out personal questionnaires. But rather, they are coerced, as a manner of speaking, in the sense that free choice is impossible as long as deprivations or rewards are involved in their choice. While one does not lose points in the sense of having them subtracted for not participating in experiments and filling out questionnaires (for a student whose grade is not commensurately raised as are the grades of the majority of students who participate) the practical effect is the same. And though students who wish to get extra credit do not have to make appointments for the experiments at times which are inconvenient to them, it is my understanding that if none of the scheduled times are convenient for a student, that is, if they conflict with regularly scheduled classes or weekend activities, he does not have the same opportunity to participate that other students have.

Finally, Mr. Worster and Mr. Buxton avoided commenting on my contention that grades should not be used to bribe students into revealing personal information about themselves. And the many "personal" things which Mr. Greenberg sees on campus are usually things which students reveal of their own volition.

A White House panel charged with investigating invasions of privacy has said that "the right to privacy is the right of the individual to decide for himself how much he will share with others his thoughts, his feelings, and the facts of

his personal life."

The present activities of the Psychology Department violate the spirit, if not the letter, of federal legislation which prohibits compromising individuals' privacy as a condition for universities receiving federal grants.

Eric Clay

Editor, Daily Tar Heel:

According to the recent statistics I have encountered, to say that education in North Carolina is below par is quite an inordinate overstatement to say the least. I don't think anyone would deny the fact that educational standards and institutions in our state could use a good "shot in the arm". This involves, of course, the advancement of teacher's salaries and benefits which would quite obviously increase the incentive to teach, and thus replenish the now deficient profession — at least in number. In this light, I was altogether pleased with Gov. Moore's proposals in his state of the state address last Thursday.

But what about the funds necessary to carry out such an ambitious program? Where in the state's budget can Gov. Moore or the legislature comfortably allow enough money to escape for such a purpose? Any appreciable success in attaining this goal would either mean ignoring other also vital projects or an increase in Federal aid, or both — despite the suspiciously overstated credit balance in the General Fund and other state agencies. From my point of view the answer to our problem rests not in the amount of money appropriated, but rather in the allocation of this money.

One who travels to any extent over North Carolina cannot help but notice the luxurious, "ultra-modern", architecture of so many of our public school buildings. The last thing a visitor would conceive of is this critical problem that we are now faced

with. It's very clear that a good deal of money is spent to erect such elegant buildings. In fact, too much.

A good example of this is in my own hometown. The state is adding three rooms to our high school at the almost unbelievable cost of \$18,000 apiece! That means a sum total of \$54,000 for the three room addition. "Of course," they say, "it's a beautiful piece of architecture — air conditioning, gas heat, and almost entirely composed of glass. Plus, the most up-to-date materials were involved in its construction" — also, the most expensive.

What I would like to know is why the emphasis, along with a huge sum of money, is placed on the appearance and comfort instead of the number and utility of our public schools. It's not that I'm opposed to beautiful schools or the students' repose which supposedly accompanies them, but the state seems obsessed with the desire for external beauty at the expense of internal quality.

I'm well aware of the crowded conditions which have haunted our school system for many years; and I agree that more and bigger schools should be built. This is the very essence of my case. However, it is quite obvious that no extensive effort has been spent "cutting corners" as to the unit costs of our schools.

With a concentrated effort, we might build more, simpler schools and at the same time obtain more, better qualified teachers. I won't go so far as to say that school buildings should be conventionalized, but I do say that the useless extravagance going into these buildings are not only draining the state's educational funds, but also, and most importantly, depriving our state and its citizens of real beauty — that beauty which comes with utilitarian and observing the personified attributes derived from a good state educational system.

Claude Pickett, Jr.
301 Mangum

Departmental Paranoia

(Editor's note: In light of the controversy at UNC—or, at least, in our letters column—it appears fascinating that the Daily Tar Heel found a similar problem on their campus.)

Last year a big stink was raised over the department of psychology's practice of using its elementary course students as subjects for the department's experiments. Participation in a certain number of experiments was required, and failure to participate would affect a student's grade.

People didn't like the idea of having their grades influenced by work that had virtually nothing to do with the course—a rather unacademic

practice. The department defended itself by saying that the experiments were a learning experience, and thus a legitimate part of the grade.

The matter got a lot of publicity and the department apparently was a bit paranoid about it all.

So for last the department tired to avoid more problems — fairly successfully — by altering the requirement. Now students have the option of writing a term paper or going to the experiments. Which means students have a choice between an academic grade or a non-academic grade.

At many schools guinea pigs are paid rather than drafted, but since here the de-

partment apparently can't afford to hire its labor, and since elementary psychology courses are required for many majors, the department finds the drafting method quite convenient.

But the students don't. And the fact remains that even with the "option" the practice is an unacademic one. It seems strange that a department that can afford to build a new building can't afford to hire its labor like other departments do.

What's more, it could set a dangerous precedent. Construction workers on the new psychology building might demand academic credit for their work.

Faculty, Students Need Fair Shake

By THOMAS CABARGA

The titulating case of the nude coed of Fla. U. has again pointed up the fact that the present organization of our universities is both undemocratic and unrealistic. If Miss Brewer, a ripe 18, were anything but a coed, she would have been free to display her considerable talents in any way she saw fit, including waiting on tables while stripped to the waist, and most people would have felt that she was within her legal rights in doing so.

To say that a full grown woman loses her constitutional rights just because she is attending a university is to make a very "academic" distinction between individuals. To argue that Miss Brewer is a child simply because she is going to school is to ignore all the very obvious evidence to the contrary.

The universities have been trampling on individual rights (dorm rules, the Paull case) for many years now simply because the students have no real power in running the school.

Student riots (panty raids aside) indicate that the same lack of representation which spurred Negroes into demonstrations in the past is now goading students into making themselves heard in the only way they can — by shouting and disorder. Although, thoughtful people fear and dislike demonstrations because they are a sign that orderly government has broken down, student riots will inevitably continue to grow as fast as the multi-versities do unless students are given some real power so that they can seek redress of grievances within the power structure of the university community itself.

Everyone is agreed that Berkeley-type riots should be avoided, but the way to do this is not by imposing tighter restrictions on students, or by giving them token concessions which will just postpone the time when the real problem must be tackled, that of setting up a realistic distribution of power in the university system.

Obviously, there are three main groups to be represented — students, faculty, and administration. This triad is in many ways similar to the three branches of our federal government, legislative, judicial, and executive, respectively. The analogy is not entirely sound, but I only want to suggest that a system of checks and balances must be set up so that no one group is allowed to trample the rights of the other two as the university administration is now doing to the students and faculty.

Conservatives everywhere, but especially in the administration, will oppose the reforms I am suggesting. The problem is, however, that higher education seems to be growing into very big business, and some realistic means must be provided so that all those concerned in the enterprise will be protected and represented.

Academic Life Isn't Snowball

By BOB SPAN

"Look at those rotten kids—laughing, joking, carefree, having a ball—on our taxes!"

The following quotation was the caption for a cartoon, "The Cynic's Corner," appearing in a recent edition of the *Raleigh Times*. It was said by an elderly woman as she and her companion watched students on their way to class.

On the surface, her statement is a truism. Students appear to have a ball in college. Pick up any newspaper and you can read about wild fraternity parties, promiscuity and drugs on campus, and on and on. Attend any football game and you can watch any army of coolers and glowing faces invading the stadium. Ask any adult and he'll tell you how carefree college life is.

But this is only half the coin or better yet only the milling on the edges of the coin. Attending college is, in actuality, just plain hard work.

The average student spends fifty hours or more a week in class and studying. If a student is carrying 17 credit hours he is probably in class at least 21 hours a week. On top of that he is expected to spend two hours on outside work for each hour he is in class. This 60 hours or so a week is quite a lot when you consider that the average man works only 40 hours a week. And at least five of those hours are spent on coffee breaks or just plain goofing off.

In addition, a large percentage of students work while in school. Almost all students working during the summer vacation.

If all this were not enough for 'Joe College' there are also numerous extra curricular activities. Students participate in intermural and varsity sports, publications, student government, numerous clubs or their own particular hobbies.

Numerous other strains are also placed on the college student. One of them is rules.

When a student applies for admission to a college, he is told that he must be of superior nature and possess great intellectual qualities in order to be admitted. Once he reaches college is is told that he has great potential and a superior mind.

However outside the classroom or orientation speech he finds a different picture painted. The student is not expected to be capable of deciding when and where he will drink. He is unable to decide where he will live. He does not know when to make noise and when to be quiet. All this and more the administration decides for him.

Yes Victoria, those kids might be in school on your taxes, but they're not carefree.