

As We See It

Apartments For Women? —It's Up To The Coeds

In ten days, the women on campus will have the opportunity to vote on their rules, to say whether they like them or, hopefully, to say how they don't like them.

Sharon Rose has said that no student vote will be binding to anyone, and in the direct sense, she is right. However, the vote count will be extremely influential in shaping the decisions made by others, most particularly perhaps, in the field of women's housing.

University administrators are acutely aware of the great shortage of women's housing on campus and how much more the problem will be intensified in two years at the present rate of growth.

Administrators are concerned enough to call a series of meetings in which all the top brass get together behind closed doors and try to decide what to do with X-hundred women students whom they

predict they will have no place to put.

As of now, the administrators have half a dozen or so alternatives up for discussion. Among them is allowing certain women to live off campus. Another is to ask the University to build a high-rise residence hall for women. With the present ceiling on construction costs, even the administrators themselves admit it highly unlikely—if not impossible.

A third proposal is to stop letting coeds come to UNC until the problem presumably works itself out.

If the women clearly show that they would like the privilege given the men of living off campus, those in charge will take it into consideration.

If the women themselves say they don't really want to have the freedom, it's a certainty they won't get it.

Stronger Protest

The outlining of a broad plan to take the Vietnam war issue off the campus and into the community points to one of the sad facts of contemporary American life: people don't concern themselves with an issue until it is thrust at them.

And when this happens, sad to say, the people who do the thrusting are usually blamed for exaggerating the matter.

Now doubtless this is the case in many issues. We would even venture the opinion that this was the case in the recent mass anti-war demonstrations in New York, where excited youths burned their draft cards in a harried and highly insignificant gesture of defiance.

This is one kind of protest against war. It is not necessarily the best. Rather, we think the group of student body leaders who are preparing a second letter to President Johnson have come up with a vastly more effective—and certainly

more sane—idea for stirring thought on the war issue.

The plan calls for student volunteers to go into local communities across the United States this summer and get churches, schools and civic organizations to sponsor debates on the war. Although there is no pretension to having both sides equally represented in the discussions, this is not necessary, since most of the pro-war sentiment is based on some sort of Yahooism which arises whenever there is war.

And besides, the government has been less than effective in presenting a rational defense of its policy; a defense, that is, which can be tossed around in a debate. (Patriotism is hardly debatable.)

At any rate, the community level is where the debate belongs, not isolated on college campuses where people can—or want to—see only "Communists."

If people get involved argumentatively in this matter they will forget the "radical" ideas they have read about in the newspapers. They may even forget their Yahooism.

But one thing is certain. If enough sensible students present enough sensible arguments and cause enough sensible citizens to reflect on their previous views, it could have a far-reaching effect on policy.

Citizens do funny things. They form groups. They write congressmen. Once aroused, they get things done in a way that students cannot. And there are more of them.

DTH Awards

Learner from Experience Award: To Bob Powell who said he would not sign the second Vietnam letter until he saw the final draft. Also until he figured out how much grief he'd catch from the student body.

Involvement of the Week: To the 'concerned' people of Victory Village who had a Board of Aldermen meeting Tuesday with a grand total of 13 non-board people in attendance.

Anti-Model Airplane Makers of the Week: To the N. C. Senate who has a bill making it unlawful to use, possess, or sell all glue which might be intoxicating—like airplane glue.

Spy of the Week: Dean Carmichael who reportedly while an Economics professor in Saigon in 1962 was arrested for being a spy in at least two camps at the same time.

Mock of the Week: To the encounter in Detroit when a bandit with blanks in his pistol was thwarted by a tear-gas anti-bandit repellent full of soapy water.

Originality of the Week: To Sen. Sam Ervin who told the law students here and the law students in Williamsburg, Va. two days later that "it is the duty of all citizens to obey all laws." At least we got to hear it first.

Friendship of the Week: To State Department representative Daniel Davidson who, in his debate with Al Lowenstein, said he felt he could call about the entire administration by its first name, when he couldn't think of anything else to say.

Hit Dog (Always Barks) of the Week: To ECC President Leo Jenkins who wrote to Dr. Nash thanking him for his nice letter condemning the DTH for its anti-ECC policy. Dr. Leo said the Editor of ECC's paper wouldn't lower himself to reply. If it were possible to lower himself.

The Daily Tar Heel
 Bill Amlong, Editor
 Tom Clark, Business Manager
 Lytt Stamps, Managing Editor
 John Askew Ad. Mgr.
 Peter Harris, Steve Knowlton
 Associate Editors
 Don Campbell News Editor
 Carol Wonsavage Feature Ed.
 Jim Fields Sports Editor
 Owen Davis Asst. Spts. Ed.
 Wayne Hurder Copy Editor
 Jock Lauterer Photo Editor
 Bruce Strauch Cartoonist
 Mike McGowan, Steve Adams
 Photographers
 Steve Knowlton, Hunter George,
 Karen Freeman, Donna Reifsnider,
 Sandy Lord, Joe Ritok, Joe Coltrane,
 Penny Raynor, Joe Sanders,
 Julie Parker, Mary Lyn Field,
 Ernest Robl, Penny Satsky.

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations. . . .
 Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$9 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

Cone Workers Need Labor Rights

Since Dick Mitchell's father is manager of the Tabardrey plant in Haw River it is not difficult to understand the emotions expressed in his letter. It is considerably more difficult to understand the facts he came up with. Dick's argument is that the Textile Workers Union chose Cone mills for a campaign because it would be the

"softest nut to crack," since Cone has always been benign toward unionism and has always "preferred to live with them." But nothing will come of it anyway since most of the workers have no interest in the union, especially with its sinister interest in "checkoff of dues." This is a rather sweet fairy tale for managers' sons, but if we are to get

beyond "bib cliches" we will need something more substantial, like facts. To begin with, Cone has never "preferred to live with the union." A campaign started in Cone mills in the late 1930's and Cone fought it to the hilt.

000. I find it utterly amazing that such a firm can contend that no significant raising of wages is feasible, when one-third of all textile production jobs now pay less than the government's poverty cut-off line.

Even if the "economics" argument were sound, this would be no defense for Cone's refusal to bargain over check-off and pension. As to checkoff, it is absurd to call it a "narrow concern" which alienates the workers from the union. Most of the workers know from experience that checkoff is essential to the success of a union. In modern industry a checkoff provision in a contract is the most important indicator of whether or not a company is willing to "live with the union." In the textile industry, where pocket cash is often nonexistent and everyone must live on credit, the provision is especially essential. As a matter of fact 96 percent of all industrial union contracts contain this provision—and Cone refuses to discuss it. One might say, with Dick that his refusal stems from a tender concern for the workers' welfare, a disinclination to see their wages go to make union bureaucrats rich. Those of us who have a slightly more cynical bent might suggest instead that Cone's refusal stems from knowledge that if the local union's treasurers are strong they will be able to continually protect the workers from arbitrary dismissal or work-load increases and will be able to permanently pressure the industry into providing conditions and wages which basic human dignity demand.

As to Cone's pension plan: reflect long and hard on \$20 a month after fifty years of service.

It would be interesting to find out from what "grape-vine" Dick gets his news about labor activity - obviously it is not from the workers. The recent strike at Chatham Mills in Elkin did not "collapse." It was a limited one-week strike called to protest the unfair labor practices of Chatham. I understand that the Chatham workers are anxious to go out again soon. It was even more surprising to read about the "collapse" of the Burlington strike at Erwin. There, contrary to the allegation, the Erwin strikers won all that they struck for, which was the recognition by Burlington of their former contract.

Dick just must have been in the wrong places during last February's strike, where the union turned out some 70 percent of the workers in seven Cone plants.

During those three days the company made nowhere near the alleged 70 percent plus production claimed. Dick's "testament to reasonable wages" seems to be dwindling away, because in the current unfair labor practices strike 70-80 percent of production workers are out. If you don't believe that number, come see it for yourself—join us on the picket line, baby (Editor's note: Personally Speaking is an open column which will be used for guest columns and long letters. Guest columns should be typed and signed.)



Creative Stimulation Needed For Carolina

By MIKE MCGEE (Third in a Series)

Many students are concerned with the repression of free thought on this campus. The Student Mental Health committee of the Student Government last fall collected many comments from students on this subject, most of which

were related to the Michael Paul case—which was big, indirectly related to the Speaker Ban issue, and in the final analysis related to the whole system of instruction where certain subjects are taboo and certain ways of talking about things are discouraged.

Suppressing information on things like seduction in literature (have you ever read the filthy Classical poems of Catullus?) or communism as it exists today creates a divergence between thought and action. He thinks about these things, but in class or on campus there are no such things.

In college, one is not supposed to think about bad things, or talk about them; but everybody knows that they happen, even if you don't do them yourself. Thus you have the student who has been "just a little" dissolute, and has heard and seen in practice that dissolution does not exist in the academic world; the school does not recognize it. So his natural inclinations tend to drive him away from academics, make him feel alienated from academics. He thinks that because he went out and got drunk that weekend, or tried to seduce that girl, he is driving himself further and further from the world of thinking men. The feeling may arise that academics has no concern for him; or for people in general, whom he knows to be subject to certain natural passions. The world of learning is cold, cal-

culating and impersonal. Something to be avoided because it condemns him.

What he doesn't get is that academics is a human invention, propagated by people as passionate and sometimes as dissolute as himself. A man cannot respect intellectual accomplishment and scholarship unless he can feel some kinship with it. As things are, very many students never get serious about learnings. It's a threat.

One student commented, "We turn out graduates that are morons." It's not that they don't know anything, for most of them get and keep good jobs; it's that they don't care to take a critical look around them once they're gone from this place.

In this way the university fails to provide much more than vocational training. She fails to supply articulate, concerned persons. One could train for a job in much less time than four years. We could cut out a lot of this "humanities" and "ideas" nonsense—all those things that don't relate to real life.

But academics is vitally related to real life, if in no other realm than the political (for the average working man). But the stiff, formal, straight-laced way it is dispensed makes students doubt its necessity.

Also, many of those who do go deeply into academics believe the propaganda that ideas must be purged of humanity. These persons are often the ones who become immersed in dryness and sterility of thought.

How is North Carolina ever going to climb from next-to-last among the states if the university places such a powerful stress on the average student that he evades academics and Ideas?

Ideas are for people, not for books.

Some examples of Cone's benign outlook on unions follow: During a strike at one of the Greensboro mills in 1938 workers in the mill village were forbidden to subscribe to the Raleigh News and Observer, because it had carried too much C.I.O. labor news. A weekly company newspaper is distributed free to all Cone employees and therein a worker could entertain himself with the horror stories which passed for "editorials," depicting the C.I.O.

as "violence, war, and revolution." (See Ruth Crowell's *The Administration of the NLRA in North Carolina*, MA thesis, UNC, 1940). In 1939, the employees in a number of Cone mills, among them Tabardrey, voted for the union in an NLRB election. The vote at Tabardrey was 208-85. Cone, however (always eager to "live with the union") would not sign a union contract, and the union protested his refusal through the NLRB. In 1942 the Board ordered another election, which was again won handily by the union. Then, in the interests of preserving industrial peace during the War, the labor board dictatorially handed down what they considered to be a fair contract. That contract included wage security provisions, a pension plan, arbitration, and check-off. Cone never had a say in this contract, and always resented the union.

During a "get tough with the union" campaign by management in the late forties and early fifties, a split occurred in the leadership of the TWUA. A number of the TWUA leaders split for the AFL-United Textile Workers, and the Cone locals bolted with them. In the process they voted to return to the TWUA but were never able to regain checkoff. Due to this loss and a highly fluctuating labor force, the union went steadily downhill to virtual non-existence in the early 60's - much to the delight of Cone, of course.

Dick's tale needs revising in another important respect. Managers and their sons always seem to see unionism as an external force, plotting strategy in secret cabals in far-away rooms. "Who will be next to go brothers?" As delightful as this image is, it is terribly far from the mundane truth. Cone Mills was never selected as a campaign target by the union. Peter Brandon, TWUA campaign coordinator, was assigned to the Cone locals because he was new to the union and no one expected the locals to move. However, it is the workers and not the union who make a campaign happen. It turned out that the Cone workers, driven to the ground by work load increases, were ready to organize from scratch. They did so under threat of firing, intimidation, and race-baiting, and have waged a model union campaign characterized by a militant and dedicated spirit.

The argument that textile wages are as "good as textile economics permits" is a feeble hash already served up, in their time, by the steel industry, the auto industry, the garment industry, etc.

... and now it is textile's turn. It is true that many textile concerns are in non-competitive positions and will soon die or be gobbled up by giants such as Burlington or J. P. Stevens, but that qualification does not apply to Cone, who is more likely to gobble than to be gobbled. Right now the Cone mills are overwhelmingly the world's largest manufacturer of the staples denim and corduroy, and few firms are on a sounder financial basis. Last year Cone's profits were in the neighborhood of \$12,000,000.

On Other Campuses

Pooh-In At Texas

Winnie the Pooh fans at the UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS celebrated the birthday of Eeyore, the pessimistic donkey at a party sponsored by a group of students. The lower-beaked Eeyore wandered through a park among costumes and excited students, who nibbled and sipped beer, cupcakes, cotton candy, and snow cones. Beneath maypoles were clowns, jesters, musicians, soldiers, children, and pets. Guests picked the fruit of the "Lollypop Tree for Eeyore's Little Friends", sung and see-sawed, took pictures, listened to music, and carried big red balloons. Eeyore's birthday party is held annually.

Letters



The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters typed and signed. We welcome open discussion by all interested persons. Our policy is to print all timely letters in the public interest.

Thirty-eight Negro students at DUKE UNIVERSITY have signed an open letter expressing "dismay" that members of the University Administration and faculty hold membership in the segregated Hope Valley Country Club. The 1966 roster of the club shows among its members the University president, vice-president, provost, vice provost, Director of Athletics, head bas-

ketball coach Vic Bubas, several law professors, and more than fifty members of the medical school and hospital staff. Negro students have been turned away from such functions at the club as a dinner for "local alumni and friends." Part of the letter says, "Your membership in that establishment can only serve as a justification and rationale for bigots to continue perpetuating racist institutions. They will follow your leadership."

A campus leader and avid opponent of the Vietnam war at the UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY became probably the first ROTC student in the nation to lose his commission because of his anti-war activities. The student, who has participated in weekly peace vigils since March, says he feels that "young men can best fight for their country in the Peace Corps." The senior ROTC instructor on the campus reportedly told the student that the President (of the U. S.) is the commander-in-chief and the military supports him in not publicly protesting the policies he sets forth.