

The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor
Don Walton, Business Manager

Pamela Hawkins, Associate Editor
Terry Gingras, Managing Editor
Rebel Good, News Editor
Kermit Buckner, Advertising Manager



Part III

This University Residence Colleges

Of the two institutionalized life-styles at this University, the Residence College System has made more news in recent years than has the fraternity system.

The reason is simple: it's been doing more.

But the question looms: has the Residence College System been doing enough?

The answer, to date, is either a qualified "no," or a whimpering "yes."

For the Residence College System, for all the publicity it has gotten, for all the attention its every step forward has been given, has not made nearly the progress that its most devoted supporters would have you believe.

One reason—perhaps the most important reason—is that this baby giant's growth has been somewhat stunted by its receiving only insipid aid so far from the Administration.

Perhaps the University's attitude was best expressed by former Dean of Men William G. Long, who commented Nov. 9, 1966, that "We will get farther slower."

Long told Residence College Governors, who had just returned from a tour of the well-developed Residence College System at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, that they could not expect to move ahead locomotive fashion with all the ideas they had picked up on the trip.

AND SO HAS gone the story of the burgeoning RCS: students would have bright—sometimes even brilliant—ideas, but would be told they would have to slow down.

Despite constant protestations that what the Residence College System really needs is coeducational dorms, for example, the Administration has been loathe to make this step. The biggest breakthrough in this area is the designating of Parker Residence Hall as a coed dorm in the Scott College complex for next year.

The Administration, however, is hesitant to house both men and women in the same structure.

All the while, though, there have been some members of the faculty and administration who have been of great help to the Residence College System. Among these is Dr. Sam Hill, professor of religion and chairman of the Residence College Committee.

Hill and a few other faculty members have been tireless in their efforts to improve the RCS, but have been hampered by their role's being only a parttime one.

One of the biggest strides that has been made so far has been the appointment of the Rev. Harry Smith as a special assistant to the Chancellor in the area of residence college. This will provide a more direct link between the Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson and the student leaders of the RCS, eliminating much of the red-tape and channels through which they have previously had to go.

ANOTHER MAJOR STRIDE in the RCS has been the initiation of a Faculty Fellows program for next year, whereby certain faculty members will actually have their offices in the residence halls and will maintain closer contact with their students.

Previously, there have been classes taught in the residence halls, but it has been on such a limited and experimental basis that it has failed to significantly dent the big, impersonal university syndrome which the RCS is supposed to combat.

Administration-linked problems aren't the only thing plaguing the RCS, though: the residence college have a lot of flaws that are purely student problems.

Chief among these is, of course, apathy, the traditional apathy that pervades colleges and universities throughout the nation.

APATHY IN THE context of the residence colleges, however, is a more serious thing than it might be if one was speaking about student failure to support a football team or a student union sponsored concert.

For apathy, in the RCS context, means that the colleges not only find it hard to staff themselves, to find leaders, but also to find anyone to lead. It means that no living-learning atmosphere can be created when the residence hall dwellers concentrate on learning at the library, and living in one of the Franklin St. taverns or their fraternity houses.

There have been different ways of combating this apathy, and it is hard to say whether or not one has been more successful than another.

One of the first was the charismatic leader approach, through such persons as Roger Davis of Maverick House, the first real residence college, or John Ellis, the dynamic leader of Morrison College last year.

The main thing wrong with this approach is that there is a vacuum created after these people graduated, and the continuation of support for the college depends entirely on whether or not one of the leader's lieutenants can rise to fill this vacuum.

ANOTHER MEANS IS that which is being tried in Hinton James now: putting the running of the college down to a real grassroots level, and letting the guys on the hall take a larger responsibility for what happens.

This method has both strong points and flaws.

Its strength lies in the fact that perhaps a greater esprit de corps is created when there is more involvement by the lower echelons of the college, instead of having everything done by a chief muckety-muck and handed down to the residents.

Its weakness is that it has the danger of not presenting enough leadership to the college, in its effort not to present too much.

It remains to be seen just what is the most effective way of creating a surge of support for the RCS, but it is still young and must undergo this and several other crises before it reaches maturity.

But if it is to ever reach that maturity, it is going to take a continued effort by the students involved, and a continuation of the kind of effort the Administration has begun to put forth through such men as Sam Hill and Rev. Smith.

Mike Cozza

Lyndon In Repeat Performance!

(Editor's Note: In the March 29 edition of The Daily Tar Heel, Mike Cozza outlined the similarities of the Truman and Johnson pre-election predicaments. Cozza voiced the hunch that "Perhaps President Johnson will choose not to seek re-election." The headline on that column was 'Lyndon In Repeat Performance?')

President Johnson's announcement Sunday night that he would not accept the Democratic nomination for re-election capped off a series of events which are remarkably similar to those surrounding President Harry S. Truman's decision not to seek re-election in 1952.

To begin with, Truman and Johnson both came to the presidency upon the death of a president, and both were later re-elected in their own right. And both chose not to run for a second elected term, making public their decisions on almost exactly the same date.

Truman announced that he would not run again on March 29, 1952. Johnson made his announcement on March 31.

The similarities do not end there. They cover a wide range of events in foreign affairs and domestic politics.

In 1952, as today, the United States was involved in a gruelling Asian war which seemed to be stalemated.

Although Truman's critics weren't labelled "hawks" or "doves" as Johnson's are now, the critics were certainly present. Some wanted increased military action and some wanted concessions that would aid negotiations.

But there was one thing that the hawks and the doves were both concerned about in 1952 just as they are today. Both felt the United States was bearing too much of the struggle with too little help from our allies.

Some of our allies, such as Great Britain, supported American policy verbally and wanted to help. But the British couldn't do very much for the war effort. In 1952, as today, their country was racked by economic crisis which forced cuts in defense expenditures.



Johnson

Meanwhile, in Washington in mid-March of 1952, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was engaged in a bitter struggle with the Truman administration over foreign aid proposals. And throughout the country Americans were worried about taxes that were threaten-

ing to go up. Then, in the March 11 New Hampshire primary, President Truman suffered a demoralizing defeat at the hands of Tennessee Senator Estes Kefauver. Truman hadn't campaigned in New Hampshire, but he had allowed himself to be a candidate and he had received the support of the regular party organization.

After the primary defeat there was some talk that perhaps Truman would be unable to capture re-nomination. But the Washington insiders discounted the possibility. The President himself labelled the primary as "eyewash", indicating that as an incumbent he could get the nomination if he wanted it regardless of primaries.

'And Bless The National Committeemen From New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, California ...'



From The Charlotte Observer

out the Clifford was at the White House. And then they settled back and waited for March 29, predicting that Truman's speech would be an exciting spectacle.

And they were right. Truman began the speech slowly, talking about a variety of things that ap-

peared in his prepared text. Then, after speaking for 29 minutes, he announced, "I shall not be a candidate for re-election. I have served my country long and I think efficiently and honestly. I will not accept re-nomination."



Truman

The audience was flabbergasted. No one had even the slightest inkling that Truman would make such an announcement.

Throughout the country Americans reacted with amazement and disbelief, just as they did when President Johnson voiced his decision Sunday night.

But there was one man who reacted with neither of these emotions for it was a spectacle that he had witnessed once before. The man was the only one of President Johnson's close advisors who was present when Johnson went before the television cameras.

He is the new Secretary of Defense. His name is Clark Clifford.

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed, double-spaced and signed. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publications Board, daily except Mondays, examinations periods and vacations.

Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news - 933-1011; business, circulation, advertising - 933-1163. Address: Box 1060, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514.

Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.

Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.

Reputation Of Chapel Hill Police Threatened

By DONALD CHAMBERS
Special to the DTH

Chapel Hill policemen who have acted with indiscretion and poor judgement threaten the otherwise good reputation of the entire department. More important is the fact that these incidents, isolated and few in number as they may be, pose a very real threat to the civil rights of students.

Saturday night, Sept. 9, 1967, about ten UNC students were drinking beer outside The Shack. Some of the students stood in the driveway, while others sat on an adjacent wall.

At approximately 9 p.m., a Chapel Hill police car stopped at the driveway. Four officers jumped from the car and herded the students standing in the driveway against the wall.

Charged with drinking beer off the premises of the establishment, the students were taken up the street to the Chapel Hill Police Department. One policeman suggested posting \$50 bail for each of the students.

But the officer in charge at the station simply warned the students to be careful in the future and then released them—presumably because they were newly-arrived freshman who were unfamiliar with the local laws.

Unfortunately, the arresting officers did not demonstrate such tact and patience.

The students were not advised of their rights at the time of their arrest. One

student was nearly knocked off his feet by an overzealous policeman. In short, the arresting officers treated the students as if they were potentially dangerous hoodlums who had committed a serious offense.

In an incident which occurred on Feb. 4, 1968, according to two UNC students, a Chapel Hill police officer entered and searched their apartment in their presence without their permission and without a search warrant.

The officer later testified in Chapel Hill Recorder's Court that he had received the boys' permission to enter the apartment at 322 W. Rosemary St.

The point is one of due process. Had the officer received permission to enter the apartment, he would not have needed a search warrant. If such permission was not granted, then his entry constituted a violation of due process.

The officer's testimony suggests that he sincerely believed that permission to enter the apartment—tacit or otherwise—had been granted. The students maintain that they did not knowingly give such permission.

If the police officer was certain that permission to enter the apartment had been given by the residents, then he should have made this clear to them at that time.

Had proper search procedure been followed, there would be no disagreement between the students and the policeman.

Another incident occurred at the same house a month earlier. According to

two other UNC students, several Chapel Hill policemen entered their apartment at approximately 3 a.m., Tuesday, Jan. 2, 1968.

Because they were asleep at the time, neither of the residents remembers hearing a knock at the door. They literally awoke with flashlights shining in their faces.

The students were questioned about a runaway high school girl. When they denied any knowledge of the girl's whereabouts, the policemen left the apartment.

The policemen returned three hours later and, according to the students, repeated their questions about the runaway high school girl. The policemen left when the students continued to deny that they knew who or where the girl in question was.

Again, the point is one of procedure. The police officers made it clear to the students why they were in their apartment. They did not, however, explain their actual act of entry.

There should have been no doubt in the minds of the students as to the legality of the officers' entry. Had their rights been clearly defined, they would not have complained personally to the Chief of Police some time later.

Officers of the Chapel Hill Police Department have, in the past, exercised considerable patience and integrity in dealing with the public.

During the early civil rights demonstrations in Chapel Hill, the

department was as concerned about the welfare of the demonstrators as it was about the interests of the other townspeople.

One officer repeatedly warned a heckler who happened to be an old friend to stop harassing the demonstrators. According to Captain Coy Durham, when the man returned to the crowd and struck a sign being carried by one of the demonstrators, the officer arrested him.

Much of the praise given the department is directed at Chief William Blake. Barry Winston, a Chapel Hill attorney, commented that "Chief Blake is single-handedly responsible for the fact that Chapel Hill has a far better than average police department."

Chief Blake has, in fact, instituted a program of continuous and comprehensive training for all members of the force—including himself and his assistant, Captain Durham.

But although the Chapel Hill Police Department benefits from conscientious leadership and an enlightened training program, its reputation lies ultimately in the conduct of its officers.

Chief Blake emphasizes to his men the importance of being policemen first. When individuals demonstrate through acts of impatience and indiscretion that they are not able to maintain this standard, the community suffers with the department itself.