

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom



Todd Cohen
Chairman

J. D. Wilkinson Executive Editor
Bobby Nowell Managing Editor
Dennis Benfield News Editor
Harvey Elliott Arts Editor
Steve Enfield Associate Editor
Art Chansky Sports Editor
Arlene Jacobson Copy Editor
Mike Cozza Editor-in-Chief

Bill Staton Business Manager
Kermit Buckner, Jr. Advertising Manager

Pete Hatch Night Editor this issue

The Housing Problem: Absurd Quotas

By MARK G. RODIN

A few years ago the University of North Carolina was a rapidly growing institution. (That's not to say that it isn't today.) Student enrollment had increased tremendously and there was an acute housing shortage both on campus and in Chapel Hill itself. New dorms were needed badly. As a result, three new high-rise dormitories were constructed with federal aid under the provisions of the college housing program. Old boys' dorms were converted into girls' dorms. At the same time, real estate developers and construction companies were erecting new housing developments and apartment complexes all around and through Chapel Hill.

For more student living quarters than Chapel Hill had. Their answer was Granville Towers, two new dormitories, (soon to be three), with fully furnished and air-conditioned rooms, a boarding plan which provides students with twenty meals a week, a swimming pool, and many other conveniences that weren't available in university-owned housing. The administration and housing authorities welcomed the Granville Towers development with open arms, for there still wasn't enough housing on or near campus to provide for the increasing student body. Even as late as 1967, more housing on campus was a necessity. So still another high-rise dormitory, Hinton-James, was built out on south campus. With the completion of Hinton-James there was enough housing for students who wanted to live on campus.

A few years ago living in a dormitory on campus was desirable. The rates were cheap, and each dorm had its advantages. In my freshman year, fall 1967-Spring 1968, rates for my room in Everett Dormitory were one hundred and sixteen dollars per semester. South campus residents paid an extra nine dollars because of the phones which were installed in each room. Then in March of 1968, the director of housing, Mr. James Wadsworth, announced that there would be a twenty dollar increase in all housing rates because of the pay raise for resident advisors, (some of whom, in this writer's opinion shouldn't be paid a thing), and for other unexplained reasons. The icing was put on the cake this past March when Mrs. Wadsworth sent out the housing rate memo for next year announcing another twenty dollar increase across the board.

This time Mr. Wadsworth didn't even explain why we were paying the additional twenty dollars, and to the best recollections of my memory, did not make a public statement in the Tar Heel. (It would be nice if he did.) Now next fall, I will be paying forty dollars more than I did when I was a freshman. Maybe the administration decided to go into competition with the apartments.

This forty-dollar increase, the existence of more apartments for those who desire to live in one for various reasons, and the desire on the part of many incoming freshmen and upperclassmen to live in Granville Towers has posed a big threat to administration and housing authorities. The threat of an almost-empty thousand-man south campus dorm is looming in their minds. Furthermore, their decision to close one of them down because it would be economically unfeasible to operate. They cannot see a ten story building of brick, concrete, steel, and glass sitting there gathering dust.

Since the funding for payments of the government loans used in building the south campus dorms comes from the room rent payments of students living in them, the university authorities decided to act. Their action was imposing a percent quota on the number of freshmen who will live in any one university-owned dormitory next year and a thirty-percent quota on Granville Towers.

This action by the administration and housing authorities is both discriminatory and absurd nonsense. When a student comes to school here he supposedly has a freedom of choice as to where he wants to live. The only restriction for boys is that they must live in a dorm in their freshman year. After that they may live wherever they choose. Girls must live in a dorm for a longer period of time.

If a student who attends this university has a freedom of choice as to where he wants to live on campus and in university housing, then it is only fair to let him live where he chooses, either in his first, second, or, if necessary, third choice, no matter what class he may be in. To do otherwise is discriminatory and violates the person's freedom to choose. Likewise imposing special quotas on non-university owned housing is discriminatory. There is no reason except for full occupancy of a building, why a student can't live where he chooses. After all, he IS paying the money.

If this university is interested in assigning quotas in order to have occupancy of all living quarters, then it should assign people rooms without asking them where they wish to live.

Led Astray

Dean of Men James O. Cansler Wednesday warned "individuals not to be taken in by an old trick purporting to offer something for nothing." His warning was in reference to a chain letter presently circulating on this campus.

Mr. Cansler at the same time pointed out that students caught buying the chain letter could conceivably be tried for violation of the Honor Code.

A copy of that chain letter, which virtually guarantees any prospective buyer an earning of \$10240 for his investment of \$10, was procured by this newspaper.

That letter contained as signees the names of three prominent members of the Athletic Department of this University. It is our understanding that a good number of University administrators and faculty members signed the letter.

Dean Cansler's implicit threat of prosecution of the students who bought or will buy the letter is unfortunate. It is probable that students who did buy the letter did so because they recognized and respected the names of the administrators and members of the faculty who signed it.

Those administrators and faculty members were probably not intent on exploiting the students or on getting them into trouble. But having bought the letter and passed it on, the matter was no longer in their hands. Students who were "led astray" are now in trouble, facing the possibility of prosecution in student or federal courts.

The administrators and faculty members may be liable for federal prosecution, but are not liable for action in the student courts.

We strongly urge Mr. Cansler to declare amnesty for the students who have signed the letter and who, consequently, could face punishment for Honor Code violations. It would be a travesty if students, following the leadership of their elders, were punished for their actions.

It would also be fitting for Chancellor Sitterson, President Friday, and the Board of Trustees to formally censure their colleagues who signed the letter.

BSM Slash

Student Legislator Gene Yates, Treasurer of the defunct (?) Hayakawa Society, proposed last week a bill to cut \$4700 from the funds appropriated to the Black Student Movement (BSM). The bill comes to the floor of the legislature tonight.

Yates tells us he wants to cut the BSM budget to save money for the unappropriated Student Government balance, which he said was "in sad shape."

When Student Legislature appropriated money for the BSM two weeks ago, debate on the floor was extensive. Several legislators—including John Parker and Joe Beard—said money should not go to the BSM because it would not benefit the student body as a whole. They implied that giving money to the BSM would be encouraging institutionalized separatism.

More enlightened representatives—such as Richie Leonard and Charles Jeffress—argued that Student Government would be neglecting a major segment of the student body if it did not provide money for the BSM.

BSM spokesman Preston Dobbins appeared before legislature and delivered a dramatic speech. Mr. Dobbins explained much of the money would go toward tutorial programs to help youth in the black

community. "We don't want the money for ourselves," he said. "So don't credit us with selfish motives. We want to help our black brothers and sisters."

The speech provoked a discussion on the role of the University in the community. Should it take a part in or remain oblivious to conditions surrounding it?

The Legislature, in one of its most unscrupulous actions this year, finally decided the University could not ignore the ills of nearby society.

We agree with that decision. The BSM appropriation will probably do more good than any other item in next year's budget. It represents recognition by Student Government that black students on this campus have a legitimate organization and should not be denied funds. It also represents a commitment to help human beings help themselves.

The trouble with next year's budget is not the BSM appropriation. It is the creeping expense of the political bureaucracy on the second floor of the student union.

Cronyism

Harry Diffendal, conservative chairman of this year's Student Legislature Finance Committee, was defeated by a landslide in his bid for re-election from Ehringhaus last month. He couldn't even place in the top four candidates in his own dorm.

Mr. Diffendal, of course, is the individual most responsible for cutting next year's appropriations for the DTH, the Toronto Exchange, and almost every other worthwhile on-campus organization. He and his colleagues thought the money ought to go for more important things.

Like three phones in the Attorney General's office. And another secretary for Student Government's bureaucrats. And a raise in the Student Body President's discretionary fund.

We thought we had heard the last of Mr. Diffendal when the old Student Legislature left office last week.

Only we haven't. Student Body President Alan Albright appointed him to fill an off-campus legislative vacancy.

Of course Mr. Albright had to have the approval of the University Party's chairman and Executive Board, but that wasn't hard.

Mr. Diffendal is the University Party chairman.

But even with that advantage, Mr. Diffendal didn't want to take any chances of losing to somebody else. So he didn't announce that the vacancy existed. Not surprisingly, his was the only name submitted.

So Mr. Albright signed the appointment, and the legislature will probably re-initiate Mr. Diffendal tonight. If they do, he will probably return to his post as chairman of the Finance Committee, one of the most powerful positions in Student Government.

We hope Student Legislature will not accept Mr. Diffendal's credentials tonight. He had a fair chance to win a seat and was defeated. The voters rejected his candidacy and his political philosophy.

Mr. Albright should not have allowed Mr. Diffendal to get away with keeping the vacant seat a secret, and he should certainly not have appointed him.

But nobody should be too surprised. Mr. Diffendal was Mr. Albright's campaign manager.

From The Capitol: Political Football

By JIM MORTON

(Raleigh)—Higher education has traditionally been a political football, with each of the regional teams trying to put the ball in their own particular endzone. With the introduction of the regional university system, the game assumed new dimensions. Now it has been blown completely out of proportion by legislation allowing the regional universities to initiate doctoral programs.

North Carolina has become a state with thirteen colleges and two universities, as of May 1, 1969. One of the latest examples of the new universities is Pembroke State University. By becoming a regional university, Pembroke is granted the right to use the name "university" and to offer some type of master's degree. This school did not achieve its status by any sweeping changes in its academic standards but by an act of the legislature. Pembroke's becoming a regional, or more aptly a nominal, university had little significance other than to its own collegiate ego... until a bill to allow these regional universities to initiate doctoral studies came onto the scene.

The game was being played on a pretty trivial base as long as no one made a serious move to give the regional university the right to initiate its own doctoral programs. This was not to last, as the eastern team, quarterbacked by Representative Rountree of Greenville put HB 318 into play. This bill would allow the regional universities to offer PhD. programs with the consent of the board of higher education and subsequent appropriation from the legislature. Now the game began to be played in earnest, as the forces of regionalism squared off against the defenders of higher education.

Like any good ball-game, the cheerleaders and fans were in the wings offering support. The most important spectator and the spectator with the most at stake was ECU President Leo Jenkins, who has often been referred to as the one hundred and twenty-first member of the house. The legislators from the eastern part of the state must have felt something in common with Mayor Daley's boys in Chicago.

Though Mr. Jenkins was the most

important fan, any prizes for energetic support would have to go to Pembroke U. They ran from Pembroke to Raleigh—110 miles—to present a petition to the legislature calling for university status. On approaching the state house, they made a wrong turn and ended up at the Department of Archives and History where there was no one to receive their petition other than a few bewildered bureaucrats. This seems to say something very profound about FSU that perhaps is better left unsaid. The cheerleaders for higher education were a bit more subdued. The officials of the Greater University, and the members of the board of higher education were quietly trying to get the ball off the field.

Jim Johnson, the Concord Republican, made the first defensive play for higher education. He stated the real intent of the bill quite plainly—to allow EC the right to begin doctoral programs now instead of waiting the five years that they pledged two years ago. He also noted that the proposed safeguards of the bill were meaningless and that the recommendations of the board of higher education could be circumvented in the future as easily as they have been in the past. The gentleman closed with a paraphrase of something once said by William Jennings Bryan. "They have put education on the cross of regional and political expediency and will now place a crown of thorns on the brow of higher education."

The remainder of the opposition debate, and there was much more to come, was just as damning. They clearly showed how unprepared the majority of these schools were to even begin considering doctoral degrees and the enormous expense involved in preparing them for such programs. It was pointed out that this money could be much better spent in improving the undergraduate departments than in the useless duplication of the Greater University programs. Art Jones of Mecklinburg became so disenchanted with the farcical safeguards that he withdrew from the regional squad. In logic, debate, and reason the higher education team ran the regional squad off the field.

But logic and reason don't win

Workers' Dispute Still Unsettled

By SCOTT BRADLEY

This paper has been grossly negligent over the past several weeks in covering the "aftermath" of the food service workers' strike. This must be interpreted as tacit complicity with the University administration's conscious attempts to deny the workers a just settlement of their grievances.

The administration, in attitudes reminiscent of the strike days, is still employing the tactics aimed at delaying final settlement of the terms they agreed to over ten weeks ago. It is their hope that final contractual negotiations with outside catering firms will relieve them of responsibilities resulting from the strike.

Black Supervisors

Meanwhile, the racist and exploitive policies of the Food Services continue. Since the end of the strike, not one black person has been hired, either on a full or part-time basis; yet the number of white part-time student employees has more than doubled.

One of the main strike grievances was the lack of black supervisors. Dr. Claiborne Jones, assistant to the Chancellor and administration representative during negotiations, assured Mrs. Mary Smith of the Non-Academic Employees Union that black supervisors would be hired as soon as there were vacancies. Since then, all such vacancies have been filled by part-time, white students. Before the strike, there had never been student supervisors.

Administration Refuses Meetings

This meeting between Mrs. Smith and Dr. Jones occurred over a month ago. There has been no meeting since then between the workers or their representatives and the administration although the workers' attorneys have written three letters asking for one. Last Friday the workers themselves

political football games. Justifying their positions with the feeble excuse that the east pays taxes like every other part of the state, the regional squad asked why they couldn't have their own little doctoral programs. They passed the bill to the ten yard-line with fourteen votes to spare.

The game isn't over, and the regionals haven't gotten much more than a field goal in the first half. An amendment was added on the third reading of the bill to delay any action on doctoral programs until 1972. This turns the game into little better than a stalemate. Still it's only the first half—the senate still has to act.

The real pity of the whole farce is that higher education has become a political game with the colleges and universities of this state being hurt the most. East Carolina, a fine school and certainly a potential university, deserves a better fate than being used and abused by the local politicians. This whole idea of regional universities is absurd. No one in North Carolina is too far from a full university to benefit from its doctoral programs. PhD. studies are far too expensive to be thinly and randomly spread all over the state to satisfy regional egos. This "everybody has to have a university in their backyard" reasoning is as fallacious and impractical as spreading the state capitol all over North Carolina.

* * *

The line of the week award will have to go to Ted Harrison of WFMV-TV in Greensboro: "The sun shall never set on regional university soil."

Seeking Honest Relationships

By KEN RIPLEY

overcome them.

I talked to a girl on the phone a few days ago who identified herself only as 465-45-7869 (fictitious number at her request). She complained that although she knew she was part of an impersonal crowd, separated by walls, she didn't see any way to break them down.

"Okay, so I stereotype people," she said. "What do I do about it?"

Somehow it wasn't sufficient for her, or for any of us, to say, "Don't."

There is, however, no substitute for action. There must, if progress is to be made on any front, come a time when reasoning and preparation give way to constructive action.

The sad lot of the columnist, no matter how much he cares, no matter how many inches he writes on the subject or how cleverly he says what needs to be said, is that people must act as individuals. A columnist can exhort—he cannot execute action.

I have found three things to be necessary in our inter-relating with people below surface facades before we can hope to have meaningful relationships.

First, we must be able to accept and even "love" ourselves as individuals if we are to accept and love other people. This does not mean we puff ourselves up, nor that we aren't realistic about our faults and our weaknesses. But we must be not only aware of our limitations, we must be confident in and thankful for our strengths.

A friend of mine underwent an emotional breakdown a few months ago, basically arising from a sense of guilt. A person with a strong faith in God, nonetheless he wept. "What good is forgiveness," he asked rhetorically to the world, "when you can't forgive yourself?"

To be at peace with ourselves, we must have a sense of worth. We must be able to forgive ourselves when we blow it. A sense of personal adequacy is vitally important, if we are to be able to inter-relate and inter-act with other people.

Secondly, we must be honest with each other as well as with ourselves. We tend, and I count myself among the worst of sinners, to keep our observations and criticisms to ourselves when we are involved with others. While I am not saying abandon tact, I am saying that we must "tell our brother like it is."

Relationships must be honest and open. When we peek out from behind our shells, we make it possible for such barriers as jealousy, resentment, hurt, and pride to come between us as individuals. Only by bringing out our feelings and sharing them can we

The third area we must combat is our inability to trust people. It isn't "natural" to trust people within the normal workings of a society. Many times, peoples' actions—when we don't understand them—make us withdraw deeper into our shell.

"Games People Play" by Eric Berne is a wonderful book that shows how people "mess around" with relationships out of a basic fear of revealing themselves to others.

The best example I can think of is the way a couple will "play games" with each other, using rhetoric and back-biting each other out of insecurity and fear of the other person.

The only way I can see to break down the walls of distrust and the barriers of a relationship built on fear is to consciously make an effort to trustingly open ourselves up to people.

This way is dangerous to some degree. We can be hurt. Not everyone is honest, nor loving. But we can't ourselves be loving or trusting without accepting risk. First moves must be made.

I know it isn't easy to accept ourselves, to be honest with ourselves and with each other, and to trust other people. But I have seen no really meaningful or lasting relationship between anyone that does not include these elements. And I see no other way to realize these elements than by putting them in practice. This is hard, frustrating, open to failure time and time again.

But there is no other alternative except withdrawal, and there is no greater satisfaction than to be able to know—and love—each other.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods.

Offices are at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

Subscription rates: \$9 per year, \$5 per semester. We regret that we can accept only prepaid subscriptions.

Classified ads are \$1.00 per day prepaid. Display rate is \$1.25 per column inch.

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