

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Tom Gooding, Editor

University Must Offer Increased Financial Aid

Chancellor Sitterson has announced that the University will "make every possible effort to see that no student is denied an education because of financial need."

We commend Chancellor Sitterson for taking this stand and hope these words will be translated into action.

UNC is a state-supported institution and should be open to all residents of the state regardless of their financial status. It's easy to claim non-discriminatory admissions policies and then exclude people because they cannot afford to attend the school.

Sitterson's statement came in response to an announcement that the amount of loan money available to students would be drastically cut.

According to Sitterson the budget has been rearranged to provide an additional \$20,000 for student financial aid, from Student Stores income in 1970-71.

We wonder if the \$20,000 from the Student Stores is coming out of their yearly allotment of \$45,000

to the Athletic Association.

If not, then we suggest that the Chancellor could obtain an additional \$45,000 a year to supplement student scholarship funds.

In addition to the increase of funds from the Student Stores profits, other budgetary changes announced by Sitterson were an increase in this year's Alumni Annual Giving goal and a study of the possibility of a fund drive to solicit funds from students, staff and faculty of the University.

We hope the Chancellor will carry through these programs in an effort to obtain additional funds for student financial aid.

The cost of an education is rising every year and is far outstripping the income increases in the lower income classes. Because of this it will be even more difficult for students from economically deprived families to attend UNC.

Therefore, we encourage all factions of the University community to assist the Chancellor in making more money available for financial aid.

Support CURL'S Recommendations

terry cheek

There is reason to believe the student body is in danger of being short-changed once again in its request for a realistic open house policy.

In the Fall of 1968, when students began collectively demanding the right to visit with one another, all the arguments for visitation were presented. Marches on Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson's house and thousands of names on petitions along with countless hours of behind-the-scenes hard work on the part of student leaders demonstrated the need for a real change in the quality of life for the students here.

What we gained from our efforts was a begrudged token from the administration. The unwilling concession of the administrators was to allow a complicated

and discouraging system of "open houses" to be instituted for the purpose of dating.

The Board of Trustees, the chancellors of the Consolidated University, the offices of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women and the Dean of Student Affairs apparently view the reaction between men and women on this campus solely and exclusively as a "dating" situation.

Although it is a cliché to refer to the "generation gap," this appears to be one situation wherein it would not be impertinent to point out to these people that the days of the "big dance" in the Tin Can are gone.

It is inconsistent and regrettable that one student is allowed to visit with another only on certain appointed days

and only at certain appointed hours of the day. Maybe SYSTEMS work that way, but PEOPLE don't.

We have not been asking for a system to promote the traditional dating situation, we have been asking for a rational and natural approach to normal inter-action between people. We don't feel that something as personal and important as this can be controlled by the Office of the Dean of Men.

Although we have in the past been forced to look upon open house as a privilege, we believe the concepts of visitation and open house to be a right. The student body has reluctantly found it necessary to abide by the open house "agreement" presently in operation. The research of Sitterson's Committee on University Residential Life

(CURL) has revealed predominant compliance with the forced agreement. Out of literally thousands of opportunities for violation, there have been only 14 reported and adjudicated cases of violations.

And it is clear that the present policy was forced upon us. We were given a policy and told "either accept it or have no open house." What could we do but accept it?

The members of CURL know better than anyone else what kind of policy students want and what kind of policy is most practical and practicable. Still, even the recommendations of the Chancellor's own advisory committee cannot assure the students of an acceptable open house policy.

CURL has acted wisely and in the best interests of the University community as a whole in making a thorough and factual analysis of open house, but we cannot and should not depend solely on their competency and integrity to establish what we all want and need. Again, as last year, we must be our own advocates.

As CURL chairman Dr. John Schnorrenberg said, CURL has finished its work on open house—it has done all it can.

Student Body President Tommy Bello is performing great service to the students in his active advocacy of the CURL recommendations. We should all help.

If you have something to say—say it. If you have access to someone in a decision-making position, let him know what you think. If nothing else, send a letter to the editor of the DTH.

Let's not get short-changed again.



Help Preserve A Good Earth

Today's Teach-In Gives Chance To Learn, Help

An Environmental Teach-In intended to "show students meaningful ways to contribute to the solution of the ecology problem" will be held on campus today and Wednesday.

The Teach-In, sponsored by the Chapel Hill ECOS group, is part of a two-day Earth Day being observed nationally.

The problems concerning the environment were clearly discussed and illustrated during the Carolina Symposium last month. Few people doubt that mankind is in for serious problems with his environment. Thus the scheduled events will be attempting not only to focus attention on environmental problems but also to show people how to help improve the situation.

Six workshops will be held; sensitivity projects will include a water pollution survey, the results of the ECOS poster contest, an ecology store, a demonstration of air pollution sampling techniques, and films and slides will be shown.

A "trash-in" will be held at Polk Place where students are encouraged to bring any litter they have and dump it.

We feel that the Teach-In is a very necessary step to make people more aware of the environmental

problems and how they can go about solving them.

Thus we hope that students will attend the planned events and that more people will begin doing something besides talking to help improve our environment.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.

Harry Bryan News Editor

Rick Gray Associate Ed.

Laura White Associate Ed.

Chris Cobbs Sports Editor

Mary Burch Arts Editor

Mike McGowan Photo Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.

Ken Smith Night Editor



Earth Day Rhetoric Useless

al thomas

Hundreds of bright-eyed students here and thousands across the country will undoubtedly participate in Wednesday's much-heralded "Earth Day" activities.

By piling beer cans into aluminum mountains, as they will do here, and roaring disapproving notes about the souring of the environment, many firmly believe something will be accomplished.

The sad and somewhat tragic truth is, however, it probably won't.

Rhetoric and mass demonstrations by college students don't even raise the bushy eyebrows of many of today's dedicated politicians.

When college students, for the most part, marched and sang and wrote letters during October's Vietnam War Moratorium, little was accomplished.

When college students, for the most part, participated in November's moratorium march in the nation's capital, the result was negative.

If these and other peace rallies during the last year have proven anything, it is that mass demonstrations by college students seldom enhance a cause and may end up alienating the average American voter.

Somehow, some of the leaders of the peace movement have recognized the political facts of American life and are calling for the peace movement to move off campus and into the business community and neighborhoods. Only there, they reason, can any advance really be made.

The work which will bring more lasting profits for the peace movement—and the ecological movement—is not particularly glorious. Informing the average voter on the need for peace or the need for an improved environment doesn't leave much room for anyone to perform or win the applause of a group of people who already think the way he does anyway.

As was dramatically proven in the 1968 Kennedy and McCarthy campaigns, doorbells need to be rung. Canvassing brings the public on a one-to-one basis with someone who has at least some of the answers. It also shows dedication because the canvasser is giving up his time without being able to expect instant applause.

The local news media, not just in Chapel Hill but in Wilson, Charlotte and Wendell, needs to be shown constantly what is happening to the environment in the state.

Local governments, from the boards of aldermen to the planning boards, need to be approached.

All of this and more is needed for

success in dealing with environmental problems in a society which is politically oriented. Even then, success won't necessarily come quickly.

It takes time to establish a group as a viable and lasting political force, one which politicians have to take seriously.

To be effective, the ecological movement will have to shift its concentration and try to grip the souls and voting hands of the public.

While the upcoming teach-ins and demonstrations for ecology may prove

more effective than those which exalted the dove, the chances are not very good.

Perhaps in a year or so those who earnestly desire an improved environment will recognize the lack of political punch a campus demonstration carries.

The only problem is that a year's delay caused by a preference for campus pomp instead of political gut-fighting could make a victory of sorts even more difficult to achieve—and that would make it about impossible.

Letters To The Editor

Planners' Forum Backs Female Lib's Demands

Dear Sir:

On March 9, 1970 a set of demands concerning the rights of women students on this campus was presented to Chancellor Sitterson by the members of the Female Liberation Group. On March 25, 1970 a letter of reply to these demands was transmitted to the group through Mr. John. This letter ignored the major part of the demands, including the most important ones, and carried an implication that his office would rather not be further disturbed by such requests. In fact, the April 6 meeting with the group's representatives was cancelled by Sitterson's office.

In light of these actions the Planners' Forum, the association of graduate students in City and Regional Planning voted at its meeting of April 13 to approve the following resolution:

1. Planners' Forum substantially supports the women's demands of March 9. We especially emphasize the importance of eliminating discriminatory admissions policies, hiring more women faculty and administrative personnel at salary levels equal to those of men, establishment of a University-sponsored daycare center and addition of a course in physical self-defense.

2. We respectfully request that the Chancellor give these demands more serious and thorough consideration than has been shown to date, in the spirit of cooperation which should characterize relations between students and administration.

In addition, we offer our cooperation

in efforts to find solutions to these problems as quickly as possible.

Yours,
Michael O'Brien

Ecology Study Group Feels Misinterpreted

Dear Editor,

Your editorial, about University pollution which appeared in the Friday, April 17 Tar Heel was (presumably) derived from a study by ECOS, part of which appeared in the same issue. You said "... ECOS has conducted a survey which finds the University guilty of being about the only pollutant (sic) in the Chapel Hill area." This is a gross overstatement of the findings of the ECOS study. You went on to describe "... disgusting black coal smoke ... which kills such things as green plants," and to say that if a child fell into the creek near

Venable "... there wouldn't be a bone left to bury." Your editorial implies that these are the findings of the ECOS study.

As the Board of Directors of ECOS, we are eager that the dangers of pollution be brought before the public eye. However, our firm belief is that this should be done in an honest and responsible manner. We do not feel that your editorial is a responsible use of the information which this ECOS group collected. We do not argue with your right to express your views on the editorial page; however, we do feel that your use of ECOS' name implies that we agree with those views. On the contrary, we feel that sensational and irresponsible reporting will create credibility blocks which will hinder our efforts.

Sincerely,
Kirsten Canoy
Ron Outen
Bob Smythe
Board of Directors
ECOS

gerry cohen

'Help Fight Bureaucracy'

Rick Gray's talk of problems with the Chapel Hill Telephone Company brings back fond memories of my own struggle with bureaucracy.

My pet theory is most bureaucrats are neither inherently evil nor stupid. Most decisions are made in order to minimize the number of decisions which must be made.

Bureaucrats, the UNC Administration included, have three answers to any question, either "It's never been done before," "It's always been done that way," or "Dean X has left for the weekend." Employing rational arguments will not work, because the prime motivation behind executive decision is to lessen potential work. If they don't see you, the problem has vanished.

The solution, of course, is to bother them until they give in just to get rid of you.

If you are bothered by some minor rule, you must realize that changing one word in one rule will probably require weeks and months of sub-committee meetings. Of course they will reject your notion.

If however, you make their not acting an unpleasant alternative, results may happen. If Dean Cansler's secretary says he is not in, wait outside the office. He is actually in, and is not going to leave through the window to avoid you.

Occasionally, strategy can back fire. Back in the winter of 1967, I applied for and received a Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Third Class Radio License.

Upon receiving the document in the mail, I noticed it said I had blue eyes and blue hair. Ah, said I, easy enough to change. I drove the 100 miles to Boston and presented myself at the FCC office, inaccurate license in hand.

I asked the desk officer to please change the license. He looked at my eyes and hair, and said, "Since you and the license are not the same, I need a notarized affidavit." I tried to persuade him if I was lying, an affidavit would not change the situation. He would not listen.

In April of 1968, I applied for a passport, and presented the clerk at District court with a \$10 bill. "We don't accept cash," she said.

After reminding her it was the U.S. Government which issued the bill, I

walked the ten blocks in the rain to get a money order.

I wrote letters to my congressman, and the unofficial policy of not accepting cash has now been officially written into the regulations of the Department of State.

I should have kept my mouth shut.

This, added to my many other problems with the government, persuaded me in August, 1968 while in Chicago, to mail in my license for cancellation, with a letter accusing the FCC with complicity in the Vietnam War, hoping to confuse them into issuing me a new license.

Several weeks later, I received a certified, air mail letter demanding my license, which I ignored.

Last August, I sent a notarized letter saying I was myself, an application form, photostat of my license, and \$2 to the FCC in Boston.

I then received an official letter informing me I was to immediately appear for a personal interview with the FCC Engineer-In Charge. I again ignored the letter, and am waiting for the U.S. Marshal.

They kept the \$2.00. I am at a loss for what to do.

I plan to join the growing movement overpaying all bills by exactly one cent ... Perhaps the system will crumble under as millions of computers across the land begin to explode.

Join me.

—Gerry Cohen

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publications Board, daily except Monday, examination periods, vacations, and summer periods. Offices are at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone Numbers: News, Sports-933-1011; Business, Circulation, Advertising-933-1163. Subscription rates: \$10 per year, \$5 per semester. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.