

Med referendum would be cop-out

Those legislators in Raleigh have this knack of avoiding issues—either by discussing something else irrelevant to an issue or doing the old trick of "letting the people decide."

They let the people decide not to let other people buy mixed drinks for the state's profit. And now they are thinking about letting the people decide the fate of medical education in North Carolina—specifically whether or not to expand the East Carolina medical school.

A referendum presents several advantages to the state legislators. First, they won't have to take a stand against the largest state university in North Carolina nor will they have to take a stand against eastern North Carolina.

Second, the supporters of the referendum idea claim that a referendum will not thwart the

authority of the UNC Board of Governors—House Speaker Jim Ramsey said, "I don't think anyone can argue with a mandate of the people."

Third, Ramsey says, "the bill is so tightly drawn I don't think the issue can be confused."

The referendum seems to be Democratic leaders' plan for grasping some popularity out of the very sticky ECU med school issue.

However, we believe such a referendum would be a cop-out, would ignore the authority of the Board of Governors and would confuse and distort the issues of medical education.

The authority of the Board of Governors was granted by the legislature itself, specifically to take politics out of the financing and policy-making of state universities.

The board last year commissioned a study by medical experts to determine the best way to expand medical resources in all of North Carolina.

The board decided to follow the recommendations of the study, which suggested several faster, less expensive and more efficient methods of improving health care and increasing the number of doctors in all areas of the state.

The expertise of the people who made the study on medical education and the expertise of the educators on the Board of Governors cannot possibly be matched by the General Assembly. Nor can this medical and educational expertise be matched "by the people" in a referendum.

The legislature should scrap the referendum escape route from making sure enemies and allow the Board of Governors do what it was formed to do—govern this state's higher education.

The Daily Tar Heel

Susan Miller, Editor

Cathy Farrell, Managing Editor
Bill Welch, News Editor
David Eskridge, Associate Editor
Nancy Pate, Associate Editor
Kevin McCarthy, Features Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Ernie Pitt, Night Editor

Letters to the editor

Administration must support students

To the editor:

I recently came across an article in the Charlotte Observer entitled "Students Protest Coed Living Ban" and although I agree with the protest, I find the reasoning advanced by some of the students to be utterly ridiculous. To maintain an honest belief that no sexual activities occur in coed dormitories, a student would have to be deaf, dumb, blind, and go home every weekend.

For example, I am a resident of James dormitory and if it is any indication of other coed dormitories, according to Ms. Hallecks' statement ("It would seem incestuous to build sexual relationships on the hall in Winston dormitory"), it would

seem incest is running higher in North Carolina than most authorities estimate. But I would hope society has advanced from its 1940's and 50's view that sexual relations between consenting adults is something dirty, something to be hidden. I think UNC at Chapel Hill should be proud of its advanced policies regarding coed living, instead of refusing to admit they exist.

By showing their support of continuing coed living, UNC's administration will be showing that they believe college students are mature adults capable of learning about and handling mature relationships between the sexes. By reversing their present stand, UNC will demonstrate that it is willing to forget the Puritanisms of the past and move

Tim Sims

Start planning now for a recession

"There will be no recession!" boomed President Nixon to a cheering Congress, who would very much like to believe that bold pronouncement if for no other reason than their political lives. Constituencies don't look favorably on law makers who don't bring home the goods.

You already feel the squeeze—at the supermarket and the service station, and soon it may get more stifling. Look for small businesses to drop out of existence, your checks from home to look smaller, your friends to drop out of school for financial reasons.

Be that as it may, if we have a genuine economic recession in this country, some things are going to be in danger that shouldn't be, and, in light of this, there are some things that need pointing out.

1.) When money gets tight, people feel less charitably disposed. Many of you

support various causes and charities with your money as well as your time—organizations who do genuine, valuable work to help the lot of mankind.

To name a few, your church or synagogue, the United Fund, Heart Fund, Cancer Foundation, Easter and Christmas Seals, March of Dimes, orphanages, hospitals, etc. There are many. Please. Don't stop giving.

There are a lot of things we're going to have to do without, perhaps, in order to continue supporting these organizations, but let's let some of our unnecessary comforts and expenses be sacrificed rather than these.

Ranking humanitarian causes first is just a matter of priority with me, but there are many other valuable areas which need continued support as well—art and music foundations, schools, libraries, museums, etc.

2.) "Dog eat dog world" is not necessarily a cliché. It may get that way. If it does, and if you do, think about the high-sounding polemics of this generation about loving each other, living in peace, etc.

Don't be guilty of having your firm convictions about the brotherhood of man be controlled by your pocket book. We can do more for each other together than apart. Or, to quote a real peacemaker, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Human lives and values should not recess with the economy.

3.) Don't fall into the trap of blaming it all on the present administration or the American political system, in general. Read your newspapers. Every political system in the world right now, from monarchies to "people's republics," are suffering the beginnings of economic recession, with the possible exception of some of the oil-rich Arab states.

Ideology has little to do with the gluttonous appetites and greedy motives of homo sapiens. We don't need scapegoats right now, we need a little understanding and willingness to cooperate for the corporate benefit.

4.) To quote a mother somewhere, "Eat your broccoli, it is good for you." At the risk of sounding trite, look at what good may come out of a recession. Most of us have grown up getting pretty much what we wanted, not having to think too much about doing without.

Perhaps our grandfathers were right with their tales of how going through the depression made them appreciate values more. If they were, perhaps this generation will learn the practical application of some of the values it professes—and many it doesn't.

Values may be small comfort to an empty stomach, but there is never anything wrong with developing them in the hopes of better times when the prudence learned from difficult times may make the world a better place to live.

Finally, there are some things that can be done right now to help you and all of us before the squeeze gets too tight. Cutting out unnecessary expenses which indulge unnecessary habits or at least cutting down, having a little consideration for others in tough situations—like the lines at the gas pump, watching out for and reporting gougers who take advantage of the consumer, sharing and not hoarding, and, perhaps, developing a sense of humor.

There are many more. Make your own list, but make one. President Nixon may be bold, but he's probably wrong. Economic recession seems to be on the agenda of coming events, and the time to start planning and acting is now, not then.



Ford Runge

A self-appraisal on consumer rights

Throughout the year, I found that there were better ways to spend one's time than writing self-justifying columns in The Daily Tar Heel. For one thing, they took away from duties which if well done would need no justification. For another, they tend to be monumentally boring—to write and to read.

At the request of a number of people who felt certain issues needed clarifying, I am writing a series of articles appraising the student government, as well as my own contributions, over the last twelve months. I am grateful for the opportunity to do so.

Many may still find these issues boring. Students pay for student government, however, and have a right to hear what factors were involved in a

number of actions taken by their student representatives. The temptation I would like to avoid is taking the whole thing too seriously. Pitt Dickey made sense to me, at least as much as any of the other "straight" candidates.

I entered the race for this office last spring believing that student government was almost completely bankrupt. Its ranks were filled by people who had been unable or unwilling to make it work. The anti-war putsch had exhausted most students; the last thing to catch their interest was student government. A cynical and absurdist outlook, wrought of the frustration that seemed the result of any political involvement, dominated the scene. Pitt Dickey caught this sentiment, and nearly rode a wave of cynical

complacency to victory.

The options facing students were either to abolish the tradition of student self-government or to provide viable alternatives to a bankrupt form. The alternative the SCAU proposed was an activist consumer program. The election results indicated a begrudging willingness for this option. Since students inescapably worked, bought, ate and lived in Chapel Hill, it made sense that they should affect the quality and price of their economic environment. The SCAU was established as a student government-funded organization to meet this need.

The SCAU has been largely removed from my influence since election. To survive at all it needed autonomy and self-reliance. While my reputation is wrapped up in its successes and failures, the SCAU deserves an unbiased evaluation.

SCAU has been moderately successful in laying the groundwork for a strong student consumer voice in Chapel Hill. It has achieved this modest success primarily through information distribution—always the first step in any organization's rise to power. The *Southern Part of Heaven?*, *Franklin Street Gourmet*, and *Guide to Automobile Repair* pamphlets together

with the consumer complaint hotline conveyed this information.

The next step was to actually influence the prices and services of Chapel Hill merchants. The 10% plan introduced at the beginning of the first semester and repeated this term, was a step in this direction. Its qualified success suggests that it can be repeated and expanded.

Unfortunately, the SCAU never really succeeded in organizing around landlord-tenant problems in the way we had hoped it would. The problems in this area are enormous—a housing shortage, a transient student community, and monopolistic control of much rented housing by the likes of Roberts Associates. Nonetheless, the SCAU has worked closely with the Institute of Government to propose and pass significant landlord-tenant legislation in Raleigh.

It is unrealistic to expect a student organization to turn an economic tide in one year which has run against the student consumer for twenty-five. If students show continued interest in SCAU over the next few years, I think this tide may be turned. If complacency remains the rule, we shall continue to be exploited. The matter will soon be out of my hands.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel provides the opportunity for expression of opinions by readers through letters to the editor. This newspaper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Letters should be limited to 300 words and must include the name, address and phone number of the writer. Type letters on a 60-space line and address them to Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.

Generalization akin to mud-slinging

To the editor:

The attack made upon a few exceptionally mindless men who were spitefully charged with resenting the Women's Festival (in Tuesday's Letters Column) is a precious indictment of the very manner of thought that I feel has long been a club foot for the Women's Movement. In observance of that single attitude, I wish to make it clear that the worthy cause of Women's Rights is not at issue here. What is criticized below is the sore

toe that certain (far from all) proponents of the Movement so masochistically use to kick about at those who don't understand and oppose the Movement.

Lynn Wesson's letter unwittingly creates a nemesis (to be accordingly regarded in a position of high disgust) comprised of the male portion of the student body and neatly labeled "the typical Carolina Gentleman." I object to being thrown into such a smelly category of human being simply on the basis of sex. Certainly not all women enjoy being lumped with Jane Fonda or Gloria Steinem. This obvious pitfall of generalization is a major faction of almost every crusade's weaknesses, the Women's Crusade so painfully included.

The blatant attack on masculinity, that is also too often an element in the offensive weaponry of the Women's Movement, is a remarkable example of below the belt tactics. Such tactics cause an immediate defensive guard to be thrown up by many men and result mainly in mud slinging sprees that only serve to weaken the integrity of both sides—the initiator's most perceptively. To resort to such tactics is certainly akin to name-calling.

One might ask: Doesn't this all boil down to just another value judgment on the morals of the overbearingly sick sexist code that has long permeated the droppings of the sex war like so many brassiered and girdled maggots? Judging from the numerous panties that were left to decorate the mud of the Morrison courtyard after that infamous panty raid of the 31st, any inclination would surely lean towards an answer of "Yes."

D. Plotkin
1023 Morrison



Word is 'stupidity'

To the editor:

The word for Dean Boulton's decision concerning the future status of second floor Winston and his subsequent remarks in the *Charlotte Observer* interview is "stupidity," and the University administration that condones such blind policy-making must be characterized in the same way.

The Dean's actions raise some interesting questions:

• If the University is so sensitive to adverse publicity and criticism, why was the coed living experiment started in the first place? Certainly the fine people of this state were not more receptive to the idea of coed living in 1973 than in 1974.

• How could the Dean cite parental criticism or bad press when no one else has been aware of any such reaction, at least not until the Dean's subtle statements to the press?

• How can the Dean deny, after being

thus quoted in the *Observer* that, in his own quiet way, he is helping to create the adverse publicity that he says he would avoid?

• Has anyone bothered to tell the Dean that the very integrity of the University lies in its ability to pursue innovative programs regardless of hostility from press, parents, Helms, Coggins, or anyone else?

• How many more bombshells will on-campus residents endure before they realize that there is a basic rottenness in the special programs like second floor Winston but the rest of University housing as well; of all the inputs which go into the decision-making process, consideration for the students is the weakest.

Dean Boulton isn't a cause; he is a symptom.

We the undersigned support the residents of second floor Winston.

27 residents of Carr dormitory