

Editorials

What Is A Lounge?

Lounge: to pass time idly or indolently, a place for lounging esp. a large room.

This is the way in which Mr. Webster defines "lounge". We at UNC-C seem to have come up with a different definition - i.e. a large room with sofas that cannot be reclined upon, a carpet for looking at, wall space for plaques, and no place to play cards or listen to music or just make oneself at home. Did you ever go into the formal living room of a large mansion? Strictly for looks, right? You must have felt a little uneasy, especially if you sat on a sofa while the hostess stared at you. This is the feeling that UNC-C students get when they go into the lounge in the University Union.

Our lounge is nice; it has all the comforts of a middle class American home in the suburbs. But that's not what we want. We want a place to make ourselves at home, a place that we can furnish with objects that are meaningful in our lives. That's exactly what we don't have right now.

Many people walk through our lounge as they go back to the Parquet Room, and they look at the checkered sofas and comfortable chairs and cool green rug and say "Isn't it nice the way that the students keep this area in good order. You don't see a bunch of sloppy kids hanging around or playing rock music or cards or chess or arguing about that nasty 'existentialism' stuff." The people who come in from the community are favorably impressed - but by something that isn't really us. Students from other colleges are not so easily fooled. They ask, "Where do you cats go to really relax?" And we have to confess, "Home." It's fine to use the lounge area as a showcase area, but let's at least be honest. Let's show what we really are, not what someone wants people to think we are.

Students are not allowed to play cards in the lounge, because they "make such a mess on the rugs and things." It's their damn rug. Somebody has to be in charge of keeping it as clean as possible, but when this drive for cleanliness eliminates the actual function of the area, then someone has knocked our system of values off balance.

Students are not allowed to play loud music in the lounge, because it disturbs people in the lobby and in the cafeteria. Why not move our stereo to the back of the lounge, or even into a room in the back of the Union that could be kept open at all time? Sure, the music should be turned down, if it begins to annoy other students, but let's let the students themselves judge when they are and when they are not being disturbed. A person working behind the Union desk has no special insight into when the music gets too loud, so why should he hold the responsibility of having the stereo turned down? Maybe a listening room is high on our list of needs. If so, then let's get one.

While we're talking about music, where did those tapes that are piped through the Union come from? Let's hope that they were donated; we'd hate to find out that our money was spent for them. Most of the music is well-suited for middle-aged lotharios or overgrown prufrocks, but it is not the music of the generation that is now in college here. We are an active generation. We depend on the active pleasure of soul, the involvement of current rock, the humanism of folk, the excitement of theme-music, or the restful contemplation of pop or bossa nova for our musical enjoyment. This music is almost contraband in our Union; one has to sneak to put it on the intercom. This should not be.

It is our suggestion that the President-elect and the Union Chairman appoint a committee to investigate the immediate alteration of the STUDENT lounge to fulfill the STUDENT needs. What's wrong with posters on the walls or sculpture that is relevant? To run the risk of invalidating our argument by employing a much misused quote, "We can't relate to the lounge as it stands at present." Even the magazines that are placed there are not meeting the demands of students.

This area is one that could certainly stand active reevaluation, and we challenge Mr. Stewart as a president who is "a dreamer" and who sees this year as "a time of progress and, hopefully, of change" to start showing us all why we should have elected him. This area of exploration is one that is certainly dear to the hearts of the students. Will we have action?

Why Are Campus Politics the Way They Are at UNC-C?

We have two or three hundred more students at UNC-C this year than we had last year; yet, the vote in the SGA elections was almost cut in half from last year's turnout. Less than four hundred votes were cast for the chief executive office this year. The vote last year was about seven hundred and fifty. Percentage-wise the vote dropped from about thirty-five per cent to less than twenty. We used to be proud of our large turnouts in comparison to the other branches of the University. We can forget that now. Maybe this is one of the symptoms of a particular brand of "bigitis" that seems to be catching on here.

In order to avoid a repetition of this unfortunate lack of voter response, we need to pinpoint the causes and guard against them next time. During the daytime, there was only one poll for voting. It was downstairs in the University Union, and how many students are enrolled here who might not have even been in the Union while the poll was open? Well over a thousand. There was a poll in "C" building for night students, but not all night classes are in "C" building.

The election was a short one, scheduled to coincide with mid-semester examinations. The attitude prevailing was "let's get it over with." Even some of the candidates were anxious to see a de-emphahization of the election - that way none of them really had to face any of the issues. This was a good move, politically. That is, it was a good move if winning is the only important thing in politics. We tend to feel that a good, healthy competition in which the issues are aired and the voters are allowed to see what they're getting is also very important. With Mr. Stewart exclaiming that he had "a bunch of ideas" and Mr. Killian screaming "Down with the ruling clic(k)!" we surely didn't have a healthy competition. The lack of a real two party system hurt, also. There was not an election-wise individual on campus who would have bet against Mr. Stewart any time after the nominations were closed. Sure, UNC-C does have a ruling "Clic" And the officers from this

(Continued on page 7)

What About That Viet Nam War?

By Barbara Jean Smith

Last week, THE JOURNAL conducted a survey on campus because of the prevailing interest in serving in Vietnam in the military. THE JOURNAL asked two questions of the males interviewed--"What is your opinion of serving in the military in Vietnam?", and "Why": No one asked, was hesitant in voicing their opinion, nor were they hesitant in having their name printed. The seventeen answers are as follows:

Denny Andrews--"We're there, whether right or wrong, I feel it's my duty as an American to go. I have just as much responsibility to go as anyone else. I'm not a consciencious objector so I should go and do my part. I should support my country."

Phil Wilson--"I wouldn't want to, but if I had to I would. But it would have to be a matter of having to go."

Darrell Reichert--"I would not serve over there. It doesn't strike me as serving for my freedom. It doesn't seem to be endangering my freedom enough to serve. I would use failure to adjust to military life in order not to serve."

Doug Kietzman--"If they send me I'll go, but I can't find it right in my heart to serve because I don't think they're getting anywhere. If there was something being accomplished it would be different."

Skip Milton--"I'd go if I had to go. But if we keep having riots, I won't have to go--I'm in the National Guard!"

Bruce Harris--"I've been. I felt I was serving a purpose. I'd go again, for the money, and serving more of a military service."

Dunnie Keistler--"I'd go if I had to. I'm not wild about the idea but I feel I owe it to my county. I don't exactly agree with what's going on over there though."

Art Gentile--"I've never been there. But I'd go if I had to but only to avoid the consequences of not going. I don't support the war effort or anything else this country does unless I agree with it."

Jonathan Dudley--"I've already been in the service and I volunteered to go. S.A.C. Headquarters got me first though. I would have gone, but it's a ridiculous situation."

Steve Patterson--"Frankly I will serve in Vietnam because I feel it's my duty to protect the country. I don't necessarily agree with the war but it's my responsibility."

Jesse Connell--"I volunteered three times while I was in the

service because I feel it's my duty, besides, the money goes further and the women are more fun."

John Dabbs--"I'd serve but since we have the power and weapons to wipe out the North, I think we ought to do it, to keep the American deaths down."

Richard Dedmon--"I don't care to, because I don't want to be killed. I feel I should make a contribution in some way but I can't see getting killed when I can serve my country better alive."

Ed Wayson--"I don't want to go. First I don't want to get killed and second I don't see that it will stop the spread of Communism or any other form of Government that will hurt our prestige in the world. I feel we should help them but not militarily."

Dave Taylor--"I'd gladly go. If I get drafted, I'll volunteer for Vietnam. I feel we have a legal commitment and I will support it."

Bob Ellington--"I'm against it. I would try every way to avoid it legally. But I would probably serve as it stands now."

There were only five men asked, that both supported the effort and were willing to serve. Most said that they would serve if they had to (to avoid the consequences), and a few were vehemently against both the war and serving.

Quote

Of The Week

"The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might. And the republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order! Yes, without law and order our nation cannot survive... elect us and we shall restore law and order."

— Adolf Hitler
Hamburg, Germany, 1932

There will be a meeting of the staff of THE CAROLINA JOURNAL this Sunday at 4:00. Photographs for this year's ROGUES 'N RASCALS will be taken and plans for next year will be discussed.

THE CAROLINA JOURNAL

EDITOR R. T. Smith
Copy Editor Sherry Drake
Feature Editor F. N. Stewart
Sports Editor Mark Klaffer
Cartoonist Art Gentile
Photographers Church Howard
Art Gentile
Business Manager Wayne Eason
STAFF Walt Sherrill, John Lafferty,
Donna Raley, Barbara Jean Smith, Rod White, Mike Combs, Gayle Watts, Tim Britton, Eileen Auerbach, Anna Bullock, and W. I. T. (?)

THE CAROLINA JOURNAL is a student publication of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, published weekly at Mullen Publications, Inc. in Charlotte and under the sponsorship of the UNC-C Student Publications Board. THE JOURNAL welcomes contributions from students, faculty, administrators, and members of the Charlotte community.