

DAVID STACKS, Editor

MICHELE MECKE, Managing Editor
MICHAEL WADE, Associate Editor
GARY TERPENING, Associate Editor

MARTHA WAGGONER, News Editor
EDDIE MARKS, University Editor
CAROL HANNER, City Editor
KATHY CURRY, State and National Editor

REID TUVIM, Sports Editor
SUSAN LADD, Features Editor
LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor
ANDY JAMES, Photography Editor
DINITA JAMES, Weekender Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

87th year of editorial freedom

letters to the editor

'DTH' coverage clouded GPSF issue

To the editor:
With "CGC action could cancel effect of grad referendum," (*DTH*, Feb. 6) as my most recent (but by far not most complete) source of information on the issue, I've learned that a referendum has just passed in the Campus Governing Council to counter the 15 percent referendum initiated by the Graduate and Professional Student Federation and approved on Feb. 5. I can only guess that someone really didn't want the 15 percent clause in the CGC constitution and managed to have the vote requiring a two-thirds majority scheduled before the CGC elections, leaving sufficient time for the CGC to make their countermove requiring only a simple majority.

Because graduate and professional students generally are more involved academically than undergrads, I think time is more at a premium for the former than for the latter. So, in short, I would prefer to see some funds, should they be needed, ready and waiting rather than having to spend additional time politicking and petitioning for them.

To the *Daily Tar Heel* editorial staff, I would like to say a sarcastic "thank you" for the Feb. 6 issue. Don't look now, but you just may have greased the wheels for the eradication of the 15 percent clause by failing, in the front page headline and article, to make one thing clear: The amount to be allotted annually to the GPSF is 15 percent of fees collected from graduate and professional students *alone* and not from the entire student body. This 15 percent is money that graduate and professional students otherwise would not benefit from.

The *DTH* through the neglect of its staff in presenting the issue at hand, has probably denied me and the rest of the graduate and professional student body any more returns from our fees. And because this money would be used for journals, conferences and guest speakers as well as an annual departmental/social gathering, we are thereby denied a higher academic/professional standard as well as a higher, healthier morale.

Carl E. Baribault
Department of physics



Dark blot

To the editor:
I was shocked upon reading "CGC action could cancel effect of grad referendum," (*DTH*, Feb. 6). At a university long noted as a bastion of political freedom, the Campus Governing Council has attempted an oligarchic grab for power by placing a referendum to rescind the newly adopted Graduate and Professional Student Federation funding amendment on Tuesday's campus election ballot. This ploy is a dark blot on the reputation of the CGC, which prides itself on representing the interests of the students.

The interests of the students in this matter have been clearly indicated—the

GPSF funding amendment passed by more than a two-thirds majority. However, the guaranteed GPSF funding represents a loss of the CGC's appropriation power by \$18,000. Consequently, the CGC representatives assumed the attitude that they, rather than the students, know what is best for the students and adopted the recall referendum because of alleged voting irregularities. Would the CGC have adopted a similar referendum if the GPSF funding amendment had failed by 65 votes?

To restore a sense of dignity to the CGC, Student Body President J.B. Kelly should veto the recall referendum. If no veto should occur, I urge UNC students to show the CGC representatives that we want the CGC run ethically and in the interests of the students, rather than in the interests of a few power-hungry individuals.

Robert Eugene Eplee Jr.
1429 Granville West

'Down Home' not nebulous

To the editor:

In Bob Royalty's review, "Singing redeems 'Home,'" (*DTH*, Feb. 1), he assesses *Down Home*, the musical-drama produced by Lee Greene, as a nebulous mixture of impressionistic flashes and historical narrative. Perhaps it is not the play that is nebulous, but Royalty's knowledge and understanding of black art and history.

In the African village scene, Royalty refers to the white-sheeted figures as "either ghosts or klansmen." It doesn't take a Harvard professor of history to figure out that they were ghosts, because the Ku Klux Klan didn't enter American history until 1866—after the Emancipation Proclamation, when slavery theoretically came to an end. He also states that "songs popped up out of nowhere." First, musicals cease to be musicals when there are no songs. Second, all the songs were related thematically to the sections in which they were sung. And to say that "Everybody

Rejoice" had no connection with the rest of the play gives me all the reason I need to charge Royalty with a warped understanding of *Down Home*.

Down Home is an outline of black history. The songs, dances and music blended rather nicely to present the desired theme, and I resent strongly Royalty's assessment of the play as "ridiculous treatment of a serious theme." Royalty chose to critique a subject about which he apparently knows little. If this problem should present itself again, perhaps he should put forth a little extra effort to ask someone who knows.

John Slade
212 Mangum

Saunders the logical choice

To the editor:

On Feb. 13, the UNC student body will vote to select a fellow student for an important position—student body president. Exactly how important this office is depends upon the person who fills it.

The president should present the opinions of all students strongly and fairly. He should know the problems facing UNC in the future and know how to work for solutions. More importantly, he must have the experience and expertise to work with the administration for our interests, making an effort to survey student opinion and discover problems when they arise. Should a president who cannot fulfill these criteria become elected, all students will suffer.

After carefully reviewing the candidates' platforms and capabilities, I see that one candidate rises above the others. That candidate is Bob Saunders. Before voting, please consider how important this office is to you. Weigh each candidate's ability to fill this office. Then, vote for Saunders—the only logical choice.

Eddy Camp
Governor
Morrison Residence College

Gee whizzzzz, fellas!!!

To the editor:

I just want to thank those guys who were throwing snowballs at everybody who happened to walk by Wilson Library on Feb. 6. Gee whiz fellows, it was just like the good old days in elementary school. It sure was funny when all those people would go by, minding their own business, and all of a sudden...wham! Especially the ones who got hit upside the head. And when some people bothered to fight back, it was really neat the way you guys hit them from all sides.

The show was so entertaining I was hoping the campus police would come by and see for themselves what fun-loving and young—very young—at heart people you all are. And even though I called them three times, they never did show up. I guess they just don't know a good show when they hear about one.

Jack Gardner
3-B Kingswood Apartments

To the editor:
At about noon on Feb. 6 in front of

Wilson Library, a large group of "men" were trying to display their machismo by throwing snowballs.

There is nothing wrong with a snowball fight if the opposing parties agree on and participate in the fight. But if the people indeed started the fight in this manner, it degenerated into a bombardment of uninvolved pedestrians.

A man in his 50s walking in front of me was smashed in the side of the head by a snowball. What did the assailant then do? Did he apologize? No, but his raucous laughter was only temporarily muffled as his brain fell out of his head through his mouth.

People may argue that this kind of conduct is expected from some people. Most children I know have more sense than to carry on like these barbarians. They know that their targets would not retaliate.

I hope this letter is printed, but those who need to read it most likely cannot read.

Eric Beck
Village Green

'DTH' editor should keep open mind

By KEN ROBERTS

At one of the more than half-dozen forums I attended, someone asked the candidates for student body president, "What do you see as your chief limitation and how do you hope to compensate for it?"

It's an important question, and what became evident was that none of us really wanted to step down off the soapbox for a moment and admit to shortcomings. That's too bad. We're learning too early how to play politics the way our parents and our parents' parents learned to play them.

Even though the question wasn't addressed to me, I chose to answer it. My answer was that since I had been writing at the *Chapel Hill Newspaper* the last 18 months, my direct dealings with *The Daily Tar Heel* had suffered. I went on to say that the experience I gained with the town newspaper writing sports and news as well as doing deskwork more than compensated for this problem.

There's something else I would like to add to that: Being aware of the problems afflicting the *DTH* is one thing; to allow these problems to serve as upper limits on progress is another. To allow the problems to serve as limits is to transform the effect into the cause—what once was the problem now perpetuates the problem.

If you elect me Wednesday, you'll find you have an editor with a mind open to all possible avenues of solution. I won't be prejudiced by previous editors' answers which can cloud the path like a dense fog.

This year is an important year. In a standing lawsuit against the University, the *DTH* stands to lose its student activity fee support if the verdict goes against



Ken Roberts

UNC. The *DTH* will be working with a very different board of directors—all but one member will be leaving this school year. The *DTH*, like newspapers across the nation, must deal with production-cost increases which far overshadow revenue increases gained through increased advertising rates.

Whether there are solutions is difficult to say. I would like to think there are. But for sure, there are avenues which have yet to be explored.

Truth of the matter is, I'm not going to become editor because I want to. I'm going to become editor only if you want me to. I've been told by both the current *DTH* editor and by the current student body president that "the campaign organization" is what wins or loses an election.

The choice is yours. Make an intelligent choice. You've seen the small newspaper I've used for campaign literature. Understand that I can provide creative leadership, understand that I'm aware of the problems plaguing newspapers everywhere and understand that I am the candidate the *DTH* needs.

Now go vote, wouldja?
Ken Roberts, a senior history and journalism major from Charlotte, is a candidate for editor of *The Daily Tar Heel* in student body elections Wednesday.

Newspaper a reflection of the editor

By GEORGE SHADROU

I will not fill this space with my campaign platform or a detailed account of my experience at *The Daily Tar Heel* and the *Salisbury Evening Post*. All of this information has been reported in the *DTH* and my campaign literature or has been discussed at dorms, fraternities and sororities I've visited and at various forums. Instead, I would like to discuss from a philosophical and idealistic viewpoint what I believe the *DTH*'s and, in particular, the editor's role on this campus should be. Such a discussion is worthwhile, because the *DTH*'s future will reflect the goals and philosophy of the editor.

The *DTH* editor must first be capable of performing his essential tasks: keeping the newspaper running smoothly, facilitating staff relationships and deciding the news and editorial content of the paper. Yet an editor who merely goes through the motions of putting out a newspaper will eventually find his job, his staff and the paper becoming stale and meaningless.

As an associate editor, assistant managing editor and a staff writer at the *DTH*, I have learned to deal with the daily problems inherent in the newspaper business—fast approaching deadlines, bruised egos and numerous other minor crises. Being able to meet these situations calmly and confidently is essential to being an effective editor, particularly because once the kinks and mechanics of putting out a newspaper are ironed out, the editor and the staff can focus on a more idealistic and satisfying goal—providing a newspaper that matters to the students, the administration and the state. William Faulkner once cited the



George Shadrou

DTH editorial page as the voice of intelligent and sensitive racial attitudes. Then, and now, the *DTH* could make a difference.

A newspaper that fails to meet its primary task—that of reporting fairly, objectively and accurately newsworthy events—loses the respect of the students and the entire University community and the opportunity to serve successfully as a watchdog of student concerns and interests. The contrast between going through the motions and actually being an effective editor may seem a fine distinction to many students, but within the *DTH* office, the difference is tangible—and it eventually will be reflected in the quality of the newspaper.

The *DTH* is destined to become what Mark Twain would call a dog with no teeth if the editor does not demand excellence from his staff, command respect from the entire University community and, in turn, respect the *DTH*'s role on the UNC campus. It is a role of serving University needs, reflecting student concerns and actions and stimulating intelligent discussion of issues and ideas.

George Shadrou, a senior history and journalism major from Salisbury, is a candidate for editor of *The Daily Tar Heel* in student body elections Wednesday.

For editor, Shadroui

It takes hundreds of man-hours to produce each issue of *The Daily Tar Heel*. Every article in the newspaper is the work of a writer, a desk editor, a copy editor, a layout editor, a typesetter, a proofreader, a paste-up artist, a composition editor and a pressman. The efforts of more than 150 students and professionals from five separate staffs—business, advertising, editorial, composition and printing—come together to bring you a newspaper five days a week.

Accordingly, the editor chosen by the students to marshal these efforts must be competent in each aspect of the newspaper's operations. He must be able to instill the motivation, tap the talent and provide the direction necessary to make things go. But above all else, the editor must be a leader who is unafraid to find fault with the newspaper and work to correct its shortcomings.

Of the two candidates for editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*, we believe George Shadroui is better-prepared to recognize the problems the newspaper faces and provide the leadership needed to make the publication more responsive to the needs of students and the University community.

Shadroui has had extensive experience as a staff writer, assistant managing editor and associate editor for *The Daily Tar Heel*. He has reported news events, supervised the composition staff, overseen the mechanics of putting the paper together, analyzed issues and written editorials. He has been in close contact with the business and advertising staffs to acquire a working knowledge of the financial side of the newspaper. And as a reporter for the *Salisbury Evening Post* during the summer of 1979, Shadroui covered local politics, features, spot news and community activities. There is little to be done at a newspaper with which Shadroui is unfamiliar.

The other candidate for editor, Ken Roberts, also has a newspaper background. As a sports writer for *The Daily Tar Heel* and the *Chapel Hill Newspaper*, Roberts has seen how newsroom decisions are made and how personalities mesh to solidify the tone of a newspaper. At the *Chapel Hill Newspaper*, he has written and edited sports and news stories, and laid out pages. Through his work at the *Chapel Hill Newspaper* and *The Daily Tar Heel*, Roberts has demonstrated a solid commitment to the field of journalism.

It is true that Roberts seems capable of performing the most basic duties required of the editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*. But because of several significant differences in how he and Shadroui view the scope of problems the editor must deal with, we believe Shadroui is the better choice.

For example, Roberts says he would like to eliminate the headlines in the News In Brief column. By doing so, he says the paper can make space for two or three more national and international news stories each day without disturbing the campus-oriented nature of the newspaper. Shadroui, on the other hand, recognizes that *The Daily Tar Heel* continues to have difficulty adequately reporting activities on the campus. While Roberts looks to adjust the graphic style of the paper to make more space for national stories, Shadroui has pledged to expand the staff of reporters assigned to cover the University—something seemingly in accordance with the idea that the primary mission of *The Daily Tar Heel* is to seek out campus news aggressively and protect students' rights with firm editorial stands.

There are other instances of Shadroui's superior focus on how the newspaper should strive to serve the students: Roberts says that one of the first things he would do as editor would be to learn about the business and advertising operations of the newspaper. Shadroui, already well-versed in the paper's financial concerns, says he would take steps to monitor problem drop boxes with an eye toward changes that would improve the distribution system.

In short, George Shadroui is more than capable of guiding this newspaper during the course of the next year. He would bring to the editorship a rare combination of talents that few of his predecessors have had. He recognizes *The Daily Tar Heel*'s strengths and would strive to keep them. But he also recognizes the weaknesses of the paper and has his own ideas on how to make it more responsive to student needs. We believe he is the better choice for editor.

Alas, to court again

Student Body President J.B. Kelly has chosen correctly to veto a bill passed by the Campus Governing Council Tuesday night that calls for a constitutional referendum to overturn the results of Tuesday's Graduate and Professional Student Federation-sponsored referendum. The referendum Tuesday, which passed by more than a two-thirds majority, gives the federation control of 15 percent of the student activities fees paid by graduate and professional students at the University.

Kelly's choice is correct because the council has no authority under the Student Government Code to arbitrate election disputes. That power—recognized by Kelly but not by the council—clearly lies with the Elections Board, and several council members since have admitted they acted improperly Tuesday night.

Both Kelly and certain council members have suggested that the Tuesday night action points to what might be an unfortunate anti-graduate-student sentiment on the council. One council member said the decision to call for a counter-referendum was a hasty, panicky move. We agree, and we also lament the fact that politics were allowed to usurp reason Tuesday night. Many council members are adamantly opposed to guaranteeing the federation 15 percent of graduate students' fees; having consistently opposed the referendum in this space during the past several months, we can understand their feelings. But we cannot understand why responsible, elected student officials succumbed to panic and haste—a faltering step which bolsters the federation's contention that malice toward the graduate and professional student population does indeed exist on the council.

The Elections Board certified the referendum results Thursday afternoon; the complaints the board considered—defacement of campaign posters, political solicitation within 50 feet of a ballot box and misrepresentation of an election issue—did not, in the minds of 10 board members, materially affect the outcome of the voting. But the board's certification is not final; a public hearing will be held at 7 tonight in Suite C of the Carolina Union to contest the board's decision. In addition to reviewing the three complaints considered Thursday, the board will be faced with a variety of complaints filed after the certification charging irregularities.

Whatever the Election Board's finding after tonight's hearing, the dispute is destined to be settled in the Student Supreme Court—according to recognized constitutional procedures. It is perplexing, though, that for the second time in two years, a student body election will not be decided by the voters.