

GEORGE SHADROU, Editor

DINITA JAMES, Managing Editor
BRAD KUTBOW, Associate Editor
PAM KELLEY, Associate Editor

KAREN ROWLEY, News Editor
LINDA BROWN, University Editor
MARTHA WAGGONER, City Editor
MARK MURRELL, State and National Editor

BILL FIELDS, Sports Editor
JAMES ALEXANDER, Features Editor
TOM MOORE, Arts Editor
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor
ANN PETERS, Weekend Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

R-U-G-L-F spells...TV

The Campus Governing Council has not historically been in the business of buying refrigerators, stereos and meat slicers. But in 1976 a fund called RUGLF was set up "to provide a permanent mechanism for the expenditure of funds from the Residence Unit Grant and Loan for permanent improvements in residential units...."

Such improvements also include television sets and Dempsey Dumpsters. For example, in fall 1978 the Finance Committee, which has the power to approve RUGLF requests, OK'd funds for the Kappa Alpha Fraternity. It sought to buy four Gilliam sofas, two Gilliam chairs, one Gilliam wing-back chair and one Thomasville end table. The total amount requested came to a \$1,000 grant and a \$2,125 loan. The Finance Committee approved a \$500 loan and a \$500 grant. And, no doubt, the fraternity is more comfortable for its efforts.

The 1980 Finance Committee currently is investigating the origins of RUGLF, for members are questioning whether the CGC should be in the "enhancement" business. Apparently, in 1976 it was. Initially, \$15,000 was set aside for RUGLF, but since then it has dwindled to about \$4,000. The fact that the money came from the CGC enabled the items mentioned above to be bought at reduced prices through the University.

Dianne Hubbard, chairman of the Finance Committee, has said RUGLF is a questionable fund because the guidelines for its use are neither stringent nor consistent enough to provide adequate control. CGC member Wayne Rackoff calls the fund a "boondoggle."

Their concerns are more than justified. Before RUGLF, most dorms bought stereos, televisions and such with University enhancement funds that are paid by students living in a particular area. Industrious dorm members even collected money on halls to add to the enhancement money. But since 1976 students who have known about RUGLF—certainly many don't—have made good use of it. A few years back Stacy dorm wanted to buy a Zenith table-top 19-inch television set, and it received \$308.36 in RUGLF funds. CGC also owns numerous ice machines around campus.

We can't blame dorms, fraternities and sororities for using money that exists for their use. And, certainly, the Finance Committee tries to be judicious in its allocation of money. That doesn't make us (or them) any less skeptical about whether CGC should spend student fees on such special-interest items. Rackoff currently is researching the history of RUGLF in an effort to find out the governmental philosophy behind the "boondoggle."

In the meantime, the money will be available until Nov. 15, according to the RUGLF act. And the funds will continue to be available until they are depleted or until the Finance Committee decides to put it back into the general surplus fund. Hubbard says she is reluctant to take this action until Rackoff finishes his investigation because the money was specifically intended for such improvements by the 1976 CGC that made it available under law. So, if you need draperies, carpet, televisions, stereos, Dempsey Dumpsters or even a meat slicer, then take your chances if you like. You might even be doing the Finance Committee a favor by using the money and thus ridding them of a "boondoggle" they're not quite sure what to do about.

The Bottom Line

Lice-all party

Mouse House

Harry Otterson has a dream. Otterson, an exterminator in Gettysburg, Pa., has invented a disposable contraption called the Mouse House, which will make rodent extermination a cleaner operation. The trap, unlike conventional ones that decapitate or crush their victims, is a cardboard tube with adhesive lining. According to Otterson, peanut butter lures the rodent and the adhesive catches it, but simple paranoia is the potent killer.

"A field mouse can't stand to be in captivity; they'll die from stress," he told the Associated Press. "The advantage of this trap is that the captor doesn't have to look at the dead rat." Otterson added that he'd like to see his mousetrap used by more than the average American rodent-hater.

"My ambition is to have the Mouse House in the White House," he said.

Discount exhibitionist

When a woman suspected of stuffing a leather jacket under her skirt recently was stopped at the door of a discount store in Falls Church, Va., she decided to go one step past proving her innocence.

After denying that she had done any such thing, the unidentified woman, approximately age 40, proceeded to take off her dress and everything else except a bra, according to witnesses. She then dressed and left the store, while store clerks and customers stood with mouths agape.

"I told her it wasn't necessary that she go that far," store manager Tom Lamotta told the Associated Press. "She made a spectacle of herself."

Spectacle or otherwise, she was one suspect who will remain innocent until proven guilty—of stuffing her brassiere.

Students at the University of Tulsa had an unexpected three-day holiday last week after school officials scratched classes in order to battle an embarrassing invasion of head lice.

Students were issued anti-lice shampoo and body lotion while all classes and business operations at the university were canceled so campus buildings could be fumigated in hopes of eradicating the tiny parasites. It's not that the university has a long-standing grudge against insects, it's just that students and faculty had a hard time carrying on their business with little bugs sucking blood out of their heads.

"Everyone's a little embarrassed about it," Greg Frizzell, student body president, said, "but I think they're taking it in good spirits, especially with the unexpected holiday." One student organization threw an all-campus celebration last Thursday that was dubbed a "lice party. Some groups of students simply congregated in local bars, attempting, as one said, "to drown the lice out of their heads."

By last Thursday 200 cases of head lice had been found at the university and many more were expected. An unfortunate "rumor mill" suggesting thousands of students and faculty were plagued by the little critters also had started. "It got so that every speck of dandruff was thought to be a bug," Frizzell said.

School administrators claimed that unsanitary conditions were not the cause of the epidemic and that a solitary carrier could have caused the entire problem.

"We're not real happy that we've got lice here," said Jim Lamb, assistant director of university relations, "but we try to be honest about our warts when we have them."

Nevertheless, you can be sure that they'll bathe those warts a little more thoroughly, and regularly, in the future.

And that's the bottom line.

Home ec and no shop makes Pam a dumb blonde

By PAM KELLEY

My car refused to start the other day, and while attempting to describe my problem to a service station attendant, I found myself speaking in inanities:

"Sometimes it just clicks when I turn the key, and sometimes it goes rurr, rurr," I said.

The tone of condescension practically oozed out of my telephone receiver as the attendant slowly explained that my battery was dead. It got thicker after I asked him why it would be dead. "Probably because it's old," he answered. Oh.

I could tell he knew I was the kind of customer who would buy a new engine if a mechanic told me I needed one, and I really don't blame him for his attitude. When I have to deal with mechanical matters, matters that involve electricity, carpentry or drafting, I am transformed from a college-educated woman to a bumbling blonde who must describe a mechanical problem by saying, "Rurr, rurr."

As I have done with all my shortcomings, have found

an excuse for my mechanical ineptitude. I blame the nation's school system.

While that service station attendant was in junior high school experimenting with electrical wiring and building birdhouses—practical skills he has no doubt put into use in his adult life—I was relegated to practicing changing diapers on a plastic doll and making baked Alaska. Neither accomplishment has come in handy yet.

My male classmates had to take "shop" and never knew of what went on in home ec. They missed a lot. I made a beanbag in sewing class. That's still all I can make. It took the class all semester to finish them, but they were great beanbags. If I ever need one, I'm sure I can remember how to whip one up even today.

In a cooking class taught by a woman who went into fits of ecstasy every time she kneaded bread dough, I learned that meals should be planned so they have good color, for one thing. Serving spaghetti, strawberry pie and red soda pop, for instance, is out. Bad color.

Though I've got to admit that coming in contact with a sewing machine and a spatula might have done me some good, I have not yet figured out why my school

taught a third home economics course. I never knew what it was called. It was a combination of child care and poise tips with a few warnings about the evils of premarital sex thrown in for good measure. For most of the girls in my class, it was completely useless.

In that class I learned that a lady should hold her skirt to her legs as she climbed stairs so as not to leave herself open, so to speak, to roving male eyes. I learned a lady should never comb her hair while sitting at a table in a restaurant, and I was made aware that wearing heavy eye makeup made one look cheap.

Most of all, I learned what a girl should do if a boy got a bit too fresh with her, especially if he began breathing heavily. She should excuse herself and go get a drink of water.

I finally had a new car battery installed last week, and if it ever goes dead again, I may know how to fix it. The attendant told me how to jump a car. I asked him if he had ever made a beanbag. He hadn't. He didn't even know how.

Pam Kelley, a senior journalism major from Hamilton, Ohio, is associate editor for The Daily Tar Heel.

letters to the editor

'Tar Heel' editorials 'ludicrous,' debatable

To the editor:

I always enjoy reading DTH editorials. I usually get a good laugh. But recently I've been rolling in the aisles.

In "Immoral Morality," (DTH, Nov. 11), The Tar Heel criticized the Moral Majority for its narrow morality. Well, that wasn't so funny. But then the DTH turned around and flaunted its own style of "narrow morality" by trying to discredit the views of Moral Majority by citing the gospels of Harris and Gallup concerning ERA and abortion.

That was funny, but also a little disturbing. Even if the holy opinion polls are correct, what gives the majority mob the right to decide that unborn children should be sacrificed on the altar of expediency? Or, pardon my blasphemy, the right to decide what simplistic amendment (and they said Reagan was simple) should give that great rapist of individual rights, the federal government, the power to violate and exploit the previously undefiled territory of family law.

And then the DTH used a patented New Right technique, comparing your enemy with an evil villain of the past, and compared the New Right and its leaders to Joseph McCarthy and McCarthyism. Obviously, some DTH editors have graduated from the Jerry Falwell and Paul Weyrich school of propaganda techniques with honors.

But then there was the punch line in "...targeting the tube," (DTH, Nov. 11), which went "If most viewers found 'Dallas,' and 'Three's Company,' and 'Charlie Angels,' all that objectionable, they would not be on the air." Are the DTH editors so ignorant or moralistic as to believe that such "exploitative rot" is not objectionable to the majority of TV viewers! (With the possible exception of "Dallas," of course). Have they never heard of the theory of the "Least Objectionable Program," which says that if viewers are given a choice of three pieces of trash they'll choose the best trash? But trash, by any other name, is still trash, and if Moral Majority can improve the quality of television, though I doubt it, more power to them.

But the most hilarious piece was in "Looking backward," (DTH, Nov. 12).



In this editorial the Tar Heel blasphemes its own sacred gospel of Gallup which has stated that 64 percent of all blacks oppose affirmative action or any other kind of preferential treatment. And then they say that "affirmative action is a catch-phrase for the hundreds of programs...to help overcome 200 years of discrimination favoring white, Protestant, male Americans." Instead, let's have 200 years of discrimination against white, Protestant, male Americans, who weren't at all responsible for the sins of their fathers, in order to get things in "balance."

In essence, the DTH is showing itself to be an advocate of blatant sexism and racism when it states that uncontrollable factors such as sex or race should be taken into account by anyone for any reason.

But I'm not asking the DTH to start taking truly liberal stands and to stop writing these ludicrous editorials. I like

them. It gives me something to laugh at when David Poole's column doesn't appear.

Joey Holleman
330 Ehringhaus

Di and Phi to debate

To the editor:
During the past two weeks The Daily Tar Heel has been accused of unobjective news reporting, misquotations, trite and aggravating columns, and unethical journalistic behavior on the part of an "inexperienced and overzealous" reporter—and these were the accusations printed in the DTH. Other allegations voiced ranged from an incorrect lead headline to poor journalistic judgment to failure to report news important to the University.

These accusations are neither sporadic nor insubstantial. They reflect a basic

dissatisfaction on this campus with the staff, journalistic quality and editorial policies of the DTH. Many students and organizations feel that the DTH is currently inadequate to serve their needs and those of the University community. In the words of Chancellor Christopher Fordham III, "The DTH has not been real bad," but it could be better. Because of the general unhappiness over the performance of the DTH, the Di and Phi Societies have challenged the newspaper to a debate on whether the DTH adequately serves the needs of the students and the University community. It will be held at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday in 300 New West. This is an opportunity for students and organizations to address directly the question of DTH competence. As long as the campus does not publicly voice its dissatisfaction, no improvements will be forthcoming.

Tracy Sanders
Dialectic and Philanthropic

Carter: amid the debris, wondering why

By CHARLES HERNDON

WASHINGTON—Jimmy Carter was gone. He had come, given his concession to President-elect Ronald Reagan, and left. That was all.

So, as party-goers and dazed Carter supporters trickled out of the Sheraton-Washington's cavernous ballroom, the only job left was to try to figure out why there had been such a massive rejection of Jimmy Carter on Election Day 1980.

Reporters filed early stories in the makeshift press room and waited for an announcement—and explanation—from Jody Powell, the president's press secretary. Powell stood dejectedly watching a battery of television sets proclaim Reagan's runaway win.

Carter's pollster, Pat Caddell, ambled in and joined Powell at the podium, and the room became quiet. "I am not interested in reliving the entire campaign right now," Caddell began, pausing to chug a Heineken. "I'm interested in just drinking some more," he said.

For the next 45 minutes, Powell and Caddell tried to explain. Using data from polls taken from the middle of October to the Monday afternoon before Election Day, when the last, deciding poll was taken, they tried to understand. Caddell said that, like the rest of the country, he and the president had anticipated a close race with Reagan, not the 10-point margin victory and sweep of 45 states, which gave Reagan the landslide. Though Caddell's polls showed a slight decrease of support and momentum for the president after the Oct. 28 debate with Reagan, the White House strategists expected a rebound, which they got, and a last-week surge of support for the incumbent, which never came.

"The historical trend in the last week of the election is toward the incumbent party...we expected that," Caddell said. "But this election was very ahistorical. Close elections tend to stay close at the end," he said. This one didn't, Caddell said, stressing the similarity between the election and a primary election, where there is "a lot of movement" among voter preference before Election Day.

Caddell stressed that Carter and Reagan, according to his and everyone else's polls, had been in an even race throughout the fall, with the only radical changes coming in Reagan's post-debate surge and in the final two days before the election. Caddell's polls before the debate showed Carter with a statistically insignificant one-point lead over Reagan, at 41 to 40 percent, with Independent candidate John Anderson garnering 10 percent. But the day after the debate showed a 4-5 percent loss for Carter. That, Caddell said, was expected. Expected, too, was a leveling of support by the weekend. "Our full survey Saturday night found that

the situation had returned to virtually an even race. The impact of the debate tended to erode..." Caddell said. In fact, the attitude about the candidates expressed in Caddell's poll had returned to the pre-debate level. Carter's positive rating rose and Reagan's dropped among the poll respondents. "We were quite encouraged by this," Caddell said.

Then came Nov. 2. Powell interjected, "If you have a weak stomach, you'd better leave." "Yeah, it gets pretty gruesome," Caddell said. No one in the room laughed.

Following the president's nationwide address Sunday night on the Iran negotiations that had taken place over the weekend, Caddell took a poll, his second-to-last of the campaign. Sunday night's survey results were not



The band plays after Carter concedes...but few have anything to celebrate

good; from a one-point lead Carter had suddenly dropped to a five-point underdog. Something was happening.

Caddell's fears were confirmed on the last day of the 1980 campaign, when he took one final afternoon poll on Nov. 3. Carter's support had bottomed out—he had fallen an incredible 10 points behind Reagan, an insurmountable margin. "That's when the gates were up. We knew (Carter had lost)," Caddell said.

However, according to the same Sunday and Monday polls, the situation in Iran had not hurt the president; in fact, Carter's approval rating of the handling of the crisis had risen two percentage points, from 51 to 53 percent. A majority of the people surveyed did not approve of Iran's demands for the

release of the hostages, but this apparently did not affect Carter's standings, Caddell said.

"What we saw was an enormous expression of frustration," Caddell said. "We've seen what seems to be a protest vote."

Meanwhile, Carter was ending a last-minute 23-hour campaign blitz across the country, speaking in Seattle, Wash., Monday evening. Powell received the poll's bad news as the president was finishing up his last speech of the campaign, but waited until they were aboard Air Force One and flying to Plains to break the news to Carter that the race was over. "I can't say it was one of the finer moments in our relationship," Powell said, cracking a smile. Powell mixed himself a drink and told the president. "He just said he'd go to sleep for an hour or two," Powell said of Carter's reaction to the death knell of his presidency.

Of course, it was too late to do anything, Caddell said. "When you are 10 points behind and the polls have already opened in New Hampshire, there's not much you can do," he said. Powell piped in. "We thought about (doing something), but we rejected a coup. I think the final vote was five to four." He paused and sipped his beer. "I won't tell you what my vote was."

The two men also had a final word for John Anderson, who they still believe was a spoiler for Carter. "He served at parts of the campaign as a spoiler," Caddell said. "We still can't help feeling that the Anderson voters would have been our voters," he said. The margin of Reagan's victory was smaller than the vote totals Anderson accumulated in 13 states, including New York and North Carolina. But even had Carter collected all the Anderson voters, which would have been unlikely, he still could not have won.

The press conference ended. Powell and Caddell were visibly worn and tired. A reporter called one final question as Powell made his way toward a side door. "What about '84, Jody?" Powell looked back and smiled. "What about it?" he shot back, stepping out the door.

Caddell made his way out slowly, still nursing his beer. Around him clustered reporters with questions. Most just sat around the room and talked or phoned in stories or typed on portable typewriters. The night had ended early. It was only 11:30 p.m. Everyone knew Caddell couldn't give any definitive answers about the election—maybe that would come later. But he didn't know. On election night, no one knew why Jimmy Carter had lost so badly to Ronald Reagan. Carter had known he would lose even before the election. And still, no one knew why.

Charles Herndon, a junior journalism and English major from Baltimore, Md., covered the presidential election for The Daily Tar Heel.