

# The Daily Tar Heel

90th year of editorial freedom

JOHN DRESCHER, Editor

ANN PETERS, Managing Editor

RACHEL PERRY, University Editor

LUCY HOOD, City Editor

JIM WRINN, State and National Editor

S.L. PRICE, Sports Editor

LAURA SEIFERT, News Editor

GELAREH ASAYESH, Contributions Editor

LINDA ROBERTSON, Associate Editor

ELAINE MCCLATCHEY, Projects Editor

TERESA CURRY, Features Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

JANE CALLOWAY, Weekend Editor

AL STEELE, Photography Editor

## Vote today

Today UNC students have the opportunity to vote on four referendums at the same time that they choose among candidates for student body president, *Daily Tar Heel* editor, Carolina Athletic Association president, Resident Hall Association president and Senior Class president.

### Student initiative

The first referendum on today's ballot would clarify the student body president's role in student initiative for requesting a referendum. This referendum should be approved.

This issue arose after Student Body President Mike Vandenberg decided not to turn petitions requesting a vote on a 1983 spring concert over to the Elections Board chairman. Vandenberg withheld the petitions because the Campus Governing Council already had approved a bill similar to the petition.

The constitution allows students to petition to hold a campus-wide referendum. If enough signatures — 10 percent of the student body — are collected, the constitution says the student body president shall pass the petitions to the Elections Board chairman. The directions to do this, however, are vague. This referendum would lessen the student body president's discretionary powers by speeding up the procedure time and giving the president more specific instructions. That change would leave no doubt as to what the president's function is involving student initiative.

### Religious, political funding

The third referendum listed on today's ballot would add to the Student Constitution a section prohibiting the Campus Governing Council from allocating student fees "to programs, services or events of a political or religious nature." If approved, this referendum could involve the Student Supreme Court in the budgeting of student funds; for that reason, the referendum should be defeated.

The Campus Governing Council currently prohibits itself from funding groups and services of a political or religious nature. For groups denied funds for either of those reasons, the referendum would add an appeal process separate from the council. Groups now can appeal fund cuts to the CGC Appeals Committee; under the proposed amendment, they would be able to appeal to the Student Supreme Court.

Despite adding another option to the appeals process, the amendment unwisely would involve the Student Supreme Court in the budgeting process of student organizations. One primary function of the CGC is to allocate student funds and it, and not the Supreme Court, should fulfill that purpose.

The amendment does not define "religious" or "political" and that would continue to be a problem. The CGC has had difficulty allocating student fees because it has been unable to define religious or political. The amendment simply would shift the burden of defining those terms from the CGC to the Supreme Court. It would be far better for the Supreme Court to recommend definitions of "religious" and "political" to the CGC and for the CGC to form definitions with which it can work. Vote against the referendum to constitutionally prohibit the funding of political or religious groups.

### Divestment

The last referendum on the ballot asks the UNC Board of Trustees to divest its holdings in firms operating in South Africa, and asks the board to start a task force to investigate the criteria the University uses to invest funds.

The divestment issue has swept across college campuses, in many ways filling the vacuum left by Vietnam War activities. The University of Massachusetts, University of Wisconsin, Ohio University and Michigan State are a few of the schools which have divested funds. States and cities also have divested, often to their economic advantage.

Racism is the institutional foundation of South African society. Rights are rationed on the basis of color. Integration is forbidden by the Parliament. The effects of such a system are predictable. Non-whites suffer great disadvantages in the areas of land ownership, education, employment and health care. Blacks are barred from voting or holding office.

United States investments in South Africa total more than \$6 billion, but U.S. corporations employ fewer than 1 percent of all working people, so many question how those prosperous businesses can be improving the standard of living for South African blacks. Instead, it is argued, U.S. corporate activity in South Africa fosters apartheid by stabilizing the government. There is no economic pressure on the government to change its discriminatory policies. By investing in those corporations, UNC is indirectly lending support to and profiting from institutionalized racism.

The referendum encourages the Board of Trustees to put its money elsewhere, to find alternatives to investment in South Africa. Students should voice their approval to this questionable practice.

The *DTH* on Monday endorsed an increase in the Student Activity Fee by \$1.25 per student per semester. The *DTH* also has endorsed Jon Reckford for student body president, Kerry DeRochi for *DTH* editor, Henry Miles for Residence Hall Association president and Padraic Baxter for Carolina Athletic Association president. Vote today at one of 19 poll sites across campus.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Divestment not a meaningless gesture

To the editor:

In South Africa blacks are denied even the right to vote but today UNC students will have the chance to vote in opposition to the continual aid of the racist South African regime. The University currently has \$2 million invested in corporations operating in South Africa. These investments represent tacit support for apartheid and the all-white parliament.

When acknowledging that South African society is racist, students naturally project their own conceptions of discrimination. True, there are parallels between South African and American societies, but by drawing parallels, we also risk creating an image of a fairly healthy society only partially disfigured by racial tensions.

In reality, racism in South Africa constitutes the very fabric and design of the society. South African law strictly forbids racial integration — not discrimination.

While black Africans make up 72 percent of the population, they are delegated only 13 percent of the land, in desolate, impoverished areas called "homelands." Pass laws severely restrict the movement of blacks, permitting their passage into "white areas" only to work. At least 8 million people have been arrested or prosecuted under the pass laws since 1961.

The average black wage is below the poverty Datum Line, an index defined as a bare-survival income. In 1975 the annual per capita income was \$2,500 for whites, and \$175 for blacks.

Blacks are barred from positions on the governing parliament. Moreover, they are denied the right to oppose the all-white authority. Bans on public meetings outlaw all gatherings "of a political nature" involving more than 10 people. It is also a criminal offense, punishable by a minimum of five years in prison and a maximum of death, for a black to publicly support divestment. Consequently, those who argue that U.S. corporations are wanted there are ignoring the helplessness of the population to oppose foreign corporate presence.

Those who also argue that U.S. corporations have a positive impact, facilitating social change, are distorting the actual role of these corporations in order to rationalize profit. The role of corporations has been to provide the capital and technology needed to maintain control of the black majority. Over the last 20 years the growth of foreign investments has been paralleled by the growth of the repressive apparatus of the apartheid state. Consequently, there have been more restrictions, more convictions, and more imprisonments without trial.

A revealing example of corporate compliance with the South African government is General Motors (one of the corporations UNC has invested in). GM secretly drew up contingency plans in 1977, stating that the company would cooperate with the South African government "in the event of civil unrest" and that "vehicles may be taken over for Civil Defense purposes." Management also stated that it was prepared to place some of the corporation's employees at the disposal of the military.

Through investments in corporations like GM, UNC aids and profits from institutionalized racism in South Africa. Many students are concerned with racist expressions in the classroom, inequitable hiring practices, and racial imbalances in student enrollment, not realizing that the University's realm of activity extends beyond the campus. The University is

responsible for its racist policies at home and abroad.

Unfortunately, most students entrust their authorities to make wise and ethical decisions, particularly in financial matters which seem too complex and removed. However, people must often be the conscience of an institution, because in pursuing financial gain, human concerns are often forgotten.

The issue is, above all, a moral one, but pragmatic arguments can also be put forth. Divestment has been carried out by more than 20 universities and colleges without incurring serious financial loss. In fact, according to the director of investments and trusts at Michigan State University (which divested \$7.5 million in December, 1978) alternative investments had earned MSU an additional \$1 million as of June, 1980.

States such as Nebraska, Wisconsin, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Michigan and cities such as Hartford, Madison, Berkeley, Washington, and New York have taken action against apartheid. They have been joined by the National Council of Churches and the United Methodist Board of Global Ministries (which removed over \$57 million from banking and corporate links).

Proponents of South African investments often discount divestment as a meaningless gesture. True, the financial impact from a single university may be small, but the total impact from unified divestiture will be immense. Furthermore, as a symbolic gesture, it expresses disapproval of institutionalized racism. Divestment, then, can only benefit UNC by redeeming an image now tainted with racial prejudice.

Ashley McKinney  
member of UNC-PIRG

### Non-whites benefit

To the editor:

Should UNC invest in corporations that operate in South Africa? Any person who believes in equality could not support the Nationalist government of South Africa and its system of apartheid. But to support the removal of investments, one must assume that American corporations in South Africa work to the detriment of the non-whites, and not to their benefit.

American corporations in South Africa certainly tacitly support apartheid and benefit from cheap non-white labor. But they also provide economic well-being for all of South Africa that indirectly benefits the non-whites, and without which their positions would be worsened.

The South African system has been compared to the American South. Here, we know that racism grows in recessions. Harsh economic realities have encouraged racism and allowed groups like the Ku Klux Klan to grow by manipulating white insecurities. The history of South Africa has also shown that when the whites have undergone economic hardship, it is the non-whites that suffer. It was the failure of agriculture to provide a living for whites and the displacement of white farmers that allowed apartheid to grow harsher in the early twentieth century and become the predominant political force by 1948.

I do not support the apartheid system in South Africa. My compassion for non-white people of South Africa makes me speak out. Pragmatically, American investments in South Africa help the non-whites. I cannot vote to have those investments removed, nor idly watch misguided idealism advocate the creation of harsh economic effects that will hurt the people it seeks to help.

Tom Mayes

## Fee hike needed

To the editor:

Among all the hoopla about the Campus Governing Council's decision to place a referendum allowing students to decide whether to increase the student activity fee, there are a few indisputable facts. The first is that the student activity fee has not been raised since 1977. While inflation has caused prices to jump well over 30 percent during this time, your student activity fee has remained the same. I'm sure that most students are happy that at least one school expense has not risen. But before we vote down the increase, we should consider this increase, which is less than 20 percent.

Most seniors can remember the glory days of 10-page *Daily Tar Heels*. But the 16 percent that the *DTH* receives from the activity fee could not keep pace with increasing costs in printing, wire services and everything else a newspaper needs to function.

As for the Union, we cannot provide speakers of the quality and quantity in 1983 as we could in 1977, or even 1980. Speaker fees have gone up tremendously since 1977. A few years ago, the Union instituted the idea of charging a dollar for recent-run films on Friday nights. One film this semester had to have a \$1.50 ticket price. While the fee increase would not ensure more speakers or more films, it should at least postpone the day when Union lectures and films can no longer be presented free of charge. I use these examples because they are two of the Union's most visible programs.

The choice today is clear: students can vote to keep the quality of cultural, educational and entertainment presentations at a high level, and even enhance their quality, or they can watch as these opportunities for enrichment shrink in quality and quantity.

Wayne Plummer  
President, Carolina Union

### Spud power

To the editor:

No doubt everyone is now aware that in the past academic year there has been an ongoing controversy centered on the use of high heat appliances in dormitories. However, the true victim in this titanic clash between the administration and the student body has thus far been overlooked. This victim is the humble potato.

The banning of deep fat fryers prevents the potato from fulfilling his ultimate function: to become a french fry. The elimination of the hot plate denies the existence of the mashed potato and its resurrected counterpart, the potato pancake. After all, doesn't the potato have the right to reach its own private destiny, free from the noise and hassles of the public kitchen?

In order to voice the desperate plea of the oppressed potato, the Spuds For A Free Society (SFFS) proudly announce their candidate for RHA President, Mr. Potatohead.

Mr. Potatohead, or "Tate" as his friends fondly call him, is a junior botany major from Idaho. His honesty and moral integrity stand beyond question. He has remained free from the party politics and brown-nosing that have plagued past administrations. He urges compromise and cooperation and thrives on a little manure and sunlight. He refuses to compromise his sense of true justice. While others may carry the impractical torch of radicalism, he believes in making the present system work, as his campaign slogan so forcefully proclaims: "Speak softly and carry a big spud!"

We urge all voters to carefully examine the real campaign issues. Ask not what your spud can do for you, but what you can do for your spud!!! Is it not the time to seek an end to this blatant discrimination against the potato? Mr. Potatohead will not be toyed with! Please join with the SFFS and write-in Mr. Potatohead, instead. If we do not fry together, we will most certainly fry separately!

The Spuds For A Free Society  
Cabot Dixon  
Edward C. Brackett  
David L. Moon

### Baxter for CAA

To the editor:

I would like to encourage all those interested in an improved student ticket distribution policy to vote for Padraic Baxter for CAA President.

During the past year, I have had the opportunity to conduct student meetings for the purpose of improving the ticket distribution policy for football and basketball games. Baxter has shown an excellent understanding of the present system, while at the same time offering innovative suggestions for improving it. While I have heard the ideas of many students, Baxter is unique in that he has combined his ideas with a willingness to become involved. Finally, Baxter has also shown an understanding of how important it is to work not only with students, but with the University's athletic administration as well.

Student ticket distribution is the most important extracurricular issue to many students on this campus. Anyone with a genuine concern in distribution policy should cast his or her ballot for Padraic Baxter for CAA President.

George DeLoache  
CAA Ticket Commission Chairman  
Ives for CAA

To the editor:

After reading the *Daily Tar Heel's* recommendation for CAA president ("For CAA, Baxter," *DTH*, Feb. 4), I must state my disappointment in the paper's discussion of the candidates' qualifications. The *DTH's* recommendation went to Padraic Baxter, a newcomer to the CAA, who makes a few flashy suggestions. However, when studied closely, Baxter's proposals prove to be less than adequate.

a single lovely action."

W. Leake Little  
Chapel Hill

### Reckford for SBP

To the editor:

As a former Executive Assistant to Student Body President Mike Vandenberg, I would like to express my views on the upcoming election for student body president.

The position of student body president is one of great responsibility. Along with his position as a full member of the Board of Trustees, the student body president must make day-to-day policy decisions that greatly affect students. The president must also have the ability to establish a cooperative working relationship with administrators — a relationship that is built on mutual respect.

Only one candidate, Jon Reckford, possesses all these traits. I worked closely with Reckford this past year in Student Government and was impressed with his ability to work with the other students involved in Student Government and with the administrators. Reckford is the only candidate that has the working knowledge of all facets of Student Government and the ability to give Student Government the direction that it requires to remain an

active organization working for the best interest of the UNC student.

When you vote today remember Reckford has the drive, motivation and the proven knowledge that makes the student body president a strong leader.

Donald Beeson

### Reckshun for SBP

To the editor:

After spending six years at this University as an undergraduate and a law student, I have had a chance to see numerous student body presidents come and go. Funny thing, I can't remember anything they have ever done. The only thing I know for sure is that they receive an all-zone parking sticker and are usually Chi Psi's. The campaign platform as enunciated by Hugh G. Reckshun ("Sharing Experience and Beer," *DTH*, Feb. 4) recognizes that student body presidents lack the power to accomplish anything of significance. In his articulate essay, Reckshun exposes the farcical nature of the other two candidates' platform.

Come on Jon Reckford and Kevin Monroe, are you kidding me? How many people expect to see a reserve room in the library for textbooks? Monroe states that he has not been limited to dealing with the cooking policy, the food service, or the tripling policy (minor issues?), but has served

on numerous committees, offering advice on "major" issues. If there are any major issues, the state or the University administration deals with them, not student government. After conducting an informal poll here at the law school, no one knew either what a National Affairs Committee is or what it does, and no one had ever called the Student Hotline or much less knew the number. If the Food Service/Health Affairs Committee does so much, then why haven't they been able to hold down our health fee or improve the food service? Very simply, it is out of their control. Invariably, committees such as these serve others only in the eyes of those on the committee.

Reckshun recognizes student government and president for what they are — a farce. His suggestions are the only ones that make any sense because they are realistic. Returning the executive branch's money to the scholarship fund or using them for bands and keg parties would be a more worthwhile use for these funds. Reckshun is a serious candidate. Vote for a person that's not afraid to admit that there is little he can do about popcorn poppers. Don't be duped by the promises of the other two. Hugh G. Reckshun for student body president.

Charles Meier  
Carrboro

## Is Student Government effective?

To the editor:

This year's slate of student body presidential candidates presents the student body with the most interesting choice it has had in the past decade. There is no room for apathy in this election. We have three diligent hopefuls and two distinct approaches to the office. In one corner we have Jon Reckford and Kevin Monroe fighting for the dignity of the top executive position. In the other is Hugh (Lamb) Reckshun and his biting, if cynical, expose of what he feels to be Suite C's greatest farce: the executive branch. Let's take a closer look.

Reckford, most popular with those who know him least, has a good personality and a soda pop smile. He's getting a lot of support with his campaign. He should. He's a member of the Chi Psi fraternity and we all know that the machine still works for those who don't step on too many toes. Reckford has stressed his exhaustive list of positions held in Student Government as his point d'appui for being the next president. But a careful person, in listening to all the campaign rhetoric, may have missed Reckford's most important attribute: his accomplishments. That's understandable. He has none. A convenient conversation with anyone who has worked with Reckford on anything besides his campaign would reveal that he has no singular accomplishment of any significance. His

work has had no real ground or substance. A good friend once told me that a person without substance is like a car without a motor. It may look real good, but it just doesn't go too far under its own power. Although anyone can be groomed for office (we now have proof), not everyone has the substance to do a good job. Another executive assistant? Come on Reckford.

Monroe, also a Chi Psi, is a personable fellow. He's not just a token black candidate; Monroe has a real chance of winning. Moreover, he has substance. He hasn't held any glamorous positions in Suite C, but he has done good committee work and is respected by many for being a doer (not just a position filler). While he and Reckford echo many of the same concerns as well as promises, Monroe's type of experience amplifies the claim that his administration would be "in touch" with the greater student body. No one can predict the future, but it is clear that a Monroe administration has the potential of being more responsive to all students than would a Reckford presidency.

Like many, I have no specific knowledge of Reckshun's campus contributions, although one can be safe in assuming they are quite numerous and especially varied. This mystery is one highlight of this year's most refreshing candidate (in style if not in substance).

Another major plus for Reckshun has got to be his campaign manager: Randolph Hastings Walker, III (Randy for short). It cannot be denied that Walker has done more for the preservation of humor on the campus than Orville Redenbacher's done for the freshness of popcorn, many kudos to the red-strawed stranger from Richmond. No one can question the timeliness of the Reckshun campaign; his concerns about the effectiveness of the executive branch are well-founded and deserve our consideration. We must ask ourselves (to quote Reckshun), "Just what's going on here?" Reckshun has exhibited a great attitude about himself and the campaign, especially for being the "joke" candidate. He has captured a real need: the need to re-examine the executive branch's approach to student governance.

This is not a feeble attempt to be aloof. I am... and will remain so. It is perhaps a caustic reproach for serious candidates in this election. However, when the slippery issues such as race relations, cooking, student fees, etc. slide in and out of your mind to-night, be sure to think about the kind of executive branch you want and we need. The choice will be on today's ballot. In closing, some simple advice to the candidates from the notes of James Russell Lowell, "Every person feels instinctively that all the beautiful sentiments in the world weigh less than