

The Daily Tar Heel

94th year of editorial freedom

JIM ZOOK, Editor
 STUART TONKINSON, Associate Editor
 GRANT PARSONS, University Editor
 BRYAN GATES, News Editor
 KERSTIN COYLE, City Editor
 JILL GERBER, State and National Editor
 SCOTT FOWLER, Sports Editor
 DENISE SMITHERMAN, Features Editor
 ROBERT KEEFE, Business Editor
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor
 DAN CHARLSON, Photography Editor
 RANDY FARMER, Production Editor

Editorials

Reflections on infractions

No terrorism perpetrated by armed forces, no cases of widespread ballot-box stuffing were reported and Ted Koppel won't be interviewing David Brady and Bryan Hassel anytime soon, but this year's campus elections were stained by a series of ethically questionable campaign practices that threaten the credibility and respect student leaders require.

A student who seeks the honor and the responsibility of a campus leadership position must demonstrate his adherence to two codes of conduct. One is entrenched in the Student Constitution and in other organizations' constitutions as a set of negative rules, such as: Candidates can't spend more than so much on a campaign, resident assistants can't work for candidates and students are prohibited from defacing campaign posters.

The second code is simpler, shorter and far more important. It's an unwritten code, one that can be neglected without any fear of legal reprisals. Essentially, it calls on candidates and their supporters to act only on the side of clear, demonstrable conscientiousness. Infringement of this code made the recent campaign so distasteful.

The violations of this code are not the work of one person. Unlike past elections, the ubiquitous Frank Winstead apparently did not make trouble for campus politicians. Instead, it was the candidates who abused a democratic system designed to put the most qualified students in positions of power. The most significant abuses of the trust voters place in candidates were legally acceptable but ethically indefensible.

Student body president candidate David Brady was himself a victim of an ugly style of campaigning in November, before the election had even begun. Pink fliers were posted across campus alleging that Brady was a homosexual. Brady should have learned then the importance of honesty, fairness and decency in

conducting a campaign, but he has since placed himself in the company of whoever posted the fliers.

Brady knew that the elections laws were designed to keep all expenses for a candidate under a specified limit. He knew that the cost of the T-shirts, produced by his fraternity brothers without his consent, would have thrown his campaign over that limit. Legally, he appears not to have had any responsibility to keep his supporters from wearing the shirts.

But he had a very great moral responsibility to do what he thought, and when he told a campaign worker carrying some of the shirts, "I don't see those; that's your department," he failed to do what was right. Yes, he checked with Elections Board Chairman Bruce Lillie to make sure his actions were legal, but he should have checked within himself for an ethical judge as well.

Similarly, when Residence Hall Association President Tim Cobb allowed H.F. Watts to vote for himself in an endorsement for the RHA race, Watts should have declined. He may be considered canny for doing what he did, but any candidate for such a position needs to prove himself worthy of the students' faith.

Questions of morality must be left to each individual to determine. The candidates must decide if they are comfortable with their moral positions, and it is then left to the voters to determine whether they are comfortable with that decision. Official bodies, whether Student Supreme Courts or *The Daily Tar Heel* endorsement panels, cannot presume to make that determination for voters.

To win the trust of citizens, a democratic leader must be ever-conscious of the light in which his actions appear. He must also always listen to the inner light within him that provides the surest guidance.

Caveat to colleges

A cancer that has spread through our educational system appears to be entering remission. Its malignant existence began when academic standards were sacrificed in the name of athletic victory. The latest and now one of its most publicized victims, the University of Georgia, has been told by an Atlanta federal jury that such skewed priorities must be eradicated.

The \$2.57 million award the University must pay to Jan Kemp, a former Georgia professor of remedial studies, is the strongest example to date of the growing public intolerance for diploma factories in higher education. Kemp's outspoken criticism of preferential treatment for Georgia athletes brought about her dismissal, a move that made her so despondent it drove her to two suicide attempts.

While on the witness stand, attempts by University officials to downplay Kemp's contentions were absurd. These statements helped solidify Kemp's case,

one already backed up by hard evidence proving Georgia to be well below an already deplorable national rate for student-athlete graduations. From the fall of 1978 to the fall of 1981, the graduation rate for Division I athletes was 23 percent. Only 17 percent of all football players at the University of Georgia have earned a degree in the past 10 years; an abysmal 4 percent of Bulldog basketball players earned a degree in the same period.

The role of college academics in such an athletic setting needs a complete overhaul, even if (horror!) it means a team loses a game now and then. The present definition has a false vision, a vision that often emphasizes winning over morals and integrity. Very few ever make the big bucks of professional sports, and many such "student-athletes" are left unequipped to deal with society after their sports careers have fizzled.

The status of athletics needs to be returned to an extra-curricular activity.

Tar Heel Forum

They're clowning around with Ronald

Guy Lucas
 Staff Writer

Some things in life were just meant to be eternal, like the ocean, the stars, true love and Dean Smith. And I thought Ronald McDonald was one of those things. Since my youngest days, he'd been there, on TV, my milkshake lids and the walls of McDonald's restaurants. But no more. Ronald's gone Hollywood.

Well, not Ronald really, but McDonald's. They've hired a new actor to portray Ronald in their commercials. I have no idea why the old Ronald left. Maybe he was fired, maybe he wanted more money, maybe he just retired. Or maybe he refused to go to Hollywood, so he was canned.

Enter New Ronald. This guy was not born to be a clown. His voice is wrong. His build is wrong. His delivery is sooo wrong. He makes me sick.

When the old Ronald spoke, you knew he was a clown. It was what God meant him to play. He had that intangible quality of sounding funny without even saying a joke. When the new Ronald talks, you expect the cast of *Days of Our Lives* to come out. He just doesn't sound funny. His voice is too trained, you can feel it. This guy has been trying to break into acting for years. The old Ronald sounded like Joe Average, found on the street at the last minute and told, "Here, you're a clown."

Do you know what I saw the new Ronald do on TV the other day? He was playing the

piano, wearing a shiny clown suit (a kind of metallic version of the old suit) and singing some poppy, glitzy tune. The old Ronald never would have been caught dead doing this.

And the new Ronald can't laugh. You know those laughs that the old Ronald did at the end of every commercial, that high-pitched half-giggle-half-cackle, a real clown's laugh. The new guy doesn't laugh. Or if he does, he doesn't do it right, since I can't remember ever hearing it.

You know what this new Ronald sounds like? The kind of person who goes to different schools with safety tips for the kids, and he talks to them all like they're brain-dead. I always hated those people when I was a kid. They'd say stuff like, "Do you know what this is?" Duh nah.

The new Ronald doesn't walk like a clown either. He saunters. Clowns don't saunter; they, I don't know, clown-walk. You know. How's a clown supposed to be funny when he's sauntering?

This new guy doesn't even have the right color of hair. It's a darker red than the old Ronald's. How are kids supposed to relate to Ronald

McDonald now? It's painfully clear that this Ronald has not been a kid in a long time. He wouldn't know how to be one if you gave him a manual with instructions. It would come out looking like a grown-up acting like a kid, all very Hollywood and not at all believable. The old Ronald was a kid. You could feel it. The guy just never grew up on the inside, no matter how tall his outside got. This was a person you would enjoy being with because he could have a good time; he hadn't forgotten how. He could talk to children without making them sense that he thought somehow they weren't as good as he was.

I don't know if I'll go to McDonald's anymore. They've always been my favorite, partly because their commercials marched on, oblivious to the attacks from their competitors. They didn't make cheap alterations in the scripts, at least as far as Ronald is concerned (I admit I'm pretty tired of all this slapping and "hot hand warming" garbage). But they've gone and done it. They fixed what weren't broke, and I'm not pleased.

Why did they change him? And if they had to change him, why get this really sorry clown of a clown? Why not Clara Peller? She may not be eternal, but at least if she sang, it would be darned funny.

Guy Lucas is a junior journalism major from Greensboro.

Memories, traditions haunt dormitories

To the editor:

When I awake tomorrow morning I will go to my window and from there I will look out onto South Building, Gerrard Hall, Old West, Person Hall, the Davie Poplar (which saw the birth of our school and the birth of our nation) and the Old Well! The most unfeeling of all the hearts in all the people who have ever loved this place must stir at the sound of these words; at the feelings inspired by thoughts of these places.

Mine is the window from which my father and his father viewed the same beloved places that I can view today. Mine is the window from which anyone here in 1793 could look down upon the dear, dear ground which nurtured these places. Mine is a window in the oldest part of the oldest building of the oldest public university in our country. OLD EAST!

The name itself is synonymous with Continuity, Tradition and Constancy in our inconsistent world. It has seen our nation grow together, and has seen our nation divided. It stood through the War to End All Wars and then stood through a second.

Above that, it has seen our school grow to greatness. Carolina, Carolina! It has been home to Tar Heels born, bred and dead for nearly 200 years.

Now, who will be so bold as to knot-up the end of this 193-year timeline? Who dares to put his name beside those of William Richardson Davie, Alexander Jackson Davis, James Knox Polk, Thomas Wolfe and the many other great men who have shaped the history of this great building? Let them dare to be so bold as to break with Tradition, for if they do, their names shall be infamous. Instead, let them dare to stay the course and to break their base reasoning for alteration.

Do not deprive my children and the children of their children the opportunity to wake in the morning to the sights their ancestors so loved. Hark the sound of Tarheel voices past present and future. The conversion of Old East to an "office building" would cut not only to the quick, but to the soul of our university.

Charles M. Brown III
 Junior
 English

Clean out the trash

To the editor:

We are sick and tired of reading trash on the editorial page of the *DTH*. If we see one more letter about what a crappy job ARA is doing, we will scream. If there is anyone out there who hasn't gotten the point by now, at least let him enjoy his blissful ignorance. After a year of this nonsense, we fail to see why these people continue to pursue this redundant topic. The idea of letting students manage Lenoir Hall is preposterous. Professors barely have enough time to conduct lectures and remain accessible to students. They don't have time to oversee a food service as well. Sure, ARA is a mismanaged organization with more than its share of problems, but constant whining in the *DTH* doesn't help matters any. When ARA's contract comes up for renewal, we shall see how our fate will be decided.

As far as Old East is concerned, it is time we gave it to the dogs. Old East has served its purpose as a dorm for centuries and is not worth the cost of renovations. If certain members of the alumni are so concerned

about tradition, perhaps we should consider having them pay the \$2 million necessary for the renovations. It doesn't seem fair to burden residents of other dorms with yet another rent increase. Also, Charlie Madison (*DTH* Feb. 13) should not use the poor reputation of Student Affairs as a means to support the interests of only a few. When was the last time a class was held in Old East to make it an "academic tradition" anyway? You may rest assured that even if Old East is turned into office space, its reputation as the oldest state university building will remain.

It is high time for some fresh, somewhat intelligent, ideas on the *DTH* editorial page instead of the repetitious garbage that now covers it. It is time to stop breeding negative attitudes on this campus. UNC really isn't such a bad place.

Marshal Rohde
 Sophomore
 Computer Science

Ahmad Ali
 Junior
 Biology

Letters to the Editor

Elevators need a lift

To the editor:

I have recently been pondering a matter of great importance. This matter shall be referred to as "the elevator gap." President Reagan speaks of a "military gap" between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. (which is in their favor, of course) and David Letterman often demonstrates the "gap between the front teeth," but these are not the gaps of which I speak. No, the gap I refer to is much closer to all of us and it is evident most clearly to all students who use Greenlaw and Hamilton halls for classes.

The elevators in Hamilton should not be called elevators; rather they should be referred to as time machines. I say this because one can grow noticeably older while waiting for one. Another funny thing is that said elevators seem to be based on the fourth or fifth floor, which happens to be the two floors which contain most of the history professors' offices. My, what a funny coincidence.

The one thing in favor of the Hamilton Time Machines is that they do allow "mere" students to use them. The elevators of Greenlaw are reserved for use by the elite faculty. What's going on? After all, we are paying them to educate us, not the other way around. I wonder how handicapped students are able to use the Greenlaw "elite elevator;" do they have to call in advance and book times so as not to inconvenience the faculty members, who really can't quite climb stairs?

Well, here is the neat part of my letter. Not only do I complain, but I solve as well. First, base the Hamilton elevators on the first floor like all the other elevators in the universe. Second, fix the Greenlaw elevators so all can use them, especially those students who cannot use the stairs.

Edward Mark Gilgor
 Junior
 Political Science

New policy for letters

For anyone itching to publicly espouse your views in our "Letters to the Editor" box, we ask that you take note of the *DTH*'s requirements in our new policy that goes into effect today:

• A limit of two signatures per letter. Each person whose name appears should also include a phone number, year in school and major. We have chosen to run those last two facts with the letters because

it is more relevant than the writer's Chapel Hill address.

• No more than 250 words. This is a common policy among professional newspapers that will help us deal with space constraints. This limit does not hold true for columns. The distinction between letters and columns: letters are usually a reaction to a piece that previously ran in the *DTH* while columns address an issue in general.



Supreme Court decision restricts freedom of speech

The decision in the David Brady T-shirt case was a missed opportunity to strike a blow for freedom of expression on this campus. By dismissing the charges against Brady because of what amounted to a technicality, the Student Supreme Court failed to set an important precedent.

As the elections laws stand now they are an infringement on students' rights to self-expression. The wearing of T-shirts is a legitimate form of expression and therefore is protected by the First Amendment. A law requiring candidates to ask their supporters not to express their opinions, whether the supporters express themselves through T-shirts or skywriting, is wrong.

In *Cohen v. California*, an obscure case, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a man's right to wear a patch on his jacket that read "Fuck the draft" because to force him to remove the patch would interfere with the man's freedom of expression.

Bryan Gates
 News Editor

his mode of dress, but why should the law require even this limited sanction on his behavior?

Some will say that changing this law will bring political action committees to the campus. I agree with the placement of spending limits on candidates for campus offices but spending on a candidate's behalf is part of the political process. Students can't simply legislate away the unsavory facets of politics. If Brady did not pay for the T-shirts or actively encourage them, then he should be in the clear. He should not be required to take action to prevent people from wearing them.

PACs could be limited legitimately, but there is no way to keep them out of campus elections. How can the law keep an individual from spending his own money on a candidate if that is what he chooses to do? The law can keep the candidate from authorizing this, but if a student wants to spend his own money independently of any candidate to get someone elected,

there is no way to legitimately prevent him from doing so.

This controversy is part of a dangerous trend on this campus. It is in the same vein as the desire to remove negative campaign tactics from the campus, which cropped up during last year's elections. Freedom of expression comes with a price — frequently we have to hear things we don't like. I despise negative campaigning and the possibility of campus PACs as much as anybody, but if we are to live in a society that permits free speech then we have to put up with those who will use that right irresponsibly.

Are the democratic ideals and the concept of free speech and the free marketplace of ideas something we just learn about in political science classes or is it something we are willing to put into practice? And if we are not willing to practice them on this campus, will we be ready to use them when we enter the real world?

Laws must take into account the difference between the outside world and the campus and provide some adjustments, but what kind of education are we getting if we try to insulate ourselves from the reality of politics?

Bryan Gates is a junior journalism major from Wendell.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Ed Brackett, Tom Camp and Dewey Messer
 Layout: Siobhan O'Brien and Laura Zeigman

News: Jenny Albright, Lisa Allen, Andrea Beam, Rick Beasley, Lisa Brantley, Helene Cooper, Vicki Daughtry, Michelle Efrid, Jennifer Essen, Jeannie Farris, Jo Fleischer, Todd Gossett, Mike Gunzenhauser, Nancy Harrington, Kenneth Harris, Suzanne Jeffries, Denise Johnson, Teresa Kriegsman, Laura Lance, Scott Larsen, Alicia Lassiter, Mitra Loffi, Guy Lucas, Jean Lutes, Karen McManis, Anjetta McQueen, Laurie Martin, Smithson Mills, Yvette Denise Moultrie, Linda Montanari, Mary Mulvihill, Kathy Nanney, Felisa Neuringer, Beth Ownley, Rachel Orr, Gordon Rankin, Liz Saylor, Rob Sherman, Kelli Slaughter, Rachel Stiffler, Joy Thompson, Elisa Turner, Rhesa Versola, Laurie Willis, Bruce Wood and Katherine Wood. Matthew Fury, wire editor.

Sports: Tim Crothers, James Surowiecki and Bob Young, assistant sports editors. Mike Berardino, Greg Cook, Phyllis Fair, Phil Gitelman, Paris Goodnight, Louise Hines, Lorna Khalil, Mike MacKay, Tom Morris, Kathy Mulvey, Lee Roberts, Wendy Stringfellow and Buffie Velliquette.

Features: Mike Altieri, James Cameron, Eleni Chamis, Kelly Clark, Kara V. Donaldson, Marymolda Hall, Shirley Hunter, Randall Patterson, Jeanie Mammo, Tracy Hill, Sharon Sheridan and Martha Wallace.

Arts: James Burrell, Mark Davis, Mary Hamilton, Aniket Majumdar, Alexandra Mann, Alan Mason, Mark Mattox, Sally Pont, Garrett Weyr and Ian Williams.

Photography: Charlotte Cannon, Larry Childress, Jamie Cobb and Janet Jarman.

Copy Editors: Jennifer Cox, Carmen Graham, Roy Greene, Tracy Hill, Toni Shipman, Kelli Slaughter and Joy Thompson.

Artists: Adam Cohen, Bill Cokas and Trip Park.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, managing director; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Mary Pearce, advertising coordinator, Angela Boozie, student business manager; Angela Ostwald, accounts receivable clerk; Doug Robinson, student advertising manager; Alicia Brady, Keith Childers, Eve Davis, Staci Ferguson, Kellie McElhane, Melanie Parlier and Scott Whitaker, advertising representatives; Staci Ferguson, Kelly Johnson and Rob Patton, classified advertising clerks; David Leff, office manager and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager; Tucker Stevens, circulation assistant.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway and Rose Lee, production assistants.

Printing: Hinton Press Inc. of Mebane