

The Lance would like to extend its congratulations and appreciation to Dr. Joyner for the time, effort, and energy that he put into bringing about last weekends' folk festival. Its success was effectively demonstrated by the ever increasing hordes of students who attended the concerts, sing alongs, craft work shops, and craft exhibitions.

## Constitution Cause Of Elections Confusion

BY JEFF NEILL

The decision of the Senate yesterday not to seat Dave Smith in the position willingly vacated by Dave Gibbs further demonstrates the ineffectiveness and unwillingness of senators to serve their constituents.

An amendment was proposed nullifying Article III, section 2 (a) of the constitution requiring candidates for President and Vice-President of the Student Association to have held prior elected offices. In a referendum, the amendment was passed. And it passed by a wide margin showing over-whelming support for doing away with the qualification. The only reason the amendment did not go into effect was because of a procedural technicality whereby the F. E. C. felt the faculty should be allowed to deal with approving the amendment as a whole body.

David Smith, in the meantime, had an honest desire to run for the position of Vice-President of the Student Association, but lacked the qualifications and was barred from obtaining admittance to the race because of a procedural problem. After much debate he decided to seek appointment to an elected position thereby getting around the procedural red tape, elected position thereby getting around the procedural red tape.

The Senate, however, failed to act in consistency with the beliefs and desires already made known by the student body.

One Senator rationalized by saying that since Mr. Smith was a sophomore, he could run for another position thereby establishing qualifications for next year's election. But all he would be doing is establishing qualifications that will not be required next year by holding a position that he might not have an interest in, thereby being a disinterested, ineffective student government member . . . just like some people who hold office now that we know.

## Problems Developing With Tri Levels

BY JEFF NEILL

The tri-level dorm system has not been in effect for more than a month or two months. Yet it has already proven itself full of potential inequities. Already suites that have opted for one type of living structure have found that some other type of living arrangement has been designated for them.

One such situation that has arisen pertains to suite six Wilmington. There, five suite members plan to remain within the suite next year. All of these people opted for the loosely-structured living arrangement. From other parts of the dorm and campus, another six-seven women are planning to move into the suite. They too requested loosely-structured living arrangements.

However, even though twelve of a possible fourteen member suite opted and signed up for a loosely structured living arrangement, they were told they would have to settle for a semi-structured arrangement. The main reason? Two freshmen are slated for the empty beds in that suite and the administration feels they need those beds in a semi-structured arrangement.

According to Dean McNair, Director of Housing, this situation occurred because only five of the girls planned to return to the suite and since the other residents were labelled transients, they were not taken into account when determining what type of structure the suite would have.

We expect and take for granted the fact that no new system can be instituted free from flaws. Yet flaws such as this one described above should have been expected and procedures for correcting the situation es-

tablished. Instead there is no recourse for those people who live or are planning to live in suite six Wilmington next year. They must accept a decision that was not their making when they were told that they would be the ones deciding the type of hours they would have. Because of a need by the administration to have a suite labelled "semi-structured" twelve people who asked for loosely-structured living arrangements must settle for what they are given so as to accommodate two incoming students.

Since the situation for this year can not be corrected according to Dean McNair, steps need to be taken so similar inconvenience to suites will not occur next year.

It might be advisable for the Senate to take upon itself the responsibility of insuring this type of inconvenience as well as others are minimized in the future. The Senate should form a sub-committee to work with Dean McNair on determining the housing arrangements for year after next.

One correction that seems evident to us is the switching of the procedure of applying for the type of living structure and room sign-up. By reversing the procedure -- making room sign-up first, and type of living arrangement second -- the administration and the suite can have a fairly accurate idea of how many students are really planning to be in a suite, how many beds will be opened to incoming students and the type of living arrangement the suite as a whole desires for the next year. Perhaps in this manner twelve upper-classmen desiring one type of living structure will not be forced to accept another type of living arrangement for only two new students.

## Three Board Members Resign To Protest Faculty Inaction

The following is the letter of resignation submitted to the Elections Board by John Bryan, Hugh Helm, and Dave Bunn. A copy was made available to the Lance for publication.

To: The Elections Board

We are submitting our resignation to the Elections Board on the grounds that we feel we have reached a position that is impossible for us to resolve ethically. We feel we have been put in the position of deciding between preserving the present constitutional structure for structure's sake, or for representing the desires of the student body as expressed

in the recent referendum for constitutional revision.

The Elections Board had established a calendar which would recognize a petition for constitutional amendment which is pertinent to the present elections. This petition initiated a referendum with regard to due process which was then passed by 82% of the students voting. This referendum was carried to a called meeting of the Student Life Committee and was unanimously recommended to the President of the College.

The last step necessary to put this amendment into effect was faculty approval -- the Faculty Executive Committee

met and has refused to take action on the issue until the next scheduled faculty meeting.

Considering the circumstances we feel that the Faculty Executive Committee could have taken immediate action considering the importance of the issue to the student body and to the Elections Board schedule.

As the Elections Board must abide by the constitution and this necessitates our support in this instance, we feel we have no other ethical course but resignation.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Bryan  
David Bunn  
Hugh Helm

## Smith Relates Frustrations Of Seeking Student Office

To whom it may concern:

Due to the delay of action by the Faculty Executive Committee on the proposed amendment to the Constitution, I regret that I am not able to run for the office of vice-president of the Student Association. Every means to legitimize my candidacy has been exhausted.

After receiving the news that the amendment has been temporarily restrained by the FEC, a member of the men's residence court willingly resigned from his position and I was then appointed to that position by the Attorney General. This action was taken so that I would have held an elected office prior

to elections, thus fulfilling the present requirements as set forth in the constitution of the student association. However, this appointment was subject to approval by the student senate, which consists of the presidents and vice-presidents of the dorms, along with off-campus representatives. Your senate did not approve this appointment, why I do not know. So, as you can see every alternative failed to provide the desired results.

At this time I feel it is necessary for all of us to come to grips with reality and see what little power we as a student body have in the workings of student government. Your referendum

failed to take affect during this election, and that is not the way you wanted it. The petition you signed specifically stated that you wanted Article III, Section 2 (a) changed in order to include all members of the student body before this year's elections. What happened to this stipulation? Was it overlooked, or just forgotten? I wish I knew.

As a concerned student, let me offer you this in closing. Tomorrow when you vote, elect people who will represent and respect the needs and desires of the student body, and not those who will support the absurd bureaucracy now existing.

Respectfully,  
David Smith

## Tri-Level Dorm Policy Cause Of Complaints From Students

BY GLENDA BUCK

Recently Student Life Committee initiated and passed a program concerning the social environment in the suites aimed at alleviating peer pressure which forces suite members to live in an environment that conflicts with their self-interests. In theory, this means that the members of each suite will determine the "level" of their suite--structured, semi-structured, and loosely structured -- in such a way that no one suite member can force other suite members to change their life styles. In practice, however, the new program is causing tension and peer pressure within suites due to interpretations of this program by Student Affairs.

Suite One Concord is a good example. Because most current members of the suite are seniors and are not returning next year. Student Affairs designated it a semi-structured suite. Although women from other suites on campus who thought they would enjoy living together in a suite had already planned to move into that suite and had filed cards with Student Affairs requesting a loosely-structured suite, their request was ignored. So were the cards designating a choice of loosely-structured suite filed by two women returning to the suite next year. At present, there is

one vacant bed in that suite which will be filled by an incoming student next year who will be told that the members of suite one Concord signed up for a semi-structured suite. Thus, one member of the suite will force every member to change her life-style in a way she believes to be against her self-interest. The problem compounds next year when the incoming student realizes the position she has been put into

by the misrepresentation of the desires of the suite as presented by Student Affairs. Is this new program going to prevent the tension her presence will be causing in the suite and the peer-pressure she will feel from other suite members?

Perhaps Student Life Committee should re-examine the new program in practice and evaluate its effectiveness in achieving its original purposes.

### THE LANCE Staff

Editor	Jeff Neill
Associate Editor	Lani Baldwin
Associate Editor	Marshall Gravely
Business Manager	Hunter Watson
Copy Editor	Elaine Thomas
Advisor	Mr. Fowler Dugger

Staff writers: Ligon Perrow, Rod Brown, Dan Breidegam  
Susan Harris, Nancy Meator, Glenda Buck, Jackie Dove.

The Editorial staff's intent is to maintain professional standards within the guidelines put forth by the Code of Responsibility. Signed articles reflect the opinion of the author, whereas unsigned editorials and articles reflect the majority opinion of the staff. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the College. Letters to the editor and articles are welcomed though subject to space limitations.

Subscription rates \$2.50 per semester.  
Advertising rates \$ .90 per column inch.  
Semester contracts, \$ .80 per column inch.