

The Daily Tar Heel

77 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor
Bill Staton, Business Manager



Rebel Good, Managing Editor
J. D. Wilkinson, News Editor
Harvey Elliott, Features Editor
Art Chansky, Sports Editor
Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor
Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager

Rebel Good

UNC's Electoral Decay Evident

Student elections at Carolina are a big farce. An apathetic student majority, power-hungry politicians, and discriminatory election laws have combined to produce this situation.

Changing the election laws is now a necessity. It will not eliminate voter apathy or political effects, but will help reduce both.

Tuesday's campus-wide elections provide three good examples of the farce: the presidential, editorial, and legislative races. Each was troubled by one or more of the above maladies.

The election law played a key role in

the presidential race. It provided that a candidate nominated by a political party could spend no more than \$250 during his campaign, while an 'independent' candidate was limited to \$50 in funds. The discrimination is quite obvious. Without the funds needed to wage a strong campaign against party candidates, an independent acquires the image of a spoiler or joker, not that of the serious contender he may be.

The student Supreme Court invalidated the expenditures portion of the election law Sunday afternoon and postponed the elections one week. However, at 3 a.m.

Monday morning, thanks to some political maneuvering on the part of the Student Body President and the party candidates, the postponement decision was reversed. Candidates were allowed to spend as much as they desired on the final day of the campaign, but could not hope to overcome the damage of the past month.

The only fair and equitable decision that can be made now would be to invalidate the old election and call for a new one after spring vacation. This would start all candidates out on an equal footing as possible, considering the

damage that has already been done.

Now the election for editor of the Daily Tar Heel is an example of how power politics can influence a race. The Publications Board traditionally endorses candidates for the position on the basis of journalistic experience. In the past two elections, however, candidates with absolutely no journalistic experience have been endorsed. It is quite easy to understand why—the president appoints most student members of the Board, making it easy for him to ask favors of them.

An 'independent' candidate in this election, one without Pub Board endorsement, is at a distinct disadvantage, even though he may be infinitely more experienced than an endorsed candidate. Lack of endorsement unjustly makes him appear qualified.

If we are to retain the present system of electing the editor, and we must if we are to keep the Pub Board from appointing an editor, then a new policy must be established to eliminate politically motivated endorsements.

The simplest and best method would be to eliminate endorsements altogether. All candidates would start out equally and those with the journalistic experience needed to make a good editor would become obvious to the students.

The last, and perhaps most disquieting, problem is that of student voter apathy. This problem is distressingly prominent in legislative races.

The Student Legislature is composed of 50 members apportioned to electoral districts on the basis of population, no more than six or less than one from each.

The off-campus districts, those including fraternities and sororities, have heavy representation but pitifully poor voting habits. In the latest election one women's sorority district elected four legislators, the lowest one getting but nine votes. Compare this with Granville West where over 200 voted for two legislators and you can see the problem.

It is inconceivable that Legislature should be controlled by representatives who represent no one. A new method of apportioning legislative seats must be devised.

To reduce apathy and stimulate student involvement apportioning seats on the basis of voter turnout in the previous election would be the best method.

Much has been said in recent months concerning student power, workers' rights, and blacks' rights. The time has come to clean up the mess in our own backyard. If we don't, student government may fall, the Tar Heel decay, and the students left with nothing.

Knight's Resignation Shows Revisions A Must

Duke University lost its president to the hardships of the student revolution on Thursday.

Douglas Knight, the youngest president Duke has ever had, cited "an obligation to protect my family from the severe and sometimes savage demands of such a career" in announcing his plan to retire as president.

Knight has been on the hot seat numerous times in the past few years, starting with the Duke Vigil last spring and ending with the Afro-American Society's takeover of a building just recently.

During this time Knight managed to alienate both students and trustees by appearing at times to say different things to each side. Part of this was because of his personality, part of it was because the University President is, to a large degree, a man caught in the middle of students seeking major changes in their University and trustees frightened by the prospect of change in the world they know.

It was partly this pressure which forced Knight several weeks ago to make statements accepting the validity of the demands of the Duke black students and then turn around a few days later and make very strong statements to the effect that he had not granted the black militants anything. The net result of his two statements was to leave both sides in doubt as to what Knight's position was.

The situation that Knight faced is similar to the situation dozens of college and University presidents across the country are facing, including UNC's. The result in recent years has been a high turnover rate as many presidents pull out and take a plush job with various foundations.

Part of the problem is that the President of an institution has such great authority in the University that he is the person to whom factions go to first for action. Thus, when trustees are unhappy with the behavior of students they immediately apply pressure to the president, without bothering to find the basis of the students' behavior.

On the other side, when students want changes in the University they immediately turn to the president (or chancellor here) to implement changes. Often these students will

within the context of the political situation of the University and the state, make unreasonable demands on the University. Not being in on the decisionmaking within the University they are unable to judge what is possible or impossible, only what is best for their education and personal development.

The obvious implication of this is that if a University or college president would like to get rid of part of the tremendous outside pressure that is put on him he should allow students greater participation in the decisionmaking of the University. And by that we do not mean token representation on committees but meaningful representation, representation great enough that students can easily influence the decision of the committee by their votes.

Former UNC student body president Bob Powell told a congressional committee on Wednesday that "campus violence will never end as long as college administrators make all the decisions."

The responsibility for student disorders, he explained "rests squarely on the shoulders of the university—for creating one of the most undemocratic and authoritarian institutions through which young people must pass in order to achieve an educated adulthood.

He is right. As long as students feel themselves powerless they will be willing to resort to disruptive tactics to accomplish their goals. The supporters of the striking food service workers felt themselves powerless to get the administrators to do anything about the workers' grievances and so turned over tables in Lenoir Hall. The legitimate channels of action were close to the students so they relied on illegal channels.

What can be done to relieve the pressure coming from the other side, from the trustees, is questionable since many of their protests are irrational and come from failure to understand (or even try to understand) the situation in the colleges. However, an administration that wants to lessen some of the pressure from the one side would be wise to begin making their institution more democratic and less authoritarian.

Black District Needed To Guarantee Fair Trial

Student Legislature, as stated earlier in the week, has shown a significant improvement in the past few years. That improvement was evidenced Thursday night when they reconsidered and passed a bill providing for a referendum on the establishment of a voting district for black students.

A week previous the legislature had voted not to give students the opportunity to vote on whether they wanted a special district set up so that black students could be guaranteed a fair trial.

Now that the referendum has been approved it is important that students vote in favor of allowing the establishment of the special black district. The proposal on the ballot, worked out by black students in conjunction with persons in Student Government

represents the most reasonable way to guarantee that black students get fair trials in student courts.

One legislator argued that the current judges could be relied on to be fair. We question that argument. We have known too many judges that would be hostile to black students, especially to militant blacks, to expect them to be fair to blacks on trial.

In addition to this there is the constitutional argument that the accused should be guaranteed a trial by a jury of his peers. Since at UNC the members of the honor court function as a jury it is important that each student be guaranteed that his peers will sit on the court. The proposal that will be on the ballot will make that possible. We hope all students will realize this and vote for the proposal.



'Well, Man, There's Still The Old Panty-Raid'

Letters To The Editor

NCAA Ticket Policy Atrocious

To the Editor:

Upon returning to Chapel Hill from the N.C.A.A. tournament, we still find ourselves unable to comprehend the composition of our "student section" as compared with that of the other participating universities.

Supposedly, each school participating in the tournament was allotted one thousand tickets, which in the case of Drake and Purdue had been largely distributed to their student bodies. It was rather disheartening to note that a large proportion of individuals, within the Carolina section, were not students, but alumni of the University who are members of an elite club composed of avid sports fans.

The fact that these individuals, for the most part, were the "cheering representatives" of our student body is disheartening. This disillusionment is enhanced by the fact that their conduct was far from being truly representative of the University. Many were overly boisterous, vociferous, intoxicated and downright gross. This leads us to question the university's method of ticket distribution.

We constantly hear that the university serves the student and that it is he who should reflect its standards and fine name. The student should be the one to assume the active role in supporting his university's representatives to collegiate events. It appears as though more than enough students sincerely desired to go to Louisville, as evidenced by the number of names submitted in the lottery. Why should they be deprived this chance?

Alumni have already experienced the opportunity to assume an active role in supporting the University's athletic teams, they should now be content to assume a supporting role second to that

of the student.

Yes, life is full of "ifs." If our "student section" was comprised mainly of students possibly there would have been less disillusionment, on the part of those students present, regarding enthusiasm;

there would have been less students eager to return to UNC after the first game; and there would have been a truly homogeneous group to cheer the Tar Heels and represent UNC at Louisville. We remain two of the elite 250

students fortunate enough to attend the NCAA finals along with 750 alumni and staff of the university.

Sincerely
Carolyn B. Sartain
Anne E. Scholl
407 Winston

Flushed with Excitement

Toilet Aesthetics Grow

By T.W. FRANKLIN
University of Louisville

Long among the neglected aspects of contemporary American culture, water closet architecture is becoming a more and more popular form of serious aesthetic appreciation.

Art lovers are flushed with excitement when they find that such a repository of style and individuality can be as close at hand as the ubiquitous john.

A good deal of the new-found attention given to water closet architecture (W.C.A. to bowl-lovers) can be attributed to the extensive exposure given to other people's bathrooms, via twentieth century media—television, motion pictures, voyeur houses.

One of the many joys that the john critic discovers is the infinite variety of the facilities. Take those at the University of Louisville, for instance.

Some restrooms are starkly modern. The men's University Center relief station across from the bookstore is such a place. But for all its modernity the room is a travesty; it lacks that indefinable atmosphere of a real classy latrine. And the doors are walnut veneer!

The Georgian architected Administration Building, on the other hand, has a gem within it. A washroom rather than a restroom, this little beauty even has a room number—107. Outstanding features include soft-keyed frosted glass, white ceramic tile, two (count them) towel dispensers (at different



...Site of Growin' Interest?

levels), and hooks on the walls for wraps. The place is much like railroad waiting room W.C.'s built at the turn of the century.

The male lavatory on the Ad Building's third floor has a skylight. The shadowplay in the room creates a misty, nay, heady atmosphere which complements a dirty exhaust fan that runs on endlessly, seemingly unaware of its own leviathan task. And the pissoires have automatic flushers that activate every 60 seconds. Furthermore, the sit-downs have automatic seat-flushers that whoosh when the seat is raised about four inches. Orfy, each half of the seat has independent suspension, so that if a guy leans to one side disproportionately, the seat edges up on one cheek. Quite incomodious.

Perhaps the piece de resistance is the Gardiner Hall basement bathroom, hiding like a precious opal in matrix. One may have to search for it, but it's worth it. There are actually five stalls, four standups, four sinks, a wall-mounted ashtray at shoulder length, two entrances, and a thermostat.

The graffiti—perhaps the most creative on campus—covers a broad expanse of erotic western art. It is in such a room that one remembers the greats of W.C.A.—Eljer, Crane, U.S. Army. Stand before the mirrors, roll your moustache, straighten your celluloid collar, practice winking. I could go on and on.

The bohemian atmosphere in the Fine Arts Building is indicative of the "Nouveau Gush" or so-called "anti-bathroom" style. Stark, cold, desolate—at the same time strangely beautiful. There is no lock on the stall door, pipes are exposed; so is the electric wiring. The walls are covered with scrap wallboard fitted together in erratic fashion that is very powerful and horrifying, indeed.

The Natural Sciences Building facilities reflect the personality of the building itself. There is a shelf for heavy textbooks, functional asphalt tile floors, functional liquid soap dispensers, and functional rusted metal toilet partitions. It's not great W.C.A., but it's good. (Note, the jane has a couch.)

With such keen interest developing in the john as an art form, it is likely that far less bathrooms will go to pot.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods.
Offices are at the Student Union Bldg., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.
Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.
Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester. We regret that we can accept only prepaid subscriptions.
Classified ads are \$1.00 per day prepaid. Display rate is \$1.25 per column inch.
Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel, N.C.