

Election reform: no public funds

The issue of campaign reform comes up every year and, just as regularly, nothing is done about it. In the year of Watergate, however, the issue has come to a head (Nixon's) and genuine reform may once and for all be realized.

Congress is now facing its second campaign reform bill in nine months (the last was passed on July 30, 1972) and this one has a lot of teeth as well as a lot of lip. Mandatory public financing of national campaigns is a radical reform, more accurately described as a forced allocation of one tax dollar per taxpayer to a national election fund. It will not increase the tax burden directly, but guarantee that \$89 million is given yearly to run national campaigns, and hopefully clean them up.

Public financing is a step in the right direction and it reflects proper zeal in reforming the democratic process. But it is another example of a government policy which looks good on paper, and not so good in practice.

Pressure groups and influence-peddlers will not be deterred since most political favors don't involve money anyway. Public financing will have the dangerous effect of making people think they are changing something, when they are not.

People should not be forced to support any candidate they do not wish to and, conversely, should be able to give a substantial donation to candidates they do support. It is good for candidates to get out and work for the funding they receive, not have tax dollars rolling in

automatically.

It is impossible to determine fairly which candidates should have access to the public funds, or in what amounts. Third-party and grass-roots candidates will have little say in allocation. Incumbents will have the advantage if challengers are not allowed to spend more to compensate for lack of exposure. Incumbents already win 95 per cent of congressional elections.

The many faults of modern elections can best be remedied by emphasizing the other aspects of the bill presently before Congress without harping on public financing, a needless over-reaction and over-complication of an already complex process.

Strict limits must be placed on total campaign expenses, and cash transactions must be prohibited. Contributions should be less than \$5,000 per person for a presidential candidate, and major contributors should be disclosed before the election. It is helpful to the electorate to see in dollars and cents where a candidate's support originates.

Policing current campaign laws is now done by congressional employees. An independent agency should be established to avoid probable conflicts of interest.

Reform is needed desperately, but it should not include something else which will continually need reform, distributing the public funds. It doesn't make much difference where campaign money comes from as long as we know who give it, how much is spent, and how it is spent.

The Daily Tar Heel

82nd Year of Editorial Freedom

All unsigned editorials are the opinion of the editors. Letters and columns represent the opinions of individuals.

Founded February 23, 1893

Tuesday, April 2, 1974

Dr. Condie responds to Tar Heel editorial on housing situation

Some notes on housing: We would like to take this opportunity in an effort to present all sides of issues, to give you Dr. James Condie's reply to one point raised in our housing editorials last week.

The issue concerns the newly-instituted policy of two-semester room contracts, as opposed to the past policy of one-semester room contracts.

The Daily Tar Heel editorial Friday stated, "The new policy may make it easier administratively for the housing office and may ensure fuller room occupancy next spring, but what happened to a consideration of the students?" The editorial went on to say that the policy asks the students to commit themselves this spring on their living accommodations for next spring.

Condie told DTH reporter Robert Petersen Monday afternoon that next year's budget for the housing department is very tight,

and counts on 99 per cent occupancy of dorms next fall, and 96 per cent occupancy next spring in order to meet the budget. Condie stressed that the housing budget is required to be self-sufficient.

The two-semester room contract will ensure fuller occupancy next spring, thus ensuring that greater revenues come in, thus meeting the budget, and thus keeping students' room rent from rising to even higher levels, he said in effect.

So there you have it for the other side.

Also, the editors would like to apologize for forgetting, in a fit of April Foolery, to put the names of our columnists on top of yesterday's back page articles. The article entitled "Dirty Dozen holds a strategy session" reflects the opinions of columnist Gary Fulton. The accompanying article, "The you-don't-push-Moby-around case," is the view of staff writer Gary Dorsey. Credit where credit is due.

Paul Williams Winston angry

While most campus residents will be paying less than \$30 more to live in University Housing next fall, Winston residents will be given special status by having to pay a whopping \$110 more per year.

University Housing—in its Winston Phase II operation—has decided to change the classification for rent purposes of both Winston and Connor from coed buildings to women's building—thus the 29 per cent jump in room rents.

The increase was arranged without the knowledge of the residents and without any attempts at student input. RHA, the most likely student organization to intercede for the students, was completely caught off guard. We, like the residents, were conveniently informed of this arbitrary increase the afternoon before sign-up!

Housing has attempted to justify the increase because of the so-called facilities in Winston and Connor, and not because women live in both dorms.

Due to these facilities, Winston and Connor have been classed with the other women's dorms on campus. This classification was based on the quality and quantity of rooms such as lounges and study rooms.

Dr. Condie said that the objective was "to have all residence halls of equal quality and price." Yet, he has said that it could take 10 years to do so.

There were about 600 tripled rooms this year, which brought in between \$90-\$100,000. With an end to tripling there is an end to this revenue. This may be their justification for the rise in room rent. Unfortunately in the cases of Winston and Connor, a dramatic rise in rent will not result in a concurrent dramatic change in the quality of their facilities.

Let's look at these "facilities" first. The main lounge in Winston has been of very poor quality since men began to live there three years ago. This was Housing's, not the men's fault. The good furniture which had been there because it was a women's dorm was removed and replaced with whatever remnants could be found. Connor's lounge is, on the whole, in much better shape, but still not comparable to other women's dorms.

In an attempt to upgrade the facilities, Housing will refurbish the Winston lounge. However, this will be funded to the extent of one-third of the costs by Winston itself!

The study room in the basement of Winston has been used little because of the lack of tables and chairs for such usage. After many requests, furniture was provided. Connor's study facilities are not much better. One room in both Winston and Connor has been set aside as a study room for next year. Again, the residents had no say as to which rooms were chosen.

The basement in Winston was painted in its entirety as a gesture of good will, but much more is needed. One small lounge was forced into disuse because several pieces of furniture had to be disposed of due to their advanced state of disrepair.

The laundry facilities have deteriorated steadily over the year. Winston has gone from three washing machines to none at the present time. Connor presently has one working washer.

While Housing maneuvers to get University Laundry to pay rent for dorm space, Winston and Connor residents find themselves without ready access to laundry facilities. Apparently nothing will be finalized until the summer.

We have attempted to show that the facilities of Winston and Connor do not allow them to be classified as women's dorms. Do people in Morrison or Ehringhaus, with much better facilities, pay the women's rate? No, the coed rate applies there.

How can anyone seriously compare the facilities in Connor and Winston to other women's dorms, such as Cobb and Spencer? The rent should be definitely lower—in this case the coed rate should apply.

Another aspect of the problem is the \$50 room deposit. Under its present terms you would have to forfeit \$15 if you did not cancel your room for next semester by July 1.

Does this allow students enough time to find an apartment in Chapel Hill? We think not, and strongly suggest that the terms of the contract be changed so that students in Winston and Connor may retrieve their \$50 until August 1.

A more pleasant possibility is to do away with the increase for next year and reinstate it for the following year, 1975-76. This would allow students ample time to get an apartment if they so desired.

In any case, the point to be stressed is that student interests were ignored. Will this dangerous policy continue? That remains to be seen.

Chan Hardwick

Basketball haunting

Ed Norwood's face would not launch a fleet of ships. It usually needs a shave, but the broad, easy smile should be familiar to most of the male students around here. Ed is one of the gentlemen who dwell in the bowels of Woollen Gym making sure that the little sweatshirts and socks get in the right basket. When Ed isn't passing out towels, he stares wistfully at a large picture of the Sweet Carolines which he has tacked to the wall (the best girls are circled), and he teases intramural officials.

This latter diversion is increased during basketball season, and Ed has been known to hand out a whip and chair along with the whistle. What fascinates him is why anyone in his right mind would stake his well-being on the line for school, sport and \$1.85 an hour.

My own interest in the job stemmed from the lousy officiating I felt my team had been subject to in intramural play. I had visions of saddling on a red shirt, striding into basketball town and cleaning up crossed eyes and lip paralysis. But when it was all over, the general mood seemed to be, "Who was that Masked Man? I wanted to kill him."

It's no secret that basketball, even to those who refuse to care about it, haunts the classrooms and sidewalks of Chapel Hill. I remember the case of a freshman from Boston who needed a packhorse to get his pucks and skates and hockey whatnot up to his dorm. Yet, within a single month, this budding Bobby Orr was having nightmares where he would leap out of bed waving his arms and screaming, "Pass it, damn you! For God's sake! I'm open under the basket!" A dramatic example, true, but indicative of the amazing power this cowhide god has over the University. (It was believed that the youth was possessed by Eddie Fogler.)

The intramural teams come from dorms, fraternities and graduate schools with a handful of independent combinations. Every fall the season begins with the Grail Tournament which gives the players a chance to practice teamwork and collective swearing. The regular season follows, lasting about two months, with championships in each division and a final All-Campus ballyhoo which determines the best of the best.

For the officials, as the good play the better, the calls get tougher and the threats more vicious. It works in a peculiar way: the most aggressive teams win, the most aggressive teams are usually made up of experienced, ambitious men and this boils down to your bright, mature, doctors, dentists and lawyers of the future. So, at various times, I've been threatened with a scalpel, a drill and a malpractice suit.

An objective sense of humor can help. Once a guy demanded to know if I had read the rule book. I told him no, but I saw the movie version with John Garfield and Vivian Leigh, but that it got mixed reviews. This confused both of us, and the issue was dropped. As the season progresses the players get better and fouls come in quick, subtle flurries. This was particularly true in the final games where the most important aspect of the sport is called crowd control.

"Ya got yersef an ugly mob out thar, sheriff. They jest now strung up yer hoss." You're a marked man, a face without a

name, a face that every mother would hate. Sonuvabitch!

In the final game a powerful fraternity team was thrown against a surprising dorm five. It was a difficult game to call, and the abuse was heavy. Over the months the officials had built a shell against insults: water off a duck's back. The fraternity team won in the final minute, great for the fans, hell for the refs but the game was always in control. The praise an official hungers to hear is from the losing team, but this time one of the winners scorned, "you tried to give it to 'em, but it didn't work." That hurt.

Ed Norwood smiled faintly when I turned in my shotgun. He teased a little, then he told me something I doubt I'll ever forget: he said he really didn't pity the officials as much as he did all of us as students, that we need the officials so desperately. Thanks, Ed. I might do it again next year just in case you say some more stuff like that.

Letters to the editor

Parent responds to column

To the editors:

If a parent of a UNC student can express an opinion in the DTH (editorial page), I would appreciate your publishing the following:

To Tim Sims: Although your article "Death Through Legislation" was well written and designed to make you sound like a true lover of animals, it was clear to me, and to many animal lovers, that you are not what you would have us believe you are.

Elmo was not killed by legislation. He was killed by a master that let him roam the streets. Elmo was unaware that he could be killed by a car, or that he might possibly cause an accident by running in front of a car. Man is responsible for the safety and well-being of his best friend and if we are not prepared to provide these then we should not take the responsibility of an animal at all. Elmo's master did him no favor by letting him run free. He was done a disservice because he was not provided with a safe place to run and because of this, his life was short. I wonder if Mr. Sims thinks Elmo's freedom was worth his life, or maybe we should forbid cars access to our streets so that animals would be safe. Isn't it more logical to be sure that animals are safe and under their master's control?

As far as the Humane Society is concerned, while I am not in total agreement with their shelters or the treatment stray animals receive while there, I would rather see an animal mercifully put to sleep than lying smashed along a highway, or worse still, wandering aimlessly, thin and hungry, among trash cans trying to find food to stay alive.



Letters to the editor

Parent responds to column

We should all mourn Elmo's passing and the needless deaths of all animals that wander, unattended and unprotected by the masters who unthinkingly or uncaringly allow them the freedom to be killed. Anyone who really cares about their animal will keep it under control so that it remains healthy and alive.

I sincerely hope that the above is not lengthy and that you will see fit to put it into the paper. Thank you for your time.

Elaine Becker
11711 Greenlane Drive

Kung-Fu show blatantly haughty

To the editors:

The Sunday night presentation, "Masters of Kung-Fu and Karate," held in Carmichael Auditorium, has to be considered a severe disappointment to those who anticipated being enlightened with regard to the martial arts. What the audience witnessed was nothing less than a carnival of ego-trippers. It's an outrage that such a slick, commercialized display was made a part of the East Asian Symposium. The masters' show neither directed itself toward, nor related to the essence of any martial art; and it certainly failed to capture any spirit of Eastern philosophy on which the martial arts are founded.

Typically, the Carmichael audience consumed this haughty and blatantly

promotional presentation. But the brawling skits, the brick and ice breaking and the bush-league 'easy-for-anyone' maiming techniques were strictly bad entertainment. Observers hopeful for some sort of edification, which is the focus of the Symposium, were frustrated.

It would have been far better to have had either a serious treatment of the subject or else no treatment of it at all. The "masters" themselves were neither serious nor enlightening. Their show was a disparaging, ostentatious and unauthentic display of what are, in reality, some of the finest, most graceful human art forms in the world today.

Sunday's farce served only to perpetuate the myth, misrepresentation and misunderstanding of the martial arts. And it's a shame it had to happen here, as part of an otherwise fine Symposium.

James Marsh
Route 4, Chapel Hill

Reader wants chimes changed

To the editors:

Open letter to the Gnome in the Bell Tower: In honor of the East Asian Symposium, or even on a more permanent basis, how about giving our ears a rest from "A Mighty Fortress is our God" and "Let my People Go," and replacing them with some nice Buddhist chants and Noh music?

Mark Young
Camelot Apt.

Reid Murchison

Quotas: justice?

Is it constitutional for universities or other institutions to make special efforts to provide opportunities for long-oppressed minorities? Do "reverse discrimination" measures, which are used to correct the wrongs of past discrimination and equality, violate the concept of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th Amendment?

The Supreme Court must decide the answers to these questions in one of the most critical decisions since the initiation of the civil rights movement. The future of racial equality is dependent on the court's decision in the case of DeFunis vs. Odegaard.

DeFunis, charging the University of Washington with racial discrimination and the violation of his right to equal protection, filed suit after the law school refused his admission, although it accepted 36 minority students who had lower grades and test scores.

DeFunis' case questions the constitutionality of affirmative action programs and quota systems which favor the underprivileged. Such programs are designed to provide opportunities long-denied minorities. They are essential if equal opportunity is to become a reality. But it is argued by some that they violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment.

Like many universities, Washington utilizes two different admission standards, one for whites and one for minorities, and a quota system to increase minority enrollment.

Opinion on such measures is strongly divided. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish defense organization which has backed DeFunis, opposes any type of quota system or any discriminatory action. The national director summed up the League's position: "It is wrong to discriminate against a person if they're black or not black. In order to correct an evil in our society, we shouldn't engage in another evil."

The university takes another view, summed up by its executive vice-president: "If you're going to have equal access to the law and to society as a whole, we're going to have to admit on a different standard..."

In the case's first test in court, the Superior Court ruled in favor of DeFunis. Judge Shorret stated that "the 14th Amendment could no longer be stretched to accommodate the needs of any race."

However, the state supreme court overturned the lower court's decision 7-2. The court declared: "The Constitution is color-conscious to prevent the perpetuation of discrimination and to undo the effects of past segregation... Clearly, consideration of race by school authorities does not violate the Fourteenth Amendment where the purpose is to bring together, rather than to separate, the races."

Uniform quantitative standards neither insure fair selection nor are they in the best interest of the public. Freedom for flexible and subjective judgment must be maintained.

Now, the decision rests with the Supreme Court. According to most observers, the court is faced with three alternative rulings. First, based on the equal protection clause, it could decide in favor of DeFunis, declaring that the constitution prohibits the use of racial discrimination regardless of purpose.

Second, applying the "rational theory" test, the court could decide not to overturn the law school's policy since it was founded on a rational theory even though the court may disagree with the policy.

Third, applying the "compelling state interest" test, the court could uphold the University's policy since that policy was founded on a "compelling state interest"—to provide for long denied opportunities for minorities and to increase the relatively low percentage of black lawyers.

Whatever the decision is, someone will lose, perhaps unjustly. If the law school is upheld, many white individuals will suffer unfair admission restrictions as schools continue to admit sometimes less qualified minority students in order to meet quotas. If DeFunis wins, equal opportunity will become a meaningless phrase and the second reconstruction may grind to a halt.

What, then, is just? Is it just to discriminate against whites? Is it just that minorities suffer from unjust past discrimination and present inequality?

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak
Editors
Kevin McCarthy, Managing Editor
Michael Davis, Associate Editor
Jean Swallow, Associate Editor
Ken Allen, News Editor
Harriet Sugar, Feature Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Bob Jasinkiewicz, Night Editor