

GREG PORTER
Editor

BEN CORNELIUS, Managing Editor
ED RANKIN, Associate Editor
LOU BILIONIS, Associate Editor

LAURA SCISM, University Editor
ELLIOTT POTTER, City Editor
CHUCK ALSTON, State and National Editor

SARA BULLARD, Features Editor
CHIP ENSSLIN, Sports Editor
GENE UPCHURCH, Sports Editor
ALLEN JERNIGAN, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

85th year of editorial freedom

Quota system ignores merits of the individual

To the editor:

In his article on the Bakke case ("Bakke victory would be loss for all minorities," Oct. 1), Mr. Lancaster forgets that a quota system ignores the merits of the individual. Allan Bakke is not responsible for "two centuries of slavery and racial discrimination." Would Mr. Lancaster maintain his altruistic attitude if he were deprived of an opportunity in order to save the conscience of some knee-jerk liberal?

to violate the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which prohibits discrimination.

Mr. Lancaster is dismayed at the "rightward trend in the (Supreme) Court's philosophy." In that case, I would suggest he take notice of the words of William O. Douglas, that hero of the far-left, who realized in a rare moment of intelligence that "there is no constitutional right for any race to be preferred."

The type of exercises on those tests B has had little or no exposure to such tests. A scores 1250 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test B. 1200. Which one truly has the greater capacity for learning?

with various gallery exhibits, but why should we continue to provide such exhibits if they are just to be dismantled and vandalized within one day of opening? I am writing this letter to those of you who are wondering why the Gallery is bare and why the Union Gallery Committee is not doing anything at this time.

As long as an distinction between races is made, racism will exist. I do not deny that minorities should receive a fair chance — this I believe wholeheartedly. Quotas do not insure everyone a fair chance; they only extend privilege to a different group of people. Two wrongs do not make a right. Until we insure the right of every individual, white or black, to a fair shake, the problem of discrimination will not be solved.

Rick Kania
425 Avery

One of the battle cries of the insecure white males is: "Why don't we just get rid of the quotas and give the positions to the best qualified? Then everyone will have an equal chance." That is bull. Here's an analogy: A is a trained sprinter. B has not had the use of his legs for most of his life. But because of a medical breakthrough, B can now walk. A and B are both put on the starting line, and the starter says, "At the sound of the gun, you will run a 100-yard dash. You both have an equal chance of winning; so may the best man win." The outcome of the race is painfully obvious. Even though the start looks fair, A has had a lifetime headstart over B. Therefore, is the race really fair?

I am sure many of you are as dismayed as I about the current situation and I hope that in some way the problem can be resolved.

Susanna Bowen, chairperson
Carolina Union Gallery Committee

Questionable questioning?

Last spring, a group called the Orange Committee seriously challenged the right of students to vote in local elections. The challenge took registration procedures as the main point of attack, as the gentlemen of the Orange Committee claimed the "proper" questions were not asked of students who wished to register in Carrboro and Chapel Hill.

This year, the propriety of the questions asked by election registrars is again a bone of contention. Carrboro mayoral candidate Robert Drakeford said Sunday he has received calls from several students who feel they were asked questions not pertinent to establishing their eligibility as voters. He cited two examples of questions reportedly asked of students: "Do you plan to live here the rest of your life?" and "Did you know your parents will lose you as a tax deduction if you register in Orange County?" The *Daily Tar Heel*, too, has received a number of complaints from students. Drakeford's observations have been echoed in each and every case.

The facts of the matter are that tax deductions are in no way related to whether a student registers to vote in Orange County, and guaranteed lifetime residency is an irrelevant and impertinent proposition which serves better to frustrate a potential voter than establish any basis for judgment of eligibility.

After the Orange Committee debacle, it seemed that the range of proper questions was established once and for all. Nine questions are required by the state elections board, and, although some of them are of a personal nature, they are not nearly as insipid as "Do you plan to live here the rest of your life?"

The questions to be asked of the Orange County Board of Elections, on the other hand, are of critical importance and relevance. If the allegations are true, then why do registrars employ questions which have nothing to do with a voter's eligibility? Why do they spread false rumors that serve only to intimidate students? Why are they still dissatisfied with the questions which are used throughout the state? And why aren't they monitored more strictly to ensure that only proper questions are asked?

Joseph Nassif, chairperson of the board of elections, said Monday he would hear complaints only from those denied the right to vote in Orange County, and refused to act on Drakeford's complaint because he can't depend on "fifth-hand information."

Although no student may have been denied the right to vote, the allegations cast the registrars' questions in a very questionable light. We urge any student who feels irrelevant questions were asked while registering to vote to report his or her experience to Student Government (in Suite C of the Carolina Union or the *Daily Tar Heel*). And any student who feels his or her right to vote was denied as a result of misleading information or questioning should contact the Orange County Board of Elections immediately.

We are entitled to our franchise and we should be allowed to obtain it without undue hassles. Unfortunately, we are forced from time to time to defend these rights. This promises to be one of those times.

Drop hearing needs voices

Since school began this fall, letters, editorials and more letters have appeared on this page criticizing or praising the four-week drop period. It's fairly obvious who stands where on this issue.

Student letters and the *Daily Tar Heel* have repeatedly insisted that four weeks is simply not enough time for students to assess a course's value to them and whether they can fit the course into their academic schedule. Letters from faculty members have supported the present four-week drop period and said extending the drop period would just result in more "frivolous" drops by students.

Tonight at 8 p.m. students may have the last chance to show their dislike over the four-week drop period. The Campus Governing Council will hold an open meeting in Rooms 213-215 of the Carolina Union to discuss the effects of the shortened drop period on students and come up with an alternative length of time. Student Government will then make a formal recommendation at the Faculty Council's Oct. 21 meeting that the drop period be extended.

Educational Policy Committee members argue that because no students showed up at the open meeting a couple of weeks ago, students must not be too concerned with the length of their drop period. They stated that the Moss-Lassiter report recommending an extended drop period was excellent but that no other student opinion was expressed. They must assume that the Moss-Lassiter report could not be representative of student opinion on the matter — that it is just the opinion of two student leaders.

So because the policy committee is impressed by numbers, we should give them numbers at tonight's meeting. The Faculty Council must be shown that extension of the drop period is not the interest of a few individuals and the campus newspaper but of the overwhelming majority of students.

Peter Bainbridge
27 Old East

To the editor:

Tell any liberal that you oppose reverse discrimination, euphemistically called affirmative action, and you will automatically be denounced as racist, reactionary, or as an ultra-right crypto-Nazi. Thus, Mr. Lancaster's article comes as pretty old stuff: the big bad right is at it again, threatening to take away minority rights which were so painfully acquired by those paradigms of justice, goodness, sweetness and light.

These paradigms exemplify a very arrogant moral persuasion, believing that only they are concerned with justice. But to say that they are for eradicating injustice is incorrect; clearly, reverse discrimination does not reduce injustice, but merely inflicts it on a different group. But this is ok with Mr. Lancaster. He is quite willing to make his amends with minorities at the expense of some innocent third party. In reality, Mr. Lancaster proves himself to be a racist, ready

Is the race fair?

To the editor:

There has been a great amount of publicity recently about "reverse discrimination." The Bakke case has brought out into the open just what some insecure white males have thought about for a while: minorities are going to edge them out of some opportunities because the pointed-head liberals are trying to make up for past injustices.

letters to the editor

That is pure rubbish. Minorities have been pushed around by the majority for a while. Blacks in particular have been given the shaft. Before busing and during the "separate but equal" period, blacks have had to squeeze an education out of poorly funded, ill-equipped schools with usually less-than-top-rated faculties. But even with institutionalized racism, some blacks managed to score almost as high, and higher, on tests that were based on the projected proficiency of students who had received a better education overall.

Let's look at an analogy: A has had a top-quality education — B, a poor education. A has been exposed to testing situations and

Bare Gallery

To the editor:

Since the beginning of the fall semester the Union Gallery Committee has presented three art exhibits in the Union's South Gallery along with two exhibits in the Union's showcases. Of the three exhibits in the South Gallery, all have been vandalized or damaged, and in one exhibit theft has occurred.

I find it very difficult to understand why people take pieces of art and mutilate them and thereby discourage the prospects of future exhibits. It is my job, and the committee's, to provide the student body

Turnout great

To the editor:

On behalf of the women's field hockey team, I would like to thank everyone who attended the UNC vs. UVA game. The large turnout boosted the team's morale immensely.

Though our team lost, I think the spectators will agree that one seldom sees field hockey played so well below the Mason-Dixon line. Everyone who enjoyed the game Friday is reminded that the Tar Heels' next game will be Tuesday, Oct. 11, at 3 p.m. against Catawba. This game (as the four remaining home games) will be played on James field.

Thanks again, fans and team.

Dana Cagle
614 James

Floundering

To the editor:

David Bodenheimer declared that he was not "floundering"; he will enter UNC Law School next fall ("Trying to help," Letters, Oct. 6).

Mr. Bodenheimer, you are about to flounder like you have never floundered before.

George H. Masterson
UNC Law School



Police must obtain consent before searching premises

Editor's Note: This advice was prepared by Student Legal Services which maintains an office in Suite C of the Carolina Union. UNC students have prepaid for this service and may obtain advice at no additional charge.

Police can justify a warrantless search of your home or apartment on several grounds, and one of them is consent. The officers must obtain your freely given permission to enter and their search is limited to those areas and methods to which you agree. Officers appearing at your door and asking to search the premises, however, are not required to inform you that you have the right to refuse to consent.

Furthermore, it is possible that persons other than yourself can consent to a search of your apartment. While your landlord's consent is inadequate, any cooccupant with whom you share access and control of the premises has the right to authorize the search. The law bases this on the theory that by sharing your home you "assume the risk" that the other person might give you consent. Such a person cannot consent to a search of any area (closet, desk drawer, etc.) which you use exclusively. He or she can authorize a search of any of your private possessions if he or she has been allowed to use them or has been allowed access to them.

ADVICE FOR THE DAY: 1) You have the right to refuse a warrantless search of your home; 2) Do not physically resist a police officer but make it quite clear that you are not consenting if the search is not desired. 3) If the officer is insistent, call an attorney immediately.

Two days of 'academic value'

Fall break a time for scholarly pursuits?

By ROBIN McWILLIAM

It appears that we may have another fall break in October '78, one more to add to those breaks we take for beach-and mountain-trips and the Labor Day and Thanksgiving vacations. In order to compensate for the two-day holiday, we are to have two class days added before exams.

That seems rather pointless, as the purpose for spending four years in Chapel Hill is not to learn, but to take advantage of its locale in the heart of Piedmont country, within reasonably easy access of the coast and the mountains.

Finals are a nuisance that professors slam on us so they can complete their grading assignment, and it will do the academic spirit no good to have students and faculty quibble over the wording of exam questions during the traditional cramming days. We're told a break between Labor Day and Thanksgiving would be academically valuable. "How can two days away from the University be academically valuable?" a skeptical acquaintance asks me.

"It's simple," I reply. "Quite rightly, the proponents of this break realize our time will be spent immersed in the literature of the five courses we're taking."

He doesn't believe I really think students will study in the middle of October. I tell him that no students, especially those on a student committee for a proposed school calendar, would consider these days to be wasted by their fellows.

"Isn't this committee using the term 'academically valuable' to get Ferebee to accept the calendar?" my friend persists.

I tell him Ferebee is no fool; he knows perfectly well we will become better scholars because of another holiday.

With the results of the survey taken by the Residence Hall Association and Student Government in September, in which three-quarters of the students wanted a fall break. I trust no one would have the audacity to deny us it. Who better to judge what is best for a student's education than the scholarly, young tuition-payers? Surely no professor in his 35th year of teaching

who tell us a four-day weekend will easily turn into a 10-day vacation. How can they make such damning accusations? Isn't it well known that students here have respect for their instructors to a degree that they wouldn't insult them by skipping class? I called up a fellow by the name of Short, or Broad, or some such dimension, who's one of the student

advantages is precisely the kind of statement to rally the students to a mature, scholarly attitude."

"I'm afraid it wasn't supposed to be a serious proposal," he says.

"What! Do you mean to tell me that after writing this much of my column it's all a huge joke?"

"Yes," he confirmed. "Do me a favor, please. Make sure you let the chancellor's calendar committee, the deans of all the schools, the vice chancellors and the chancellor know that this is not a serious suggestion."

"...he knows perfectly well we will become better scholars because of another holiday."

could know the benefits of two days of classes.

committee members. "Tremendous!" I bellow. "To say that the fall break is needed and has some definite academic

Robin McWilliam, a junior, is an interdisciplinary studies major from Edinburgh, Scotland.

The Daily Tar Heel

News: Tony Gunn, assistant editor; Mark Andrews, Mike Coyne, Meredith Crews, Shelley Droscher, Bruce Ellis, Betsy Flagler, Grant Hamill, Lou Harned, Stephen Harris, Kathy Hart, Nancy Hartis, Chip Highsmith, Keith Hollar, Steve Huettel, Jaci Hughes, Jay Jennings, George Jeter, Ramona Jones, Will Jones, Julie Knight, Eddie Marks, Amy McRary, Elizabeth Messick, Beverly Mills, Beth Parsons, Chip Pearsall, Bernie Ransbottom, Evelyn Sahr, George Shadrout, Vanessa Sidle, Barry Smith, David Stacks, Melinda Stovall, Robert Thomason, Howard Troxler, Mike Wade, Martha Waggoner, David Watters and Ed Williams.

News Desk: Reid Tuvim, assistant managing editor. Copy chief: Keith Hollar. Copy editors: Richard Barron, Amy Colgan, Kathy Curry, Dinita James, Carol Lee, Michele Mecke, Lisa Nieman, Dan Nobles, Melanie Sill, Melinda Stovall, Melanie Topp and Larry Tupler.

Sports: Lee Pace, assistant editor, Evan Appel, Dede Biles, Bill Fields, Skip Foreman, Tod Hughes, Dinita James, Dave McNeill, Pete Mitchell, David Poole, Ken Roberts, Rick Scoppe, Frank Snyder, Will Wilson and Isabel Worley.

Features: Jeff Brad, Zap Brueckner, David Craft, Debbie Moose, Dan Nobles, Lynn Williford, Peter Hapke, Tim Smith, Etta Lee, Kimberly McGuire and Ken Roberts.

Arts and Entertainment: Melanie Modlin, assistant editor, Hank Baker, Becky Burcham, Pat Green, Marianne Hansen, Libby Lewis and Valerie Van Arsdale.

Graphic Arts: Artists: Dan Brady, Allen Edwards, Cliff Marley, Jocelyn Pettibone, Lee Poole and John Tomlinson. Photographers: Fred Barbour, Joseph Thomas, Michael Sneed and Sam Fulwood.

Business: Vernia Taylor, business manager, Claire Bagley, assistant business manager. Mike Neville, David Squires and Howard Troxler. Circulation manager: Bill Bagley.

Advertising: Dan Collins, manager; Carol Bedsole, assistant sales manager; Steve Crowell, classifieds manager; Julie Coston, Neal Kimball, Cynthia Lesley, Anne Sherril and Melanie Stokes. Ad layout: Evelyn Sahr.

Composition Editors: Frank Moore and Nancy Oliver.

Composition and Makeup: UNC Printing Dept. Robert Jasinkiewicz, supervisor; Robert Streeter, Geanie McMillan, Judy Dunn, Carolyn Kuhn, David Parker, Joni Peters, Steve Quakenbush and Duke Sullivan.

