

The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, Managing Editor

LOUIS BISSETTE, Editorial Page Editor

JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor

TAMMY BLACKARD, State and National Editor

ERIK FLIPPO, Business Editor

CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor

JULIA COON, News Editor

SHELLEY ERBLAND, Design Editor

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, Editorial Page Editor

JENNY CLONINGER, University Editor

CHARLES BRITTAIN, City Editor

DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor

JAMES BENTON, Omnibus Editor

DAVID SUROWIECKI, Photography Editor

KELLY THOMPSON, Design Editor

Violations plague elections

What could have been commendable campaigns by all campus candidates have been cheapened in an election fraught with violations. Candidates and their campaign staffers blatantly violated rules in both the general election and the runoff, and the Elections Board is unable to challenge the violations vigorously. In addition, pollsite workers were often unclear on the rules and thus did not enforce them; many did not even understand how to do their jobs.

Some of the worst violations included improper campaigning near the pollsites and around campus. There are suggestions that students cast ballots in elections for which they were ineligible to vote, a violation not only of elections rules but of the Campus Code. Further problems with the system may render some results questionable.

But the main problem is that now, after the election, it's too late for the Elections Board to take significant action against the candidates. And since the Student Supreme Court decision handed down two weeks ago essentially nullified the Board, any candidates' appeals will be surrounded by confusion over who has in charge.

Candidates ultimately responsible

The most obvious violations occurred in both the general election and the runoff. Candidates are responsible for their campaign workers' actions, and they must be held accountable for overzealous and immature staffers. Campaign staffers were obnoxious at some candidates' forums, attacking other candidates instead of letting uninformed and uninvolved students ask questions. On election days, candidates campaigned within 50 feet of the polls both in person and through posters that were not removed, a clear violation. One candidate's worker just "hung out" a few feet away from the Union pollsite; covering his jacket were large signs for senior class candidates.

In another example of shoddy campaigning, a student body president candidate strung a large sheet with his name on it from two trees and placed posters on other trees, although elections rules clearly prohibit that. Elections Board Chairman Wilborn Roberson said he could only charge the candidate \$5 for the violation according to the Board's rules. Such a rule is hardly effective. That \$5 will not fall under the campaign expenses limit, because it will be charged after candidates turn in their financial reports. Presumably, any candidate could incur as many \$5 penalties as he pleases, knowing that nothing more than a fine would come of the violation.

Rules need enforcing

To his credit, Roberson has been a far more efficient and effective chairman than previous ones. It is unfortunate that he has to punish candidates because of the immaturity of them and their staffers. But since he does, Roberson must actively enforce the rules, and he needs an adequate staff to do so.

The rules, however, are sometimes unclear, tempting candidates to bend them. In spite of assurances to Roberson from associate housing director Al Calarco that properly posted campaign materials did not need housing's approval, posters were torn down randomly throughout the dorms. This rule, changed from last

year when approval was required, obviously did not filter down to area directors and definitely not to resident assistants, who each seemed to have their own guidelines for posting and tearing down.

Elections Board must fight fraud

The Elections Board also has to increase and educate its poll workers. That's a problem, because the Board needs 190 workers, and few people are willing to give their time. That became obvious this year when, in the general election, the Health Sciences pollsite opened late, as did Granville in the runoff. But somehow, the Board should find workers to post at the pollsites to enforce the 50-foot no-campaign rule and to watch for fraud.

And the workers must know the procedures for marking students' registration cards. Some cards were marked incorrectly in the general election, so that when those students tried to vote in the runoff, it seemed that they had already voted. In the runoff, some poll workers did not know the registration procedure. Especially considering that it had a week between the two elections to work out the kinks in the process, the Board should have had informed workers at the polls.

Voting irregularities

A further problem may have occurred this year for the last time ever, but the Elections Board should have prevented it, at least in the runoff. The way the system stands, the possibility exists that students who are not juniors could vote for senior class offices, and students can cast votes for districts other than their own. Elections Board officials have no way of knowing which ballots are invalid.

The problem could have been solved — although it may have been more time-consuming — by distributing separate punch-out ballots for student body president and for senior class officers. With that, the chances for fraud could have been greatly reduced. Next year, this can be avoided when voters use bubble sheets for ballots instead, but only if poll workers bubble in voters' class and districts beforehand.

Require voting at district sites

Another way to reduce the chances for fraud is to establish a rule that on-campus students can vote only at the pollsites in their districts, with only off-campus students allowed to vote at central campus polls. This decision is up to Student Congress, which will probably be hesitant to allow the change because it may hamper voter turnout. But that's not a strong enough reason to stay with the present system; with this, the Board could pre-mark ballots by district and class so there are no more at each district site than there are voters eligible.

Finally, the Elections Board needs to make it clear at the polls that voting violations are violations of the Campus Code, for which students can be brought before the Honor Court. In the same way that stores post signs threatening prosecution for shoplifters, the Board should post signs alerting voters to the Campus Code.

Immaturity marred elections

Again, most of this year's problems are not the fault of the Elections Board — its biggest problem is a lack of informed staff to enforce the rules and register voters. Most of the fault must lie with candidates and their campaign workers, who acted irresponsibly during the campaigns, at the forums and on election days.

Please don't send in the clowns tonight

David Rowell

Pardon Me

They call the Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey circus the greatest show on earth. I should hold off on giving it this kind of endorsement, as I've yet to take in "Lola's All-Nude Review" back in Fayetteville, but I'll admit it was pretty great.

The show started with a brigade of clowns coming into the audience. Now I was with a date, so I had to make sure I stood on that fine line between showing my boyish, child-hearted nature and the macho, all-man type who might snarl in a loud Jersey accent, "This clown's tickin' me off!"

We were on the front row, so naturally "Coco" had to come over to us. He pretended he was going to throw a bucket of water on us, so I just laughed and played along. Then he kept musing up my hair. I hate when people mess with my hair. Though slightly agitated, I had to show my date I could take a joke. Next he squirted me with jelly and that's when I jumped him. I never thought the day would come when I might actually beat up a clown, but I was provoked. I have a low boiling point.

Out came the elephants. They were a lot of fun to watch, but you almost have to hate that this is the life they lead. I can just hear them squabbling in the dress room.

"You call this PR work?! I was out there standing on my head, for Christ's sake!"

"If one more person slaps my butt I am outta here!"

"Peanuts! They're payin' us peanuts!" Next was Alligator Tahar, the Moroccan Master who proves his "awesome mental power" by confronting fierce alligators. This was quite a disappointment. The trick here is that the alligators run around the ring while Tahar corners them with his "awesome mental power." First of all, if these alligators were any more drugged up

they'd be luggage.

Then he pryed one's mouth back with his huge arms and stuck his head in — an act of mental power from a guy who still carries around I Can Read books.

The middle part of the show was "The African Fantasy." Tribal warriors came out and relived ancient folklore by partaking in ritualistic dancing. Then two basketball goals were put up and they scrimmaged each other. I'm not exactly sure why "The African Fantasy" is part of the circus. It was entertaining enough, but the only risk or danger involved was that they followed the elephant act without scooping up after them.

The oldest animal trainer in the world, Gunther Gebel-Williams, was on hand for his farewell tour. I was sure he was much older than the program indicated (they listed him at a modest 126), but he did still have that command over the wild beast he's famous for. After having the lions and tigers do some neat tricks with hoops, he moved on to the advanced stuff, and led them through an impressive reading of "Our Town."

Now these animals didn't seem as sedated as some of the others (many have since entered the Betty Ford Clinic) and gave the audience some real scares. At one point, after Gunther cracked his whip for them to obey, three or four of the bigger ones jumped him and, to the horror of the crowd, proceeded to give him a severe wedgie.

Intermission came and this gave me the chance to go buy all the swell stuff they were selling in the lobby. I bought the screaming blue flashlight with a lion's head

on top (the official kind, not the crude imitations) and a master of ceremonies' top hat. I had to have a pennant and various dolls of the Flying Giavetti Family, too. I noticed some kid, who was content just to have a snowcone, staring at me the whole time.

"What's the matter?!" I yelled. "Haven't ya ever seen a guy buy souvenirs before?" I suddenly felt foolish, and decided to stash all my stuff under a bathroom stall until it was safe to retrieve them.

I found my way back to the seat, and to my surprise, saw a clown trying to pick up my date. Boy, I hate clowns. He was a real suave one, too, and was wearing a white, three-piece suit with a large gold chain.

"David, this is Slappy. Slappy's with the circus."

I reluctantly stuck out my hand and when I shook his, it came off.

"Sorry about that, sport. It's habit." He didn't sound like any clown to me. He sounded more like Don Johnson. The second half was starting, and he had taken my seat. He coolly lit a cigarette and smoothed back his bright orange hair. Then he looked up at me. "You still here?"

I jumped him, too, and we had to be separated by a tough midjet.

The second half of the circus was equally as exciting, and I could go on and on about how I got hit by the guy shot out of the cannon and how my date eventually left with a sword swallower named Leopold, but I think you get the picture. If I learned anything under the big top, it's that clowns have it in for me and the smell of elephants is not my favorite. Of course, they'd probably say the same thing about me.

David Rowell is a senior RTVMP major from Fayetteville.

Readers' Forum

Students left without choice

To the editor:

CAA President Carol Geer's statement last week (repeated in Monday's "Week in Quotes"), basically saying that students who opposed the passage of the Student Recreation Center referendum will eventually understand the importance of the center and will use it, seems to miss the point behind much of the opposition to the referendum.

I voted against the referendum, and yes, if the Student Recreation Center is completed before I graduate, I will use it. It would be a mistake not to, since I have been forced by the passage of the referendum to foot the bill for a portion of the center's cost.

My gripe with the referendum is not necessarily that the new Student Recreation Center isn't needed. A majority of the student body obviously thinks otherwise. My concern is for the minority who opposed the referendum who are now left without a choice. Many students, such as those who live in Granville Towers or in some off-campus apartment complexes, already have access to excellent recreation facilities. Why should these students be forced to pay again?

As student fees approach the cost of in-state tuition, it seems absurd that this center's cost is being added to the long list of campus bills that every student is made to pay. It would seem much more fair to have those students who really want to use the center pay an optional fee, for which they would receive a non-transferable membership card. It is likely that the cost per participant would be higher, but it is also likely that

MR. KHOMAINI,
MR. BAKKER, PRESIDENT
NIXON, MR. MEESE;
I'D LIKE YOU
TO MEET MY
GUESTS: ...



... MR. RUSHDIE,
MISS HAHN, MR.
WOODWARD, AND
MR. FLINT.

the center would be less crowded. (Wasn't that the reason for establishing the center in the first place?) Most importantly, those students who support the center, as well as those who do not, would get what they pay for.

BRIAN NICHOLSON
Sophomore
Economics/political science

An unrealistic resolution

To the editor:

Perhaps I am becoming just a little bit too cynical in my old age, but somehow I find it difficult to get excited about the recent resolution passed by the Student Congress concerning international arms reduction. It seems to me that a pseudo-governmental body which cannot effectively cope with such comparatively insignificant problems as the elimination of student parking spaces on campus, the coordination and

funding of an extensive campus escort service and the eradication of the mandatory \$100 meal plan at Lenoir might be biting off a little bit more than it can chew in its meager attempts to solve America's foreign policy problems. Perhaps the Congress's time might be better spent reendorsing the Golden Rule, or resolving to promote a kinder, gentler nation.

DAVID McCOLLUM
Junior
Chemistry/English

Hospitality not a regional trait

To the editor:

Having come a long way to Chapel Hill to be educated in an open-minded environment, it has disturbed me to find stereotyped attitudes and plain ignorance playing such prevalent roles in students' thinking. Just the other day in Psychology 28, a student noted that a

regional difference concerning hospitality is manifest between Northerners and Southerners. This particular student pointed out that Southerners are downright more hospitable — hence the term "Southern hospitality."

Besides the fact that this term is a blatant stereotype, it is also inherently degrading to non-Southerners, whom it implies are non-hospitable. Hospitality is not a regional trait exclusive to one area, nor is it a cultural characteristic limited to one people. Whether in Booneville, N.C., or Brooklyn, N.Y., hospitality is a personal quality found in individuals who show consideration, friendship, and respect for their fellow human beings.

Simply put, the term "Southern hospitality" is an expression of closed-mindedness and ignorance. Moreover, it is a display of regional arrogance, and I am sorry to say this, but it lacks hospitality.

JOANNA CHRISTIE
Senior
Political science/English

Budget process imperfect but necessary

Donnie Esposito

Guest Writer

This weekend will witness the annual budget hearings of the full Student Congress, which will undoubtedly be accompanied by the customary complaints and dissatisfaction. The budget process is the means by which the Student Congress allocates student activities fees to student organizations. Therefore, in order to diffuse some possible criticisms, it is appropriate to explain the budget process and to demonstrate its necessity.

First of all, the budget process is indeed a long and tedious procedure. Approximately 30 groups will be seeking funds for the 1989-1990 fiscal year. All of these groups will come before the Student Congress on Saturday. As might be expected, it takes a long time to consider each of these 30 budget requests.

In the past, many groups have had complaints about the number and the nature of the questions asked by congress members. Many of these questions seem to display an apparent ignorance of the group's programs and activities. This ignorance is real; in fact, it is practically impossible that any congress member would have extensive knowledge about all the activities of so many groups. And yet, if student funds are to be allocated fairly and equitably, then the information gained

during questioning is necessary to ensure the making of informed decisions.

Admittedly, some questions from congress representatives appear derogatory or condescending in nature. Because of their supposed knowledge of the treasury laws and the budget process, some representatives may seek an opportunity to demonstrate their "knowledge" to themselves and to anyone else present. Occasionally, representatives will also feel compelled to suggest how organizations should be run and what they should do. Such displays can only be tolerated and will hopefully be kept to a minimum this year by the speaker of Student Congress, Neil Riemann.

A further irritant of the budget process is its dependence upon the forms and technicalities of parliamentary procedure. It is conceivable that the substance of a discussion can become subordinated to the proper procedure. At times, representatives will know what they want to do but will not know the proper method. In addition, Student Congress members can

question the representatives of the organizations, but the representatives cannot ask questions themselves or speak unless recognized.

Nevertheless, parliamentary procedure does have its purpose. Without some form of structure, utter chaos would result. A formal procedure allows debate and questioning to occur in an orderly fashion and establishes a means for reaching decisions. When properly implemented, parliamentary procedure seeks to recognize both the majority and minority views and provides organizations with an opportunity to explain and justify their requests. The process may not be perfect, but until a better solution is offered, it is the only recourse to which the Student Congress can turn.

Therefore, the budget process itself appears to be a flawed and tedious affair. However, until a better system is devised that still accomplishes all the goals of the Student Congress, the budget process is a necessary evil.

Donnie Esposito, a sophomore history major from Clemmons, is a Dist. 12 Student Congress representative and a Finance Committee member.