

# The Carolinian

Volume XXXVIII

University of North Carolina at Greensboro, N. C. — Friday, January 17, 1969

Number 24

## Legislature Overrules Board's Decision To Validate Election

### Precedent Is Established

"This particular session was extremely important in establishing a precedent for how this kind of problem would be handled by legislature," Dr. Margaret Hunt, Legislature advisor, said of the special session of legislature.

"I'm very pleased with the conduct of the legislators themselves. I thought that most of them were concerned with trying to find the facts and with trying to resolve an extremely complicated problem."

She further commented, "I think that the proceedings were conducted impartially, and I think that the session also revealed several problems which the legislature might want to handle in the future."

During the special session of Legislature, Dr. Hunt addressed the representatives. In her address, she told them that there were several interpretations

possible of the section concerning appeals to legislature of Elections Board's decisions. She informed the body that they could either consider itself as a judicial body or as a fact-finding body.

"The real purpose in this kind of meeting," she stated, "is for the legislative body to find out what the facts are."

Dr. Hunt also said that she felt that since the Legislature had approved the Elections Board and had approved its policy, then it can be said that the Elections Board is an agent of Legislature. Therefore, it can act instead of its agent.

She finally urged the representatives to base their decisions on the evidence presented in the session, not on opinions of proposals involved or attitudes toward people involved.

## Ketner Resigns Due To Outside Pressures

"I have not resigned from caring; I have just released a title," stated Linda Ketner, Freshman Class President, in a recent interview with the *Carolinian*. Miss Ketner explained that she wished to continue working with the student government in any way she could.

Asked to state the reasons for her resignation, Miss Ketner replied, "I'm so exhausted from outside pressures that I do not wish to comment further and I think I can be more effective outside this imposed situation." Miss Ketner added that her final decision had nothing to do with the GIC issue.

"I wish I could do something to expose the pressures exerted on me, but most of the pressures have been done anonymously and there have already been enough rumors and lies on this campus. Additional comment from me would further complicate the situation."

Miss Ketner turned in her resignation to SGA President Randi Bryant on Friday, January 10, but Miss Bryant has not yet officially accepted the resignation. Miss Ketner does, however, consider her term of office ended.

Miss Bryant commented on Linda Ketner's resignation. "I think it's very unfortunate that a person of Linda Ketner's obvious ability and integrity should feel pressured into resigning. She's done, for all I can tell, a tremendous job in her office and I hate to see such potential as she has displayed wasted. I think it's a shame she's resigning. She has been subject

to what I would consider some very unfair treatment." Miss Bryant added that she knew of no one who could have withstood such pressure and that she did not consider Linda exceptionally weak (because she had to yield to these pressures). "In fact," Miss Bryant continued, "I consider her exceptionally strong, but the pressures were exceptionally great."

How the position will be filled will be determined by Miss Bryant. The alternatives are an election or an appointment by the SGA President, according to the Bylaws of the Student Government Association.

Miss Ketner wished to assure the Freshman Class that their programs would continue. She explained that twenty-nine such programs were now in the works, eighteen of which were originated this year, which are concerned with such areas as educational reform, town students, community projects, incoming freshmen, and increasing enrollments and funds at UNC-G.

The conventional class government has already been restructured into a seven board executive council in order to produce more efficient government. The programs are firmly established and will be continued. Miss Ketner stated, "We now have a concrete foundation and there is no earthly reason why the Freshman Class can't be one of the most active and effective classes on campus."

Miss Ketner did issue an

### Four Hour Session Votes 47-35

By NANCY MOORE  
Assistant News Editor

In an unprecedented action, Legislature Tuesday night overruled the refusal of the Elections Board to invalidate the January 9 referendum. Provision was made for another referendum to be held within four weeks of the beginning of second semester.

The four hour special session of Legislature met to hear an appeals of an Elections Board decision. The Elections Board on Friday, January 10, denied the contestment of the preceding day's referendum. The referendum involved two issues; the first being acceptance of the Greensboro Inter-Collegiate Council's Constitution and the second concerning the responsibility of legislative representatives. The contestment presented by William J. Burckley, John L. Pinnix, Jean Titus, Beth Bolin, and John A. Robinson, Jr., was based on the grounds that the election was not conducted under the Elections Board policy and that gross irregularities occurred.

After the contestment was denied, this same group, with the exclusion of Mr. Pinnix and with the addition of Miss Sarah Barnhill, then appealed the decision of the Elections Board to Legislature. This appeal was made under the authority of Section M of the General Policy of the Elections Board, which states that appeals of the Elections Board's decisions shall be heard and ruled upon by Legislature.

The following is a chronological account of the appeal to legislature:

The session began when Pam Greer, Chairman of Legislature, outlined the procedure for the evening. She stated that the meeting would be conducted in the form of an investigative committee, in that both the contestors and the Elections Board would each have a 30-minute debate period, with each member speaking being subject to questioning after they spoke. After this presentation there was to be a general query period, to be followed by fifteen minutes of general debate.

The house rules were suspended so that Dr. Margaret Hunt, faculty advisor to Legislature, could speak to the representatives. She stated that she was not partisan, but only concerned with the integrity of the legislature as a body. She referred to the session as a grave responsibility since any action would set a precedent because such a situation had never occurred before.

The house rules were again suspended so that non-representatives could speak. All members of the Elections Board who were present at the original contestment hearing and

The following is the text of the two motions introduced by Mary Knight at a special session of Legislature held on Tuesday January 14, 1968.

(1) "Legislature overrules Elections Board's decision and declares the election of Jan. 9, 1969 invalid and demands that Elections Board set a date for the referendum to be rescheduled within 4 weeks after 2nd semester of the 1968-69 school beginning." passed 47-35.

(2) "That the chairman of Legislature shall appoint a committee to review election board policy and that said committee report to legislature by the first election of any type." passed by unanimous consent.

certain members of the group contesting were allowed the right to speak.

Elizabeth Bolin spoke first, arguing for the appeal. Miss Bolin said that the Elections Board decision did not represent the entire campus opinion. She felt that violations of the Elections Board policy had been ignored, and that the students should be given the opportunity for another referendum.

Dale Presson, chairman of the Elections Board, spoke against the appeal. She reported that seven of the ten members of Elections Board were present at the contestment and that all members had been notified of the hearing. She then continued to read the majority report submitted to the Legislature. She also stated that each member of the Elections Board entered the hearing with the realization of their responsibility as impartial jurors. She concluded, "The burden of proof rested with the contestors."

William Burckley then spoke in favor of the appeal. He referred the representatives to the Elections Board statement that "Since the Elections Policy (section I.A.) differentiates between an election and a referendum, the regulations concerning campaigning for elections would not apply to the referendum." Mr. Burckley went on to note that if "referendum" and "elections" were used interchangeably in certain instances, such as students confined to the infirmary being able to vote in a referendum as well as in an election, then they should be used interchangeably in all instances.

John Robinson then spoke in favor of the appeal. According to Mr. Robinson, the Board had previously admitted in discussion that irregularities had occurred, and such difficulties should be sufficient grounds to invalidate the election.

Miss Sarah Barnhill then spoke in favor of the appeal, stating that her statement of appeal would speak for itself. John Pinnix then spoke in favor of the appeal.

Jim Lancaster then spoke against the appeal. He read definitions from a letter from a

Greensboro lawyer, to whom information concerning the contestment and subsequent appeal were submitted for clarification by Legislature representative Erskine Walther.

Randy Friddle then spoke against the appeal, clarifying the Board's position on the campaign material that was supposedly within fifteen feet of the polling place, which is not allowed by Elections Board policy. Mr. Friddle stated that on two occasions, at 8:30 and at 10:00, the dorms were checked for literature within the restricted area and any literature found there was removed to beyond fifteen feet.

At approximately 11:30 p.m. a five minute recess was called.

During the query period that followed, several points were brought to the attention of the assembly. Miss Presson stated that the reasons for the denial of the contestment were contained in the second page of her report to Legislature. Miss Presson also stated that there were "gross irregularities", but these were not considered by the Elections Board to be sufficient grounds to invalidate the election.

In the general debate period that followed this, a motion was made by Miss Mary Knight that Legislature overrule the Elections Board decision and call for a new election. After discussion, which included passage of an amendment which extended the time limit from two to four weeks after the beginning of the first semester, a stand up vote was taken of the representatives. The motion passed, 47-35.

Miss Knight then proposed a second motion calling for the Chairman of Legislature to appoint a committee to review the Elections Board policy and that said committee would report before the next election. This motion passed unanimously.

Pam Greer, Chairman of Legislature then announced that interviews for legislative committees, including the special committee to investigate the Elections Board policy, would be held Monday, January 20, at 7-10 p.m. Interviews are open to any student.



# The Elections Board Controversy: The Original Contestment Election Board's Report To The Legislature

(Editor's note: The following is the complete text of the challenge to the January 9, 1969, constitutional amendment. The challenge was overruled by Elections Board January 10.)

We the undersigned students challenge the referendum on Constitutional Amendments voted on January 9, 1969, on the following grounds:

The election was not conducted under the rules set down within the Elections Board policy adopted by Legislature during the 1967-68 academic year. Specifically, no provisions were made to check ID cards (see section 2, par. b No. 1, No. 2).

Furthermore Elections Board did not authorize any publicity or campaigning other than oral. The circulation of an unsigned flyer and the subsequent rebuttal are a violation of section 6 paragraph e of the Elections Board policy. The sweeping generalities and half truths contained in the original unsigned document had a demonstrable effect on the outcome of the referendum since the rebuttal was printed before the contents of the unsigned document could be determined.

Furthermore, section 3 paragraph b No. 3 of the Elections Board policy stating that the specific campaign time

specified by Elections Board shall be the only time for campaign material was violated. No campaign time was announced.

Furthermore, gross irregularities occurred at several polling places.

(1) Balloting was conducted in the Men's Club Room of Elliott Hall, an unauthorized polling place. The ballot box was left unattended throughout the day, specifically at 2:30, 3:20, and 5:15 p.m.

(2) Town Students Lounge. No one attended the ballot box at 1:30 p.m.

(3) Phillips Hall. At least one instance of a graduate student registering and casting a vote.

Furthermore, reports were heard throughout the day that elections materials were not received until the last minute in the dormitories, that campaign material was placed on ballot boxes, and that persons were instructed how to vote while at the ballot box (specifically Mary Foust Hall).

Therefore, we the undersigned students respectfully request that Elections Board invalidate the results of the January 9, 1969 referendum.

William J. Burckley

John L. Pinnix

Jean Titus

Beth Bolin

John A. Robinson, Jr.

since no I.D. cards had been checked.

8) Two different witnesses testified that the ballot box in the Men's Club Room was left untended by a Poll Watcher at 3:20 through 3:30 p.m. This fact was completely disregarded by Elections Board.

William Burckley

Last Friday night, January 10, Elections Board heard a contestment of which I was one of the signers. The contestment was denied. I am appealing this hearing along with the other signers on the grounds of lack of due process and error in judgment.

Although five students signed this joint contestment, we were called in separately. All of us except Jack Pinnix were there although official notification to appear at the hearing was given only to Bill Burckley. Upon entering the committee room where the hearing was held, I was not asked if I had an opening statement, but was simply asked two questions. After answering these I was allowed to make a statement. I did this, but the Chairman of Elections Board ruled this out of order, and a member of Elections Board was not allowed to question my statement.

I contend that the failure to allow an opening statement, and an arbitrary "out of order" ruling which was itself out of order shows a lack of due process and therefore I appeal this to the Student Legislature of UNC-G.

Jean Titus

Appearing as a witness before the Elections Board during the hearing concerning the validity of the referendum of January 9, 1969, I was denied due process of law. While the Board accepted the validity of my contention, it ignored my evidence. I stated evidence concerning a student sitting for at least one hour within fifteen feet of the official polling area verbally campaigning vehemently against the Greensboro Intercollegiate Council. The Elections Board policy concerning this violation was read in my presence. It said specifically that there was to be no verbal campaigning in the polling area. This area was defined by Elections Board as fifteen feet and it was determined that I could judge fifteen feet. This evidence was obviously completely ignored in the decision as it was a valid (in fact was admitted by Elections Board) violation of the Elections Board policy of 1967-68 by which our Elections Board operates. I was also not informed that I was allowed an opening statement as is provided for in all hearing at this University by the Judicial Policy established by the Student Government Association.

For these reasons I wish to appeal their decision to Legislature.

Sarah P. Barnhill

## My Neighbors



"Coffee, tea or milk?"

(Editor's note: The following is the complete text of the Election Board Chairman Dale Presson's report to Legislature defending the January 10 decision that upheld the January 9 referendum.)

Seven of the ten members of Elections Board were present to hear a contestment and a formal inquiry on Friday night, January 10, 1969, at nine-thirty o'clock. Present were Dale Presson, Chairman; Jim Lancaster, Vice-chairman; Harry Alexander, secretary; Donna Bolick; Randy Friddle; Dot Sox; Mike Walters; and Molly Young.

Dale Presson read the contestment which had been submitted by William J. Burckley, John L. Pinnix, Jean Titus, Beth Bolin, and John A. Robinson, Jr. The sections in the 1967-68 Elections Board Policy that had been cited in the contestment were read, as was the flyer circulated by S.T.A.R.T. which was also submitted with the contestment.

Having been told by John L. Pinnix that William J. Burckley would be spokesman for the group the chairman then asked Mr. Burckley to sit before the Board. Having presented his opening statement, Mr. Burckley then answered questions from the Board. He then gave his closing statement. Since Mr. Burckley had said that he knew little concerning the sixth paragraph (i.e., elections materials, campaign material in balloting areas, and voting under duress in Mary Foust Hall), he suggested that we talk to Beth Bolin. After Mr. Burckley had left, Miss Bolin was asked to come in. She had no additional information to contribute but added that Jean Titus could answer the questions about the sixth paragraph. Miss Titus answered the question concerning the distribution of elections materials. At Miss Titus' suggestion, "Beth Bolin's little sister" was asked to testify. While the contestors were locating her, the Board asked John A. Robinson, Jr., to testify. Mr. Robinson, Jr., brought his tape recorder for his own "protection" but assured the Board that the tape would not be misused. Sara Barnhill, "Beth Bolin's little sister's roommate," explained the section on verbal campaigning in Mary Foust Hall.

It was voted unanimously that the members of Elections Board who were not present should not be able to vote by absentee ballot since they were not present for the discussions. A secret ballot was taken among the seven members. These were tallied by the chairman and the vice-chairman of the Board. The vote was four to three to deny the contestment.

Due to the nature of the new ID cards (i.e., encased in plastic), it was not feasible to attempt to mark them in any way. The signing of a registration sheet was considered legal in lieu thereof.

Since the Elections Policy (section I.A.) differentiates between an election and a referendum, the regulations concerning campaigning for elections would not apply to referendums.

Ballots had been distributed in every hall and TSA lounge the previous night. Since polls do not open until eight o'clock in the morning, the materials were received in plenty of time. Several members of the Elections Board had checked many halls for campaign material which had been placed on the ballot box. They had checked at least two times during the balloting hours. All material was promptly removed. Miss Barnhill was questioned concerning voting under duress in Mary Foust Hall. She admitted that the voting was still by secret ballot and that the girl was too far away to note the marking of a ballot.

Concerning the "irregularity" of several polling areas, the Men's Club Room of Elliott Hall has always been a legal polling place. There also is nothing in the constitution or in the Elections Board Policy which denied graduate students the right to vote on this campus.

The burden of proof rested with the contestors. Upon close scrutiny of the registration sheets of the TSA lounge and of the Men's Club Room, the Board pointed out to the contestors that in spite of any allegations of any absence of poll-tenders, the number registered and the number voting checked out perfectly; that is to say, that there was a signature for each ballot that was cast.

## Minority Report

(Editor's note: The following is a minority Elections Board report, filed by board member Dot Sox)

I feel compelled by my disillusionment with the total ignoring of the democratic processes in the decision of January 10, 1969, concerning the constitutional referendum of January 9, 1969, of the Elections Board to write this dissenting opinion. As a member of Elections Board, I heard witnesses abused, not allowed opening and/or closing statements, evidence suppressed and ignored, contradictory interpretation of policy, exclusion of ex officio members, board members were not given a copy of the contestment of Elections Board policy, board members were not allowed to ask certain questions, and no explanation of the verdict. On these grounds I would like to lodge a protest against the decision of January 10 in the form of a dissenting opinion.

The witnesses were treated with hostility and often asked insulting questions. The fact that four of the five signing witnesses wished to testify annoyed several members of the board. The five witnesses all signed one contestment which covered each of their cases in the interest of saving time and effort for Elections Board. The board expected only one witness to testify in behalf of the group. This would have meant that

(Continued on page 3)

## The Statements Of Appeal

Whereas, the Elections Board of UNC-G knowingly ruled on a contestment of the Constitutional Referendum of January 10, 1969 without the presence or notification of the advisor, Mrs. Gross, of said board and;

Whereas said board knowingly disregarded testimony proving irregularities and negligence of the part of poll watchers and even a board member, and;

Whereas, ex officio members of said board were excluded from the aforementioned hearing;

Therefore, I the undersigned appeal the decision of the UNC-G Elections Board on the grounds of lack of due process and gross negligence.

John A. Robinson, Jr.

I respectfully request that the decision of the Elections Board on the night of January 10, 1969 which represented a violation of the trust placed in them by Legislature, be appealed to Legislature. This appeal is based upon the fact that the decision came after a hearing that denied due process of law and completely ignored the principle of *stau decisis*. At no time during the period that I testified before the Board was I advised of any of my rights as a witness—specifically the right to make an opening and closing statement. Furthermore, although the contention was made as a group and we attempted to enter as a group, this was denied us. Moreover, no attempt was made by the Elections Board to question me

on any facts in the contention of which I had knowledge, indicating gross negligence upon the part of the Elections Board. Elizabeth A. Bolin

I the undersigned challenge the decision of Elections Board on its verdict not to invalidate the referendum on Constitutional Amendments voted on January 9, 1969 on the following grounds:

1) There was a gross lack of due process on the parts of Elections Board.

2) They would not allow the petitioning students to enter as a group, even though the original contestment had been signed by a number of people.

3) No faculty advisor was present.

4) Members of Elections Board who were openly opposed to the GIC were allowed to sit in and to vote.

5) The board vice-chairman stated that the Elections Board policy would be taken literally, i.e. the primary definition of a word would be used to interpret the policy yet several times they contradicted themselves.

6) Elections Board vice-chairman stated that all students including Graduate students were allowed to vote.

7) When asked why no ballot box was placed in Spencer Annex if graduate students were in fact allowed to vote the Vice-Chairman of Elections Board replied that it was a part of North Spencer and that in fact some graduate students may have voted in North Spencer



# The Official Documents

(Continued from page 2)

hearsay evidence was to be used. The board reluctantly allowed all the complaining witnesses to testify, but did not in one instance allow them to testify on the violation which they had witnessed.

Several witnesses were not allowed opening and/or closing statements. Sarah Barnhill was denied an opening statement. Beth Bolin was denied both. John Robinson was denied an opening statement. The Judicial Policy of UNC-G requires that all witnesses at all hearings be allowed opening and closing statements. I assume that this policy concerns even Elections Board.

Several times witnesses were not allowed to volunteer information. This was notable in the case of Miss Titus. One of the points of the contestment concerned the influencing of voters and used Mary Foust dormitory as an example. Miss Titus attempted to testify concerning voter influencing in Winfield and was stopped. I, a full member of Elections Board, questioned Miss Titus concerning this irregularity and was informed by the chairman and vice-chairman that I could not ask this question. Miss Bolin was questioned concerning portions of the contestment other than the one to which she was a witness, and only by insisting was allowed to express her contestment.

The contestment was submitted at 6:00 p.m. to the chairman and a meeting of the board was called for 9:00 p.m. In the interim the chairman and the vice-chairman allowed no one on the board to see the contestment. They spent this period preparing a case against the contestment. At 9:30, the board members were read the contestment by the chairman but were not given a copy or

allowed to use it to refer to ask questions. The chairman and vice-chairman were allowed this right. Since the contestment was rather lengthy and involved at least five infractions, it would have been in the interest of justice to allow each member to have a copy to refer to in the questioning. The aforementioned exclusion in most instances limited the questioning to the chairman and vice-chairman. By this means, both the rights of the persons contesting and of the other board members were violated. We were not allowed to have the copy of the policy to refer to in the questioning, either.

The president and vice-president of SGA are ex officio (voting) members of Elections Board. They were not asked to attend and the president was called at 10:00 to appear as a witness. She was kept waiting until she was in the Elections Board office. The advisor to Elections Board was not notified of the meeting at all. She was not present.

Evidence proving beyond a doubt that a violation was committed was either ignored or brushed off with a cliché or non sequitur. Miss Barnhill testified that she had witnessed an attempt to influence voters in Mary Foust dorm. She stated that there was a student sitting within 15 feet of the poll campaigning vehemently against the GIC for at least one hour. The Elections Board policy specifically states under "Section III. Routine Procedure to be followed by Elections Board," "Paragraph C. Campaigning," that "No verbal campaigning shall take place at the balloting area during voting hours. The board defined balloting area as 15 feet and further determined that Miss Barnhill could judge 15 feet. She

was even questioned concerning the vehemence of the campaigning which has no significance as defined in the Elections Board policy, which the Board has previously taken so literally as to use only first listed definitions. The complaint was dismissed by a statement of free speech in America by the chairman. In the case of the use of only the first meanings of words the two words "election" and "referendum" were concerned. In the incomplete dictionary for college students, the first definition of the word "election" is "the formal choice of a person or persons for any position or dignity, usually by ballot." The second definition is "popular vote upon any question officially proposed." The definition of referendum is "the submission of a proposed public measure or law that has been passed upon by a legislature or convention to a vote of the people for ratification or rejection." The board ruled finally that a referendum was a type of election but that an election was not necessarily a referendum. In most cases in the policy the word election was used instead of referendum in outlining campaign procedures, voting procedures, etc. The board ruled that, although a referendum is a type of election and since it was not specifically named in these procedures they did not refer to referendums. Included in these procedures was routine procedure for Elections Board. It seems that only small isolated positions of the policy apply to referendums and that the board may invent its own policy as each case arises. This does not seem to be the spirit of the tradition of the provision for an Elections Board policy to be followed by the board.

Miss Titus, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Burckley all testified

concerning the negligence of poll watchers in the Town Students' lounge. Miss Presson stated that she had been in the lounge when Miss Titus voted, but she (Miss Presson) had previously stated that she had not been called upon to help watch any poll. This seems to be a rather odd discrepancy. Mr. Robinson and Mr. Burckley testified that at 3:20 the poll in the Men's Clubroom (not Town Student's Lounge) was completely unwatched for at least 10 minutes. The Elections Board policy specifically states that the polls shall be watched at all times. All three of the witnesses stated that they did not have to show their ID's to vote. The student must show his ID card and have it stamped in order to register. The board ruled that it was not feasible to stamp the present ID's but could not rule that they not be presented. I was shocked by the breakdown in the democratic process in this hearing.

The abuses of the rights of the witnesses, the inability of board members to ask certain questions, and the total ignoring of several valid proofs of violations of Elections Board Policy have made me submit this minority opinion, to show that the entire Elections Board did not agree with the process or the ruling of the hearing of Jan. 10, 1969.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dot Sox

## JOHN F. KENNEDY

"...ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country." Inaugural Address (Jan. 20, 1961)

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds,  
new Freedom Shares

## -Ketner-

(Continued from page 1)

official statement of her resignation, which was as follows: "It is with great regret that I have resigned as President of the Freshman Class, for I love UNC-G and the Freshman Class. I have resigned because of outside pressures that were too great for me to accept along with the normal pressures of being a freshman and being the president of a class. I thank sincerely all of those who have supported me and stuck by me."

(Notice: Committee interviews for all legislative committees will be held Monday night 7:00-10 in Pam Greer's office.)

## MATCHLESS BEAUTY

The beauty of Southern forests... the enjoyment they provide... are matchless. Let's keep it that way. Protect Southern forests by being extra careful with matches. Hold them until cold, then break them in two. Appoint yourself guardian of our Southern forests. They deserve it.



HELP PREVENT  
FOREST FIRES  
IN THE SOUTH





# The Carolinian

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

Published twice weekly during the school year by the students of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Editorial opinions expressed herein are the views of the writers. All unsigned editorials are by the editor. All letters to the editor must be signed and in the Carolinian office by noon Mondays. Letters should be concise, typed and a duplicate copy must be enclosed. Member of Associated Collegiate Press. Telephone: University extension 379-5227; Office: 201 Elliott Hall, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, N. C. 27412. Second class postage paid at Greensboro, N. C.



**CPS**

COLLEGE  
PRESS SERVICE

AN AGENCY OF THE U.S. STUDENT PRESS ASSOCIATION



REPRESENTED FOR NATIONAL ADVERTISING BY  
**National Educational Advertising Services**

A DIVISION OF  
READER'S DIGEST SALES & SERVICES, INC.  
360 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017

## editorial

It is both with a sense of sorrow and disgust that we note the resignation of freshman class President Linda Ketner. The freshman class is being denied the talents and services of their duly elected president because of the willful, spiteful, and vindictive actions of certain individuals determined to rule (or obstruct), no matter whose personal reputation they demand in the process.

Miss Ketner is not the first official who has been the subject of unjust attacks and unsubstantiated rumors calculated to serve the personal ends of unreasoning individuals. Nor will she be the last as long as the student-citizens of this community sit complacently by while one of their fellow students is crucified by lies.

A high SGA official has observed more than once that the favorite pastime of UNC-G students is spreading and listening to rumors. Well, a fine, decent student leader has just been forced out of office. And it can happen again, and again, as long as individual students let it happen. Is it worth the price?

### (EDITOR'S NOTE)

Two specific issues necessitated the publication of this "Extra" issue of the *Carolinian* on the eve of exams. The first is discussed above. The second is last Tuesday's special session of legislature. In order to be fair to all sides we have handled this matter by reprinting the full text of all of the official documents presented to the body.

### The Carolinian

John L. Pinnix  
editor  
Cheryl Parry  
business and advertising manager

Marie Nahikian  
associate editor

Asst. Managing Editors . . . . . Millie Sharpe, Carolyn Stone  
Managing editor . . . . . Pat Quinn  
News editor . . . . . Marian Morgan  
Assistant news editor . . . . . Nancy Moore  
Political editor . . . . . Beth Bolin  
Assistant Advertising Manager . . . . . Debby Stegall  
Photographers . . . . . Ed Woodard, David Moore, Phil Link  
Lynn Moulton, H.E. Link, III, H. Milton Gunn  
Layout editor . . . . . Rebecca Wilson  
Copy editor . . . . . Dee Bedsole  
Circulation manager . . . . . H. Caroline Russell  
General staff . . . . . Judy Leonard, Betty Chunn, Sarah Barnhill, Pat Clappse, Nanker Phelge, Carolyn Stone, Susan Schmalbach, Debby King, Linda Klopman, Lee Keating, Dotty Lambeth, Kathy Viverette, Maureen Walsh, Millie Sharpe, Ada Fisher, Cheryl East, Sylvia Tuttle, Betty Vanstory, Dianne Murray, Katura Williams, Annie King, Nancy Robinson, Ann Wynecoff, Carol Levenson, Susan Morgan.

# Letters To The Editor

To the Editor:

What has happened to politics on this campus? When I came here as a freshman last year, I heard it was "dirty" from upperclassmen, but I didn't believe it. Well, I found out quickly in some of the elections last year.

I have found that once you hold an office on this campus you are up for criticism, rumors, slander, etc. But now it has gone deeper. It is pretty bad when an officer decides to resign because of "crack pot" calls at early morning hours, anonymous letters and "petty" gossip. What causes this? Simply the fact that you support someone or something because you believe in them. You don't believe in them because someone else does, but for your own self. Then, because you hold an office you are harassed and criticized. Clean, honest, and sincere criticism is welcomed, but gossip and slander is just too much. Being a class president is a hard job, but you run for the office and you work like crazy for your class. Besides this, you must remember we are students too, and we have to study. It is a pressing and nerve racking job sometimes, but you love it. But, how long could you last if you got phone calls at early morning hours and anonymous letters?

This is what Linda Ketner, Freshman Class President, has been going through. She is a darn good president and she is leading her class well. Are you going to let her resign because of certain minority groups on this campus who are harassing her? Freshman year is rough, as we all know, and you have many problems, but this should not add to them.

Linda is a good leader, and she has exceptional leadership ability. She is not resigning because she can't handle the job and is admitting defeat. I know Linda too well. I must say I don't blame her for resigning. It is a full-time job being class president and student. There is just not time to fight the dirty, "petty," "mickey mouse" politics that exists on this campus. I am not knocking fair play politics, but plain ole "mud." We have all seen it in past years, especially the SGA elections last year. It is time to clean it up. Only you, the students of UNC-G can do it.

Susan Ruzicka,  
Sophomore Class President

To the Editor:

The action taken by legislature last Tuesday night was done in the most tense session that body has seen all year—probably the tensest it has been in quite a long time. And indeed, it was totally unprecedented.

However, many members of legislature did not wish to stand by and let the action taken by elections board concerning the contestment stand. Some maintained that individual legislators were arguing the case only to get another chance for the campus to vote on the Greensboro Inter-Collegiate Council—an issue that has been under debate practically the entire semester. Indeed it was unfortunate that the GICC was defeated, but that was not the reason for legislature's action. Legislature based its decision on the fact that there was an error in judgment on behalf of elections board, as well as some questioning of the manner in which the board heard the contestment. This special session of legislature brought to the body's attention the fallacies in the board's policy—mainly its vagueness. The most important

outcome of the session is not found in the decision to overrule elections board decision, but to investigate the makeup of the policy and write one that might provide a means for a more organized and smoothly run election. That was the purpose of legislature's action as I see it.

The reason I moved for election boards decision to be overruled and another election date established seemed to me to be the fairest and quickest way the matter could be settled. Fairest, in that if signs and lobbying or campaigning was carried on within 15 feet of the polling place (and I believe that there was) then the campus will have a chance to show if they were improperly influenced or not. It is also the quickest because if the body had decided to send the appeal to a special committee then that committee would have had to report back to legislature probably either February 5 or as late as February 19. At the time of that report, legislature could have accepted or rejected that committee's proposal. A lot of time would have been wasted on the middle man.

It is my sincerest desire that another appeals case not come before legislature. Not because it was a tense session . . . but because I wish to see elections board take the responsibility of following guidelines that do not yield themselves to a great deal of variation in interpretation so that elections on this campus may become consistent in procedure and well carried out. And if a contestment does arise again, then the board should have procedure established for hearing contestments and guidelines as to what they would consider sufficient irregularities in an election to invalidate it. Hopefully, this will happen now that legislature has acted as the "big Daddy" to elections board and given them help in forming those policies and guidelines.

Mary Knight

To the Editor:

As a student in this University, I would like to comment about the recent voting on the Constitution of the GIC.

First of all, when I first entered UNC-G, I was astounded by the tremendous apathy which exists on this campus. During last week's voting, I was glad to see that two sides of an issue were being presented, because I realized that many students began for the first time to take an active interest in school issues. I also believe, however, that the superemotionally-charged atmosphere brought on the poor turnout at the polls. Also, the tremendous amount of threatening and mudslinging kept students away from the polls, and has even caused the resignation of our freshman class president, whom we all admired and knew was a great candidate for the job. I do not believe that in that heated emotional atmosphere, where there is a question of proper elections procedure, that many students voted with clear, rational minds. I know I didn't. Furthermore, I believe there was at least one great man in history who followed the rule, "I may not agree with what you are saying, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." This does not include threatening or cajoling to force one person's opinion on 6,000.

As for myself, I close by stating that I myself am in favor of another referendum, because I sincerely believe that if there are serious defects in the Constitution of the GICC, then we the students of this school will realize it. I urge every

student in this school to look at both sides of the issue and see what's behind both sides, and then vote as you wish. Don't let people fool you to dismiss your own feelings and listen to theirs. If SGA wants this Constitution so badly, it seems to me that there is sufficient reason for us to take another, unbiased look.

Susan Morgan

To the Editor:

Re: the non-ratification of the GIC constitution by the UNC-G student body in the referendum of January 9, 1969:

Had district representatives properly represented the pros and cons of the proposed GIC constitution in district meetings, then the statements contained in the unsigned flyer which "rehashed the objections heard in legislature" would have been nothing new to the students and could not possibly have affected the referendum results. Clearly, some SGA representatives are misrepresenting legislature to their districts and/or their districts to legislature, if indeed they hold district meetings and represent legislature and their districts at all.

Amy Sexton

Letter to the Editor:

An encouraging aspect of the recent Presidential election is the fact that the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY candidates appeared by invitation before college and university groups.

This indicates that students and faculty members were interested in what the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY nominees had to say compared to the other candidates.

I hope that Women's College of the University of North Carolina gets around to inviting a representative of the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY.

It is interesting to note that in Virginia, Henning A. Blomen, Presidential candidate of the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY, received 4,900 votes, a substantial increase compared to 1964.

Readers who are not familiar with Socialism as advocated by the SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY are invited to write for free literature to the SLP-116 Nassau Street-Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201.

Nathan Pressman  
Socialist Labor Party, N.Y.

## Letters

ALL LETTERS TO THE  
EDITOR ARE WELCOMED.  
THEY SHOULD BE CON-  
CISE, TYPED AND A DU-  
PLICATE COPY MUST BE  
ENCLOSED.

### EMMA LAZARUS

"Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning  
to be free,  
The wretched refuse of your  
teeming shore,  
Send these, the homeless,  
tempest-tossed, to me:  
I lift my lamp beside the  
golden door."  
The New Colossus:  
Inscription  
for the Statue of Liberty, New  
York Harbor

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds,  
new Freedom Shares