

DAVID STACKS, Editor

MICHELE MECKE, Managing Editor
MICHAEL WADE, Associate Editor
GARY TERPENING, Associate Editor

MARTHA WAGGONER, News Editor
EDDIE MARKS, University Editor
CAROL HANNER, City Editor
KATHY CURRY, State and National Editor

REID TUVIM, Sports Editor
SUSAN LADD, Features Editor
LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor
ANDY JAMES, Photography Editor
DINITA JAMES, Weekender Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

87th year of editorial freedom

Many happy returns

Today at *The Daily Tar Heel*, we shelve our preoccupation with world, community and campus concerns and our cynical musings on life and do something wholly sentimental, mostly sappy, but honest and just for us. We toast ourselves and a newspaper we love and a tradition we feel very deeply.

Tonight and into tomorrow we celebrate as a new editor and his staff take office and old hands clean out desks and move on. We also commemorate the 87th birthday of *The Daily Tar Heel*, which falls on Saturday. In usual fashion, it will be a kick-out-the-jams bash.

But interspersed with the revelry will be some thoughtful reflection on the nature of comings and goings, of change and of tradition that remains unchanged—*The Daily Tar Heel* itself. It is appropriate that the newspaper's birthday coincides with the passage of this editorship, for it reminds us again how strong the roots of the paper are. It reminds us how each year the old and the new meld with the always—the heritage of fairness and earnest endeavor at excellence touched with humor—that has passed through these pages since 1893.

In February of that year the first issue of this newspaper appeared as a weekly tabloid under the auspices of the University Athletic Association. The first front page pledged "with no little trepidation" to "contain a summary of all occurrences in the University and village of Chapel Hill."

Chapel Hill since has begun to lose its village flavor and *The Daily Tar Heel* has evolved into a more professional-looking newspaper. The paper has noted the major happenings of the world and the University: depression and war, peace and prosperity, basketball championships and protest marches. Sometimes it has soared and sometimes it has fallen flat, but it always has tried to capture the spirit of the times. Dozens of editors have come and gone, and each has left his mark on the paper. Writers and editors of yesteryear cherished their newspaper, and like staff members today they self-consciously pondered the hold it had on them.

The seniors who end their careers at *The Daily Tar Heel* today have given much thought this week to what it is that drew them to the newspaper and kept them here for 40 or more hours a week for three or four years, and to what makes the thought of leaving so foreign and so painful. Part of the attraction, of course, is the typical newsman's ego boast: seeing your name in print, knowing the people who make things happen, getting the inside scoop. But for that, we could have worked on any paper, and any paper would have paid more than the pittance we receive here. *The Daily Tar Heel*, however, offers other rewards.

In the same way that past editors shared victories and battles and assassinations with their readers, we brought important news to ours—and we felt it with them. We watched Jimmy Carter walk with his family up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol, and we chortled at Billy and Bert Lance. We sat up and cried with winning and losing candidates in town and on campus, and we played along with the Blue Sky Party and the Unknown Candidate. We kept our eyes on University administrators, always hoping for an opportunity to poke fun. We championed students' rights to have a say in University decision making, and we demanded academic freedom and responsibility. We went to the Peach, Liberty and Gator bowls, and we silently drowned our sorrows after the Carolina-Marquette heartbreaker.

We hope that what we have reported or praised or criticized has made a difference, but we have known all along that newsprint yellows fast. Still, our work lasted for a day at least, and we had the satisfaction of knowing that we were read and that we were the voice for the students of this University. Today, we are finding it difficult to pass that voice to someone else.

We love this newspaper, and we may have given more of our time and energy and devotion to it than to any other endeavor in our lives thus far. We know that those who come after us will do the same, but today it is hard to leave in their hands what is so much a part of us.

Tonight, though, we will try not to dwell on that. We will toast our successors and our new freedom. By Sunday, we will have entered that tradition, now in its 88th year, that proclaims on the newspaper's nameplate its service to the students and the University community. We believe that overall, *The Daily Tar Heel* has served those students and that community—and especially those who have loved it and gone on—in fine style. Happy Birthday.

A tough and incisive column on an issue of much importance

By MICHAEL WADE

Seniors, especially those few of us who have become used to the idea of spilling our guts via typewriter into the campus fishwrap, can make an awful mess of an editorial page if they're not careful. The syrupy nostalgia that starts oozing onto the page about this time every year can really get dreary. Not that we have any grand illusions that anyone looks to "Locally" for "incisive, hard-hitting analysis of what's in the news today," but we think you prefer anything—even columns on the shah—to the prospect of allowing some sap to exercise his alleged intellect with esoteric sentimentalities in your paper.

Several lines up, I wrote "can really get" instead of "really can get," which is a style rule I haven't managed to get down pat in four years of writing for the paper. Some editor, somewhere, is going to agree with me that it just sounds smoother the first way. But on the whole, I'd say I've improved since the day I meandered in here after going to Swain Hall to get my ID picture made and timidly asked somebody about applying for a "staff position." Now I don't even worry about the unprinted libelous letters to the editor that question my right to life.

Locally, it was a fine time to be working for *The Tar Heel*. We had an election in Chapel Hill last November, and one of the biggest issues was an open-space bond referendum in the Ridgefield area. I was city editor then, and it was my job to know all about what an open-space bond was and the exact location of Ridgefield. We ran a lot of stories intended to give those answers to our readers. When I said Ridgefield, it all suddenly snapped into place in your mind, didn't it? Right.

Gubernatorial debate sets pace for race

By JIM HUMMEL

It wasn't Nixon vs. Kennedy or Ford vs. Carter, but last weekend's gubernatorial debate between candidates Jim Hunt and Bob Scott gave North Carolina voters a glimpse of the type of campaign that likely will be waged in the coming months.

When the dust settled in Greensboro Saturday night, Scott emerged as an aggressive politician, attacking the incumbent Hunt and repeating the fiery rhetoric that has marked the challenger's campaign so far. Each of the Democratic candidates is pushing toward the state's election primary on May 6, and a victory that will pit the nominee against Republican I. Beverly Lake Jr. in November.

In the typical post-debate fashion that seems to be in vogue these days, both candidates claimed victory, with Hunt charging that many of Scott's questions were not worth answering. The governor deflected much of Scott's attack, opting to concentrate on the accomplishments of his three-year tenure.

Hunt will have to fend off the stream of criticism that has been leveled against his administration if he wants to campaign on his record. As perhaps the most powerful chief executive in the state's recent history, Hunt has gained national recognition and remained a strong supporter of President Jimmy Carter—but with that

reputation come charges that the Hunt administration has developed a political machine which is putting government further from the state's citizens. A news leak several weeks ago about memorandums written to Hunt by a state employee concerning political loyalty of certain state officials did not help to bolster the administration's credibility.

The governor continually points to his record since taking office in 1976 and says he has fulfilled every campaign promise except for ratifying the Equal Rights Amendment. He likes to project the image of a hard-worker, and because of his efforts to cover all bases in the state, has not established a distinguishing feature for his administration.

The State

Like his opponent, Scott also will have to establish credibility with the voters. Just before he stepped down as governor in January 1973, Scott provoked the wrath of many North Carolinians by raising taxes and playing hard-handed politics. Whether the memory of his unpopularity will affect his campaign won't be known for several months.

At first a supporter of a state constitutional amendment allowing governors to serve for two terms, Scott reversed his position recently, leaving many wondering if he changed his mind for political reasons or

because he really changed his philosophy of gubernatorial tenure.

The challenger hopes he can remind people of his accomplishments in the four years he served as governor. Among his stronger moves was the reorganization of state government and the state's universities, which led to the formation of the present 16-campus UNC system.

In keeping with another popular trend, both candidates are pushing a conservative view on the issues. Scott has promised a cut in state spending and a reduction in the size of the bureaucracy if elected. He says Hunt's office staff has increased by 130 percent in the last three years.

Hunt, however, is well skilled in riding the wave of public sentiment. During the Proposition 13 tax-cut fever in 1978, the governor pushed for a modest income tax cut during the following legislative session.

At this point the governor seems to be in the driver's seat, using the advantages of an incumbent as he proved several weeks ago by supporting a popular 10-percent pay raise for teachers and state employees. Scott may have had his only chance Saturday night to confront Hunt face to face in a debate, but he probably will unleash a new set of attacks in hopes of regaining the position he once enjoyed.

Jim Hummel, a sophomore journalism major from Grafton, Mass., is editorial assistant for The Daily Tar Heel.

Letters to the editor

Students have voice in curriculum changes

To the editor:

I wish to respond to the letter from J.B. Kelly and Jeff Koeze, "Will a stricter curriculum be stronger," (*DTH* Feb. 20), about my committee's report proposing curricular changes for our University. First, as to the statement that the goals of the University for undergraduate education have not been made clear, I can only say that they are by far clearer and more explicit in our report than in any curriculum or proposed curriculum I am aware of, including our present one. As we explain in the report, our curricular proposals grow out of a series of stated education goals, and the categories of requirements are all built around stated educational aims. I doubt that you will find any university curriculum more explicit about its bases and aims than our proposed one.

Second, as to the role of students in forming this new curriculum, let me say first that I do not share Boston University President John Silber's belief that students should have no say in these matters. There were three students on the original committee, as full participants and voting members. I have myself during the past several months met with many student groups to discuss the report and to hear their suggestions. And last and most important, our curricular proposals have not yet been given their final form; the report is at this time undergoing review and revision by nine subcommittees, each charged to examine one section of the proposal. The chairmen of these subcommittees have been given copies of the "Preliminary Analysis of the Thornton Curriculum Report" done by Student Government, and most of these subcommittees have student members, as does the larger coordinating committee composed of the nine chairmen, Dean Samuel Williamson, Assistant Dean W.J. McCoy, and myself. I would urge any student who has suggestions to make about the proposed curriculum either to communicate these ideas to Debbie Gray (coordinator of Student Government's Educational Policy Committee and student member of the coordinating committee), or to write directly to Dean Williamson or to me conveying his suggestions. Any letters we receive will be made available to the chairmen of the appropriate subcommittees.

Weldon Thornton
Professor of English
Chairman, Committee to Review
the Undergraduate Curriculum

Pursuit of liberty

To the editor:
I would like to respond to some comments made about my letter

Remember last spring when the big story about Title IX and women's athletics broke? It was on the front page of all the local papers, except this one, because the guy who was state and national editor was a little green and missed it when it came over the wire. I'm sorry, but, hey, my writers came back with a terrific follow-up local-reaction piece the next day.

I would like to thank the gentleman who called me a couple of weeks ago to ask me just who I thought I was to have the effrontery to edit his six-page, single spaced letter that began with a 197-word sentence. I thank him because I must have learned something from the experience.

I spent a good part of Tuesday out of the office, trying to track down a professor so I could get the orange computer card from him. That's the card you have to turn in after you fill out the drop form in triplicate and get your adviser to sign it. This semester I finally got tired of hunting for the professor, and I marched into Hanes Hall and handed the woman the drop form. "I couldn't find the professor anywhere," I said defiantly, steeling my frame for the skirmish I knew was coming.

Locally

"OK, just tell the professor you dropped his course." I managed to make my way out of Hanes Hall before I realized the immensity of what I had done. It had taken three and a half years to discover that the orange card is just a little sliver of cardboard that really doesn't require an annual offering of several anxious hours spent trying to locate a professor. That would have made a decent column, which would have throbbed with cynicism and no doubt would have caused a mild titter around the office at Hanes Hall—provided somebody over there got done with the crossword and happened to glance at the back page.

Read the column on the shah to your right; it would have been minic. But I called dibs on "Locally" this week.

Michael Wade, a senior journalism major from Cary, is associate editor for The Daily Tar Heel.



supporting registration, "Registration necessary," (*DTH*, Feb. 18). It seems that virtually all people agree that our country deserves support in its pursuit of individual liberties and that this policy is correct. I heartily endorse this sentiment. But the question arises as to how the greatest amount of our individual liberties can be preserved in the world as it is today.

The inescapable fact is that 31 percent of the oil we import comes from the Persian Gulf. By 1985 that figure will be 34 percent. While conservation is the best way at this time to help reduce our dependence on oil, no one who is even faintly realistic believes that, in itself, conservation can cure our energy problem in the near future.

What would happen if the Soviet Union took control of the Persian Gulf? Those of us who remember the anarchy that a 5 percent cutback in oil supplies caused should try to imagine what a 20 percent cutback would cause. Would this confusion be conducive to the pursuit of individual liberties?

I am not saying we should fight for oil for its own sake, but rather we should fight for it, if necessary, because our society, as well as its freedoms, now is dependent on oil. We should work to

reduce that need as quickly as possible. To ignore this fact and mouth idealistic phrases which sound good—but mean little to potentially hostile countries—is to endanger the liberties we wish to preserve. We need to look realistically at the world as it is and strive to turn it into the place we wish it to be.

Neil Henis
602-B Hibbard Drive

Where to park?

To the editor:
I have spent more money on parking tickets and towing fees since I have been at Chapel Hill than I have on tuition. You can go ahead and scoff at my situation and say it is my own fault, and I'll send you my accumulating bills for you to pay. Or you can be helpful and tell me just where the hell you can park safely and legally on this campus, and I'll be indebted to you forever.

For some of us countrified students, buses are not the answer. There is no bus route where I live. Thus, a car is a great necessity. I could ride a bike, you might suggest, and conserve gas at the same time. However, after being run over by a

careless driver when walking in a pedestrian median on Franklin Street two years ago, I have acquired a particular phobia about attempting the particular feat of pedaling down a narrow two-lane highway.

As for parking stickers for various lots...? After practically selling my soul to obtain a precious card at some exorbitant price, I discovered that nine out of 10 times it proved to be a ticket to a full lot.

So where does that leave us? Ah yes, the parking meters. If you are lucky enough to spot an empty place along the street, by the time you shove in enough money to purchase the maximum allotted time of 50 minutes, walk to class (usually clear across campus) and try to stay awake during lecture (so you can run back to your car in order to move it to another spot for the next class), a nice friendly policeman has left you a memorable little fine plastered to your windshield. That is on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Tuesday and Thursday classes? Forget it. I ask you—where in the hell do you park on this campus?

Candy Clapp
1507 Smith Level Road

Deposed monarch irrevocably linked to Iranian crisis

By GARY TERPENING

Deposed Shah of Iran Mohammed Reza Pahlavi whiles away his days walking in the sand and surf and playing tennis on the Panamanian island of Contadora. The balmy warmth of his home in exile can do little, though, to remove him from the crisis in Tehran.

Chances that the crisis will end quickly improve each day. U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim formally announced Wednesday the formation of a commission to investigate alleged crimes of the shah, and in Washington, official reaction was cautious but optimistic. The U.N. panel long has been considered a requisite for the release of 53 Americans—50 at the U.S. Embassy in downtown Tehran and three diplomats at the Foreign Ministry—and Waldheim's announcement understandably raises hopes that the hostages soon will be released.

But the United States' caution tempers, as it should, any optimism. The jumbled, confusing, often contradictory politics of dealing with three or more official Iranian spokesmen has taught President Jimmy Carter's foreign-policy advisors that there is no recourse but caution. Signals made by student militants who seized the embassy 110 days ago, ill, bedridden Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, newly-elected Iranian President Abolhasan Bani-Sadr and Iranian Foreign Minister Sadegh Ghotbzadeh often prove difficult for Western analysts to decipher.

The formation of the U.N. panel has drawn typical responses from Iran's motley foreign policy mouthpieces. The student militants adamantly demand the return of the shah. Ghotbzadeh also says the shah must be returned if the hostages are to be

released—but the foreign minister tends to waver occasionally, and his stance remains unclear.

Bani-Sadr's interpretation of the Iranian position toward the U.N. panel provides the strongest trace of hope. On Feb. 16, the Iranian president succinctly told a western journalist that the crisis can be reduced to a simple geometric relation and accurately pointed out that U.S. conjecture is futile. "The reality," Bani-Sadr said, "is that we want to extradite the shah, and the Americans want the hostages freed. What we need to find is the point at which these two curves intersect."

The point of intersection can only be reached, Bani-Sadr said, when the political climate between Iran and the United States changes. And Bani-Sadr said the United States must take the initiative in making that change by:

- Condemning past U.S. policy in Iran.
- Promising not to interfere in future Iranian affairs.
- Promising not to obstruct pursuit of the shah, his entourage and other criminals charged with financial crimes and treason.

President Carter's insistence on no official speculation by members of his administration is a positive step toward getting

At Large

the hostages released. Initial reaction like State Department spokesman Hodding Carter's blunt proclamation that the United States has no intention of "declaring its guilt, either specified or unspecified," has been banned by Carter so that the delicate negotiating process will not be endangered during the U.N. panel's inquiry. President Carter is aware that the panel, which is strictly investigative and not a tribunal, must address the three points Bani-Sadr identified if the 53 Americans held in Tehran are to return to the United States.

An idyllic tropical setting won't insulate the shah from a controversy in which he irrevocably is enmeshed. It seems that very soon, the shah and those striving to spare him from savage Islamic justice will realize that the Iran crisis will not be resolved without a piercing scrutiny of the relationship between the United States and the unfortunate monarch who spends his time contemplating and wandering on Panamanian beaches.

Gary Terpening, a graduate student in journalism from Biloxi, Miss., is associate editor for The Daily Tar Heel.