

# The Daily Tar Heel

90th year of editorial freedom

JOHN DRESCHER, Editor

ANN PETERS, Managing Editor

KERRY DERÓCHI, Associate Editor  
RACHEL PERRY, University Editor  
ALAN CHAPPLE, City Editor  
JIM WRINN, State and National Editor  
LINDA ROBERTSON, Sports Editor  
AL STEELE, Photography Editor

KEN MINGIS, Associate Editor  
ELAINE MCCLATCHEY, Projects Editor  
LYNN PEITHMAN, News Editor  
SUSAN HUDSON, Features Editor  
NISSEN RITTER, Arts Editor  
TERESA CURRY, Spotlight Editor

## Botany bungle

In its proposal to merge the botany and zoology departments later this year, the administration has failed to heed the advice of one of the departments involved and neglected to consult with students affected by the move.

In January, a committee studying the proposed merger recommended its approval to the administration. Two weeks later however, a delegation of botany professors met with UNC Chancellor Christopher C. Fordham III in an attempt to dissuade him from approving the merger. The department unanimously opposed the merger but was told that Fordham was already involved in the decision process.

Botany students, especially those seeking a degree in botany, were left uninformed of the impending change, and were completely left out of discussions about the issue.

Many botany faculty members have voiced fears that the botany degree program would be dropped after the merger. Though the committee report does not explicitly call for the elimination of the botany and zoology degree programs, it is likely that this would occur.

It is also possible that the botany department would be allowed to dissolve as an identifiable area of study if combined into a large biology department. The committee recognized this in its report, but made no proposals to prevent this from occurring.

Botany professor Max Hommersand, a member of the committee opposed to the merger, compares this move to similar mergers at UCLA, Yale and Stanford universities. In each case, the separate identity of the botany department suffered.

Rather than spelling out any specific curriculum changes, the report left many questions to be settled by the new chairman. By doing so, it avoids having to seek the Board of Governors' approval, but leaves students and faculty members wondering what specific changes will occur.

The manner in which the merger issue has been proposed is equally disturbing since scarcely two weeks elapsed from the time the report was issued until Fordham gave it his approval. By moving so quickly, the chancellor and other university officials have cut off necessary debate on a sensitive subject. If the administration were to delay the merger for a year, students and faculty members would be given the time needed to express their views.

## Broken trust

Secretary of State Alexander Haig always has been a colorful public speaker. After using words like "epistemologicallywise" and "nuance-al," Haig left grammarians shaking their heads and other listeners bewildered.

A story leaked to *The Washington Post* shows that Haig is an equally descriptive speaker in private. But while Haig's comments were often humorous and incisive, the story leaves serious doubt as to the competency of Haig's staff and Haig's control over it.

The report was given by an anonymous senior staff member and describes Haig's regular morning meetings with his top officials. In one meeting Haig called British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington a "duplicitous" bastard for his handling of a Middle East matter. Shortly after the military takeover in Poland, Haig said, "Everybody got his rocks off on Poland and demonstrated their masculinity in their recommendations to the president." Haig referred to previous news leaks as "one big, fat pain in the ass."

Pain in the ass or not, Haig's comments were more than just a few embarrassing obscenities. Some of his remarks could be serious enough to disrupt American relationships with other nations. The notes show that Haig is privately more pessimistic about some world problems than he is publicly. He warned his staff in January that once Israel returns the Sinai to Egypt under the terms of the Camp David agreement, "Egypt will go back into (the) Arab world, with (the) U.S. isolated as Israel's sole defender."

While honest and enlightening, it's disheartening to know that Haig cannot either trust or control his staff. The senior staff meetings are attended by about a dozen of the top officials in the state department. Every major decision-maker must have a staff in which he can confide by evaluating situations and discussing new proposals. To violate this confidence when dealing with U.S. security is a violation of public trust. It also deteriorates confidence other nations may have when dealing with the state department.

The senior staff member who leaked the story was out to get Haig. But the report was also verified by two other staff members. In June, Haig told his staff to cut down on the amount of information given to the press. "I want to show the great Washington press corps that we are disciplined," he said. Haig's staff is neither disciplined nor trustworthy. To have an effective state department, Haig should either find a new staff or his staff should find a new secretary of state.

## The Bottom Line

### Falwell's follies

It seems that television viewers are soon to find their local stations being bombarded with yet another variety show this spring.

And it won't be Donny and Marie. No, not Julie Andrews either. This one will feature none other than your favorite evangelist and mine — the Rev. Jerry Falwell.

Falwell, founder of the Moral Majority and evangelist for the Sunday morning "All-Time Gospel Hour", is seeking to expand his mass media exposure with a prime-time television special.

The program, "God Bless America Please" will include clips of President Ronald Reagan, first lady Nancy Reagan, former President Gerald Ford and interviews with Republican senators Jesse Helms and Jeremiah Denton. The "Old-Time Gospel Hour" will spend about \$1 million to purchase air time on various stations.

The Old-Time Gospel Hour's last production for prime time, a debate on the creationism and evolution issue will be telecast in 50 television

markets in March.

But, Falwell's expectations don't stop there. He also plans to write a syndicated daily newspaper column. The column will be essentially the same as Falwell's "Moral Majority Report" radio commentary except it will appear with the reverend's byline. The column, like the radio commentary, will appear five times a week.

It will be another medium in addition to the Moral Majority newsletter and the radio commentary, in which to disseminate the conservative ideas of the Moral Majority. Already newspaper editors across the country have been contacted with offers to run the column. Revenue from the sales of the column will go entirely to the Moral Majority, Falwell said.

About 5,000 people gathered in the Liberty Baptist College auditorium Sunday night to watch Falwell videotape a "moral state state of the union" message to be telecast during prime time in May.

It won't be long now. I know you Falwell fans can hardly wait. So keep your television sets tuned. And that's the bottom line.

# Will dispute end with decree?

By KATHERINE LONG

Twelve years ago, a group of lawyers pointed to several state university systems and accused them of racial discrimination. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Education Fund claimed blacks were being shut out of higher education in 16 southern states, including North Carolina.

And for the following 11 years, NAACP lawyers, UNC officials and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (now the Department of Education) tried to iron out an agreement to desegregate the North Carolina system.

"The one great unknown is when is an institution desegregated?" asked UNC President William C. Friday recently.

It's a question no one seems to be able to answer, even though UNC's case was settled officially in July 1981 when the Department of Education accepted a plan — known as the consent decree — outlining the steps the University system must take to try to attract more black students to its 11 predominantly white campuses and more white students to its five predominantly black campuses.

Although it has been signed into effect the decree has been challenged in court. Lawyers for the NAACP appealed the decree to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. after U.S. District Court Judge John H. Pratt refused to hear the appeal. Arguments were heard in January and the three-judge bench is expected to hand down its decision within the next six months.

Why is the NAACP unhappy with the decree? Elliott Lichtman, a lawyer for the NAACP, said the appeal was filed because the consent decree did not follow the criteria for desegregation issued by HEW in 1977.

"The Department of Education obviously ignored them," Lichtman said. "There has never been a suggestion that the criteria were followed."

The HEW plan called for black student enrollment to be proportional to white student enrollment, as well as the abolishment of duplicate programs in the system, Lichtman said.

But the consent decree mentions none of these things. Instead it lists programs which the university system must establish to attract minority students to each campus. It includes items such as video cassettes for high school recruitment use which "feature the multi-racial character of the institutions," and brochures for prospective minority presence students. The decree also mandates the establishment of 29 new graduate and undergraduate programs on the five black campuses.

The goal — not a set quota — of the consent decree is increasing black enrollment at white campuses to 10.6 percent of all students by 1986-87 (now 8.4 percent) and increasing white enrollment at black campuses to 15 percent (now 11.3 percent).

Lichtman said he hoped the decree would make a difference in minority enrollment in the University system. But he added, "I have very little confidence it would make any difference. It repudiated the (HEW) criteria ... it's hard to have much confidence."

Most UNC officials are positive about the decree, however.



John Jordan and William Friday discuss consent decree this summer ...the Board of Governors chairman and UNC president spoke in Chapel Hill

"I think we're on track," said Arthur Padilla, assistant vice president of academic affairs. "I think we'll meet those enrollment goals. And there are other things in there, like the academic programs."

"So far, I really don't know of any hitches." The Department of Education didn't find any hitches, either. The University submitted the first of its annual reports in December 1981 listing the consent decree commitments, followed by the steps the University has taken to follow them. A Department of Education official said if the department did not answer the report, the University's report was acceptable. The department did not answer the report.

Harold G. Wallace, vice chancellor for university affairs at Chapel Hill, said the decree would have a positive impact on UNC. "This campus has cooperated fully with the terms. They have allowed us to coordinate our activities better," Wallace said. "I think we have improved."

The plan is working well "so far," Friday said cautiously. "But there are other factors looming large."

The factor that worries University officials is financial aid cuts. On the UNC-CH campus, 87 percent of black students received some form of financial assistance — a

job, a scholarship, a grant or a loan — in 1980. Only 64 percent of white students received financial help. The cutbacks in financial aid proposed by President Ronald Reagan's administration could hit black students much harder than white students, making it impossible for the University to fulfill the goals of the decree, UNC officials said.

"That's a circumstance that's got to be watched," Friday said.

"We've all thought of it," Padilla said. "If those cuts come through, that's going to pose some real serious problems."

Vice Chancellor Wallace said the University would "have to plan to work as closely as (it) can with students" to find different kinds of financial aid. "We have to stretch our aid dollars as far as we can."

Both Wallace and Friday said that one danger of the Reagan aid cuts is that students discouraged by news of aid shortages would not apply for financial aid.

"The important thing to stress is that these are proposals, not the law," Friday said.

Katherine Long, a junior journalism major from Winter Park, Fla., is assistant state and national editor for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

## Letters to the editor

# Chapel Thrill, one more time

To the editor:

I would like to address Scott Wells' (et al) attack on "the quality/quantity of musical acts being presented on this campus ..." (*DTH*, Feb. 22). Booking a major concert is a complex process foreign to most students. It is not a matter of waving tens of thousands of dollars in the air, snapping one's fingers, and voila, Bruce Springsteen descends from heaven.

In order for top acts to be booked, two conditions must be met. First, performers must be on tour in the area. Rarely does a band fly in from New York or Los Angeles for one show. Unfortunately, 1981-1982 has been a particularly slow year for tours in this area. Bands like the Stones or the Police, when Carmichael Auditorium is in competition with larger halls like the Greensboro Coliseum, are just not realistic.

Secondly, the acts must be financially affordable. Carolina Union concerts risk money that not only comes from student fees but also jeopardizes the financial resources used for the nearly two hundred events the Union programs throughout each year. Sure, James Taylor would be great in Memorial Hall; he would be better still in your living room. But consider that by combining a 1,500 seating capacity for Memorial Hall and a high priced performer like James Taylor, the minimum ticket price would have to be in excess of \$25. While certain individuals might pay such an exorbitant price for a three-hour concert, the question is will 1,500 people do the same at a substantial liability to the Union.

The Union maintains a full-time Concert Advisory Group which researches the popularity and financial feasibility of available performers. Further, Linda

Wright, assistant director of the Carolina Union, is a seasoned professional in the concert business and conducts all negotiations with agents and promoters. Her gut reaction as to whether a band will go or not is worth its weight in platinum. The Union will continue to seek out talent for performers on this campus where informed, professional judgments indicate enough popularity to sell tickets on a break-even basis.

The Carolina Union is only associated with Chapel Thrill in an advisory capacity. Yet many of the same constraints apply for Student Government's Chapel Thrill Committee. Bands become available and unavailable on a day-to-day basis. The Chapel Thrill Committee was in constant contact with professionals as to band availability and appeal to a cross section of the student body. In light of the inherent difficulties in the concert industry, their work should be commended. Before sardonic criticism is lodged at the quantity/quality of concerts at UNC, be it Chapel Thrill or those sponsored by the Union, people should be aware of the complexity of the booking process; better yet, they should become actively involved in the organizations that sponsor the concerts rather than assailing them from the armchair.

Bill Ragland  
Chairman, Carolina Union  
Concert Advisory Group

### Drinking age

To the editor:

Proposals to raise the drinking age to 21 years of age have caused severe consternation among a number of us at the law school. If these proposals are

adopted, bars will be desolate and our social lives will suffer. We would be deprived of our principal opportunity to mingle with the undergraduate community. Most important, older men will be unduly burdened and unjustifiably inconvenienced in their pursuit of lovely coeds.

Furthermore, raising the drinking age would alter irreconcilably the character of the State of North Carolina. The Tar Heel state could go down the same path as California, where the drinking age is 21. The possibility is too frightening to contemplate.

Andy Feldman  
Julie Rousseau  
Carrboro

### Bus driver uniforms

To the editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to point out that not all Chapel Hill bus drivers are opposed to the purchase of uniforms, as implied in your editorial of Feb. 18, 1982. In fact, I would say that the majority of the drivers really have no strong feelings either one way or the other on this issue, and that there is a sizable number of drivers who would actually like to be provided with uniforms.

Were a person to but think logically for a moment about this, it would be obvious that the nature of a bus driver's job causes unusual wear on clothing, and that the personal expense of buying and maintaining proper clothing is a burden on workers who are already grossly underpaid in relation to their peer group and responsibility, and that many drivers would welcome such an additional benefit from their employer.

I myself do not really understand why

such a controversy rages over such a mundane issue. Many people in our society today wear uniforms as a normal part of their work environment — should we also ban uniforms for fast-food restaurant employees, sanitation workers, public safety officers and even nurses and doctors? Uniforms not only serve a practical purpose in every case, but they have also been shown to have a beneficial psychological effect on the attitudes of people toward their jobs.

I think the fact that more than 7,000 people have signed a petition opposing uniform purchases only proves that people will put their name to anything, even though they may be totally ignorant of facts concerning the question at hand. I feel that people who believe this is an unnecessary expenditure would do better to question such policies of the Transportation Department as the constant over-hiring of drivers who are then paid to sit around all day doing nothing, or the costs to the taxpayer of the Department's failure to properly maintain and provide a preventive maintenance program for its vehicles. These practices cost the taxpayers more than the measly \$11,000 allocated for uniforms, and also deprive drivers of possible funds for fairer compensation in salary and benefits.

I do not believe that "Uniforms Create Barriers." I think that what creates barriers are people who speak before they think and who nose into everyone else's business but their own. Perhaps a better slogan would be "Buttons Create Barriers," or even better: "Editorials Create Barriers."

Thank you for this forum.

David Owens  
CHT bus driver

### Rude reactions

To the editor:

In reference to the letters printed in the Feb. 22 edition of *The Daily Tar Heel*, I would like to express my concern over the rude reactions in response to the choice of bands at Chapel Thrill.

If these people disagree with the entertainment at Chapel Thrill, they should at least use some tact in expressing their opinions. By degrading Chapel Thrill in such a way as to embarrass those who worked so hard, they are merely reflecting their own ignorance.

Kyle Farrell  
Chapel Hill



YOU HOO - IS ANYBODY HOME? WE ARE UNARMED AMERICAN ADVISERS. COME TO TEACH YOU HOW TO BUILD LITTLE BRIDGES AND STUFF. YOU HOO - I ALSO THINK THIS IS CRAZY!

*The Daily Tar Heel* welcome letters to the editor and contributions of columns to the editorial pages. All contributions should be typed, triple-spaced on a 60-space line and are subject to editing. Column writers should include their majors and hometowns. Each letter should include the writer's name, address and phone number. Unsigned letters will not be printed.