

# The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor    JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor  
CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor  
MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor  
BILL RIEDY, News Editor

JOHN CONWAY, City Editor  
KAREN FISHER, Features Editor  
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

## Who's listening?

The messages of speakers such as Shirley Chisholm reflect exactly the true nature of our campus, not in the words themselves but in our reception of them. Enclosed in Memorial Hall, we clap repeatedly, almost ferociously, for the nationally known guests. We applaud their ideas and we applaud ourselves for being there and sharing those ideas. Then, in a mist of self-appreciation, we forget them. Nothing is learned and nothing changes.

Chisholm's words against racism and sexism Thursday night echoed the words of speakers before, of John F. Kennedy in the early '60s and Charles King in 1982. The value of Chisholm's message then, is not in the words themselves as much as in the realization that such words are still needed today. Students two, five, even 20 years ago sat as we did and applauded the same ideas.

Yet, since then, little has changed. Words calling for equality are still relevant. Did any of us Thursday night stop to wonder why?

Psychology 10 teachers would call it a prime example of selective perception and retention. We hear what we want to hear and how we want to hear it. Students are willing to take steps toward "greater awareness" between the races, because "awareness" is an integral, accepted part of university learning. Yet we balk at fighting for changes, ignoring the core of the speakers' messages. Establishing ways for greater learning makes you a member of the campus elite; challenging the existing structures makes you an outsider.

Therein lies the problem of racism in this university, this town and this nation. What we need to realize is that solving it will take more than attending a speech, or applauding the words spoken. Chisholm and the others were speaking not only of awareness, but of disagreeing with a repressive status quo, of wondering, perhaps, why University housing policies, while not promoting segregation, allow it to exist, and why administrators speak of recruitment efforts while only 50 of 1,800 faculty members are black, still fewer women. Why do black-white dialogues end in Union meeting rooms, not in classes or dormitories? Why has a student-organized black/white course designed to make changes been lost in bureaucratic red tape?

We need to question these things because each and every one of us is enrolled at an institution created to encourage these questions. And we need to worry that UNC has become an ivory tower where pseudo-intellectuals debate theories of the world and drop names from textbook learning. In past years, students have argued that they were too busy to fight back, that their actions wouldn't make a difference.

But perhaps they were just too scared to climb down and try.

## Fair game

A convicted murderer, sentenced to death last year, is going to have a second chance. The N.C. Supreme Court, apparently for the first time in its history, has granted the defendant a new and presumably more fair trial because in the first one pretrial publicity may have prejudiced his case. With its decision the state's high court will make history in an appropriately sound fashion, guaranteeing the accused the right to a fair trial, as stipulated by the Sixth Amendment.

Throughout the issue, freedom of the press was called both the culprit and the victim — even though it's not at all the main issue. In arguing for a new trial, the attorneys for defendant Bruce Jerrett contended that the 1982 murder in Alleghany County was followed by eight newspaper articles that were "highly prejudicial and inflammatory," as well as numerous radio newscasts. Then Justice Burley B. Mitchell Jr., in a minority opinion, said, "I fear the precedent established by the majority in this case inevitably creates the potential for needless friction between the right of a free press ... and the defendant's right to trial by an impartial jury." He also said that the decision "tends to destroy the delicate balance between the First Amendment and the Sixth Amendment and to give the Sixth Amendment clear priority over the First Amendment."

Thus the court's decision was likened to a victory of the right to free trial over the freedom of the press. In reality it was nothing of the sort. The majority opinion did not revolve around prejudicial news coverage. Chief Justice Joseph Branch wrote that the eight newspaper reports were "factual, informative and noninflammatory." Instead, the court based its decision on "the totality of the circumstances," which included widespread word-of-mouth publicity about the killing of a well-known citizen, Dallas Parsons, in a small, close-knit county that was "in effect, a neighborhood." At a pretrial hearing, several lawyers, a deputy sheriff and a radio station sales manager testified that, based on what they had heard from local residents, Jerrett could not get a fair trial. Too many county residents, the prospective jurors, were already familiar with the case, they said.

The potential for prejudice was demonstrated when one-third of the prospective jurors said they knew or knew about the Parsons family. Of the 12 jurors eventually selected for the case, 10 had heard about it, as had both alternates. Common sense dictated either a change of venue or that a jury be drawn from outside the county; the state's high court, in choosing the latter, guarantees Jerrett a fair trial. The decision should not be construed as an indictment of the press.



AND FOR THOSE PASSENGERS DISEMBARKING HERE IN MUNCIE, THANK YOU FOR TAKING CONTINENTAL AIRLINES

## Shaking it up

Chisholm: racism, sexism alive and well in U.S.

"I've always been a person who has dared to do certain things that need to be done, even if it might result in failure, because you might be able to open up new avenues."

— Shirley Chisholm  
Sept. 29, 1983

By JOSEPH BERRYHILL

Shirley Chisholm is a person who has opened up and widened many avenues. In 1968, she became the first black woman ever elected to Congress. In 1972, she became the first black woman to run for president of the United States. She has been called a political maverick, and she has called herself a "shaker-upper" of the system. Although she retired from Congress last year after 14 years in office, she has not retired from political activity.

She continues to lecture around the country, and she is doing a series of political commentaries in English and Spanish for radio broadcast in Dallas, Texas. She says that she is happy and satisfied with her life, and yet she refuses to go into seclusion. She remains in the public eye, where she is a vehement critic of the Reagan administration and conservative legislators. She was in Chapel Hill Thursday to speak on "Strategies for Minorities and Women in the Political Arena." Before her speech, she discussed her life and political views with a reporter from *The Daily Tar Heel*.

She said she believes that racism is America's biggest problem. "If it was not racism, you wouldn't have to be using all of these artificial mechanisms to get people to do what they are supposed to do," she said.

"You wouldn't have to be using such things legislatively as quotas, affirmative action, 10 percent set-asides. Why do you have to use those things in a presumably democratic and representative country? You have to use those things because the old spectre of racism still abides in the hearts and bodies of a lot of men in power who refuse to carry out the moral dictates of what their consciences should tell them to do."

Racism is not the only form of prejudice in America, Chisholm said. She still stands by her well-known statement that being a woman is a bigger political handicap than being a black.

"Black men are no different from white men or brown men. They're all men," she said, with a broad smile. "Men, for a long time — whether they were white men, black men or brown men — have had very definite feelings toward women going into certain areas. And one of those areas certainly has been the political arena."

Chisholm does not get angry when she speaks of racism or prejudice. She speaks rationally and without emotion. Her arms remain at her side. She is a different person than the Shirley Chisholm on the speaker's podium, where she stirs her audience emotionally with her dramatic oration. In private, she is more reserved.

Nevertheless, Chisholm speaks her mind whether in public or private. "Look at the want ads," she says, easing into a discussion of unemployment and, in particular, how it affects the black community.

To the editor:

In response to Swann's letter to the editor, "Wanted: black JV cheerleaders" (*DTH*, Sept. 29), I can only say that Swann is treading on some very dangerous territory which he is probably very unqualified to approach.

Swann laments that there have been no black female Junior Varsity cheerleaders for UNC in the past four years. He says that there must have been at least one "qualified" girl in these past years, that any one who thinks there weren't is "crazy" or "stupid," and that there is something "wrong, very wrong."

He also admits, thankfully, that his "knowledge of the things the judges are looking for is limited" and that he has only "been at every varsity tryout and three JV tryouts" in his four years at Carolina.

Well, I have actually participated in the two JV tryouts and one Varsity tryout in my two years at Carolina, and I have seen both the people who, like Swann, come and "watch" the tryouts, as well as the

## Let the people choose

To the editor:

Concerning the *DTH* story Sept. 22, "UNC Professor Assails U.S.'s Central American Policy," I would like to point out some errors of fact and interpretation. Your reporter erred in saying that the Kissinger commission (to which political science professor Enrique Baloyra is a consultant) is not long-term. In fact, it is a long-term commission and thus will not pre-empt Richard Stone's short and medium-term mission.

More important, however, is the misplaced emphasis on Baloyra's criticisms of the Reagan administration's policies rather than on his recommendations for future policies. The main point of the lecture was that U.S. policy in Latin America should promote democratic stability. To this end, our policy should insist that the peoples of



"Most of these ads are in the area of engineering, space scientists, aerospace dynamics. And yet the educational system in this country is not preparing the young people — whether they are black or white — for the future in terms of coping with the jobs that are going begging in this country. Thousands of people across this nation I travel are standing around on the streets because they don't have the requisite tools to fill these jobs."

Chisholm displays a twinge of emotion when she refers to the jobs. She is sympathetic to the plight of poor Americans, and she shows it. It was being the champion of minorities, women and the poor that earned Shirley Chisholm notoriety beyond being a black woman in Congress. She recognizes that people are her strength.

"People saw in me a leader, and my strength has always been people. I'm a people's politician. If the people ever deserted me, I think most political bosses would have been glad to get rid of me. But I've always been strong with the masses."

"Sometimes one has to tilt at windmills... Change comes about from those who dare, those who have vision."

While she acknowledges that the people have been important to her career, Chisholm also credits her own abilities in the political arena for her success in politics. She does not believe in false modesty. "I am not blowing my own horn, but I know I am (a skilled politician)," she said. There is no contradiction in that statement. She speaks the truth, as she sees it.

"The reason I have been effective is because I have been able to compromise," she said. "I've worked with Southern Democrats who were rather bigoted. I've worked with radically oriented Democrats. I have no permanent friends or enemies, just permanent interests."

Her permanent interests do not seem to jibe well with the policies of Ronald Reagan, a man Chisholm does not have a high opinion of.

"I think Ronald Reagan is one of the most charming men I've ever met, but Ronald Reagan is one of the most insensitive men that I've ever met in terms of not being attuned to the problems of the helpless and the powerless people in this country."

Reagan has such an ability to charm the American people that they often do not realize what he is saying, Chisholm said. "It is only after they (the people) have looked at what he's said — two or three weeks later — that they realize what he really did say because they were so charmed by him. I've seen it. I've been in Washington with him. I've watched him. He's a very charming man, but, boy, is he insensitive."

Chisholm does not yet support any candidate in the 1984 presidential election because, "It's too early." But she did comment on the possibility of a Jesse Jackson candidacy and the rationale for his running.

"Jesse Jackson is doing what all the other white candidates are doing. He's going around the country, trying to present himself as an alternative."

"I think Jesse Jackson is seeking leverage to make the Democratic Party realize that whether or not they like what blacks are doing, they're sick and tired of being the most loyal group to the

Democratic Party, and yet they don't get treated the way other Democrats do. In 1980, thousands of white ethnics deserted the Democratic Party and went over to Reagan — blacks didn't. And yet we're taken for granted by the Democratic Party. And the Republicans, of course, just shudder us with benign neglect."

Chisholm has some bitter words for Democrats and Republicans, but she displays no outward anger toward them. Still, her eyes are half-closed in a painful expression when she speaks about the atmosphere in many American homes today. She said she believes that many American children are raised in a pathetic environment. And while she offers no immediate solutions to the problem, she says that adult employment is the key to stabilizing a family.

"You can't change anybody's environment until you are able to ensure that every employable adult has a job. When a man doesn't have a job and a man has a family, and he's not able to provide for that family, he's not able to have any hope for the future. God knows, he becomes hopeless, disillusioned and distraught. To-

day in this country, the richest nation on earth, to think that 10 million employable adults are unemployed is absurd."

Chisholm clearly believes that America is in trouble, and that legislators are not following a logical path to improve the nation's welfare. During her years in Congress, she supported major spending increases in federal welfare, day-care and job programs. Expanding federal programs is not in vogue today, but she still believes it is the right thing to do.

"I supported increases for the conservation and preservation of the most important resources that a country ever has, and that is its human resources. What's a country without able-bodied, healthy people?"

Chisholm is quick to give her opinion of America's problems. But those who see her as a complainer and an attention-grabber are not looking deep enough. She has sought and still seeks to change America, but she is not bitter just because change comes slowly.

"Sometimes one has to tilt at windmills in order to initiate change. In a sense, Shirley Chisholm has tilted at a few windmills once in a while. One of the windmills was running for the presidency of this country. People laughed, people giggled, people said I was crazy. I wasn't crazy. I was a very sane woman. It was the idea that you've got to have guts to be a catalyst for change in any nation. Change doesn't come about by the majority of the people moving. Change comes about from those who dare, those who have vision."

There will be no more attempts at the presidency for Chisholm, although she said she might re-enter politics under the right circumstances. But she said she enjoys spending more time at home; there she can be with her husband, who was critically injured in an automobile accident two years ago. She is also enjoying the opportunity to write and teach classes at Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts. She is content and happy, a gracious and well-preserved warrior.

"I'm 59 years of age now and people are amazed by the fact that I don't look like I'm 59 and that I still have a lot of energy and vibrancy. And the reason is because I feel good about myself, and I know I have contributed to humanity."

Joseph Berryhill, a senior journalism and economics major from Charlotte, is a staff writer for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Not cheering about squad selections

I have personal knowledge of a situation at N.C. State where two girls who tried out for cheerleading but were not selected were later told confidentially, by a reliable source, that they would have been chosen if it had not been for the fact that two black girls had to be chosen instead.

Let us hope that it never comes to this at Carolina. Let's have fair representation for blacks and others not because of race, but because of capability. I hope one day to be a member of the Varsity cheerleading squad myself. I can only hope that I will be able to appropriately perpetuate the tradition of UNC's cheerleaders. It will make no difference to me what color my partner is, as long as we both do a good job. I hope Swann will feel the same way.

Stephen J. Melott  
Granville West

### Not a party

To the editor:

I was very disappointed to see a certain comment from Mikem Kenny Ward in the *DTH* article "Mikem Kenny asked to resign," Sept. 29, stating that he thought he was not given a fair chance because he was black.

I wholeheartedly think he should be given a concrete reason for the request, but why must everything boil down to a matter of black and white? Why, when Kenny received the job, did some people say that he got it because he was black and not because he was good? And why does Kenny now seem to think that because things are not working out it is because of his race? Why must everything have an ulterior motive?

Frankly, I don't care if Kenny is

white, green or Carolina blue; I still think that a great deal of his jokes lack foresight. I'm quite sure that he is funny as hell at a party, but telling Helen Keller and black/white jokes could not be more out of place than in Kanan Stadium in front of 50,000 people.

I hope no one allows themselves to think it is only "lily whites" that don't like the jokes. A great many of my black friends have also expressed their displeasure. I honestly hope Kenny will be given another chance, but I also hope he will be able to see that it is really not a question of race but rather one of taste and judgment.

Michael L. Yopp  
Granville West

J.E. Williams  
Political science graduate student