

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DE ROCCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

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

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

Happy Birthday

In recognizing the University's 190th birthday today, we as students are allowed an invaluable opportunity to pause and reflect. The occasion affords a chance to step back from the day-to-day rigors of academic competition. We can consider instead the larger perspective — that of our individual role as a thinking part of the University.

It's a role that we often neglect to define. In our haste to pad resumes and to dress for interviews, we too frequently leap before we look. College becomes a means to obtaining the diploma, a quick four-year layover for the transient, career-minded adult. We forget that, more importantly, it is a means to an education.

There is now, as in every generation of college students, a certain universality. Students 25 years ago also were preoccupied with jobs and diplomas, chugging beers, getting dates and passing tests. Only now we've become even more concerned with the job market, the stock market and the money market. Academics are crucial to today's collegian, but for the wrong reasons. As an outgrowth of a society that places greater emphasis on technology, students seek training in increasingly complex and narrow disciplines. The burdens of technology demand aggressive behavior from the new breed of student/job-seeker.

For this reason, today's students are sometimes compared with those of the radical '60s and '70s, leading to an inaccurate conclusion that we are apathetic. But what has really happened is that today's student is more concerned with the self than the whole. Cool reason and logic have replaced more emotional outbursts. UNC students in 1983 seem to sacrifice conscience for what might be termed blind acceptance of the status quo.

On University Day we cherish and honor the past, taking into account that it is precisely our remarkable history that allows us to function today. This is a time to ponder all those who have preceded us, the alumni who made possible our excursion into higher learning. But more importantly, University Day is a time to turn our attentions inward. Most of us have at one time or another pondered our purpose here — a question that has yet to be answered satisfactorily. UNC students cannot be expected to come up with all the answers. But we need to explore.

For example, we should question why last year only 7,000 out of 2,000 voted in the student general elections, and why a few weeks ago there was student uproar over the election of a male Homecoming queen. Perhaps we too should wonder how a group affiliated with the Moonies has operated on this campus for more than a month and not a single student has written a letter to the editor about them.

It's time now to consider, if not remember, who we are and why we are in college. What do we intend to get out of the University, and what do we intend to contribute to it? Are we "sliding" through, or do studies still take precedence? Has competition replaced compassion? University Day is a time of reflection, and we all would do well to seriously consider what certainly are important questions in our lives.

And many happy returns

The display of robes worn by members of the faculty and administration in today's procession should serve to remind us of the wide variety of roles each plays within the University: the administration in its operations; the faculty in academics. We as students enter the University with our own goals and aspirations, leaving four years later. The administration and the faculty remain, carrying with them the goals of the University; together they define its future.

Today is a celebration of UNC, a school with a tradition rich in academic excellence, from its scholarly research to its number of graduates that become national and world leaders. But it's in speaking of this tradition that we outline perhaps the largest problem within our administration and our faculty. Obsessed with the past, they have let it in many ways become the suppressor of the very thing that built it: individuality. This obsession grows in strength each time an administrator or professor subscribes to the notion that what is to happen today must be defined by what has gone before. They create a prefixed vision of UNC and its students, too blind to see that their vision is a blur to others, or not seen at all.

As an example, we have only to look at this year's election of a male Homecoming queen which brought shocked remarks and veiled threats to student programs. And, just recently, the administration fired a student-appointed mikeman, though they had had no part in his hiring. There was no warning given, no call for improvement. Instead, they issued a simple statement. His performance was detrimental to what they believed a football game in Kenan Stadium should be.

Administrators have become the guardians of the student image instead of promoters of free will and choice. In past years, they've made a mockery of Student Government and other organizations by instituting changes with little or no student opinion. Dorms have been opened, closed, and had cooking policies changed without consult of the Residence Hall Association, or the committee of faculty and students designed to advise. And students may be excited about a new Activities Center, but they'll be watching basketball games from the second floor.

Administrators creating this uniform image are joined by a majority of faculty members who, in pursuit of research laurels, rarely take the time to know the individual students. To them, a student is a blank face in a long line, a number on a pink registration card. They lock themselves behind the closed doors of the blue and white ivory towers, thus allowing a tradition of academic achievement to preclude its process today. They define their occupations by volumes published, not classes taught.

There are exceptions, of course, in the cases of both faculty members and administrators and we cannot ignore that outside factors restrict and determine both jobs. Administrators must continue to battle dwindling state funds in their pursuit of the University growth alumni and state officials pressure them to continue. Faculty members, meanwhile, are charged with completing research in order to keep their jobs.

But somewhere, each has lost sight of the real purpose of a university. Somehow, they've forgotten that the development of young minds is at the crux of continuing tradition. A university such as this one must be committed to building minds, not libraries, computer science buildings and basketball arenas. These are all part of UNC, but they cannot in themselves be mistaken for what makes the University great. It's the student learning from the administrator and the faculty member who creates the University. Without this process, today's celebration would be just a birthday party, the robes merely costumes.

Who's in charge here?

By BUZZ BRICE

The mikeman controversy is supposedly over. Kenny Ward has been successfully "fired" by the UNC administration. And after Saturday's game against Wake Forest, it appears that there will not be a mikeman for the remainder of this season — maybe never again.

This situation puzzled me, so I scoured *Daily Tar Heel* clips from the past two weeks and even went to the administration itself in hopes of getting to the bottom of the controversy. My efforts were in vain, however: I got no answers. The experience has merely strengthened my conviction that the administration constantly stonewalls students' concerns.

First, Ward was wrongfully fired. But the heart of the issue is that he was fired. Whether Ward performed his job well is not the issue. In the words of Sharon Mitchell, assistant dean in the department of student life, "We're trying to see how we can best serve the needs of the athletic teams because, after all, that's what we're all about" ("Official: request not race-related," *DTH*, Sept. 30).

So, obviously, it is a judgmental decision whether Ward's actions were what our university "is all about." However,

Dean Donald Boulton was not "fired" for having University employees, on University time, perform work at his home. Is that what our university is all about?

That is the shame of this particular incident. I believe Ward's problems stemmed from the new band placement and the terrible opening schedule. So a student is taking the blame for things that are not directly his fault. But has Ward been given another chance, which seems the fair thing to do? The UNC administration says no, that the issue is dead. There will not be a mikeman for the remainder of the season.

Important questions

The bottom line is that Kenny Ward is out. But still, some important questions linger. Did the office of student life have the right to fire Ward? And why is the administration so secretive about the entire process? Why haven't students been involved? Mitchell has said that a variety of people made the decision. "I think any time the University is concerned about any situation, it takes into consideration ideas from many different settings," she said in the Sept. 30 *DTH*. "Neither I nor anyone else here makes decisions in a vacuum." But the administrators won't name exactly who can be

contacted to discuss the situation further. Nor will they specify whether any students were involved in the decision-making process.

Something is not right here. I think that some white, male administrators decided that, after the Homecoming game, Ward was out. End of discussion, for all intents and purposes.

It really is disturbing. Some people in charge (we don't know who) decide they don't like the mikeman, and he is fired. Protests in Berkeley in 1965 were against just such practices. And this has become another example of how the administration, because of student complacency, actually runs everything we do.

No alcohol was allowed at last year's Carolina Concert for Children. The new Student Activities Center provides a minimal portion of good seats for students. Residence halls will be closed over Fall Break. Last year the ARA food services problem was decided by the administration. Student opinion about divestment has been completely disregarded.

All of this is in direct conflict with student concerns. With the mikeman, however, student opinion wasn't even considered. There are a lot of upright people running this school. So tonight, I wonder if the Campus Governing Council speaker or the Residence Hall Associa-

tion president could just as easily be "fired." What with the administration's recent "success" with the mikeman, I doubt that they would casually dismiss such notions. Since Boulton has referred all questions to Mitchell, I might suggest that all interested students go to her for "answers." Good luck.

Crystal ball ominous

I've come to the disappointing conclusion that the future of the mikeman is bleak. But it doesn't have to be. If the administration would let students make some decisions about the University that we comprise and pay to attend, then I wouldn't have a complaint, and we wouldn't have a problem. But in dealing with the University administrators, I feel like I'm sometimes still in high school.

Again, it's not whether Ward did a good or bad job, which is another issue. It's that your average Joe Tar Heel had no say in the matter, and that this average Joe Tar Heel could not get any answers to questions that directly concerned him. We shouldn't continue to accept such blatant abuse of power.

Seriously, UNC administration, take a long hit.

"Buzz" Brice is a junior journalism and political science major from Wilson.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

He knows nothing about the Bible

To the editor:

I am writing in response to Allan Rosen's letter about American Atheists ("American Atheists not intolerant of others' religious beliefs," *DTH*, Oct. 10).

I have no argument with Rosen's beliefs or the organization to which he belongs. We live in a democracy and everyone has the right to believe as they choose. My argument is with some of the narrow-minded, ill-informed remarks he made about the Bible in his article.

Atheists have long criticized religions and religious people for their seemingly narrow-minded and ill-informed views toward the world. Rosen, however, has committed the same crime in his appraisal of the Bible. He quotes, "It is about time for people to recite not only the nice passages in their Bibles but also to think about the social effects from its bizarre notions about sex, its bigotry toward women, its intolerance of non-Christian (or non-Jewish) people, its glorification of war, rape, violence and obedience to authority."

To begin with, the Bible that I read does not have any bizarre notions about sex. Premarital and extramarital sex are strongly discouraged, and incest and bestiality are forbidden. I'm sorry, Rosen, but most people will agree that incest and bestiality are not normal sexual

practices. If your argument is with the frown on premarital and extramarital sex and the "social effects" that this has on society, consider this: What about the "social effects" of one million teenage pregnancies in the United States per year due to premarital sex. What about the "social effects" of all the divorces caused by extramarital affairs? You may disagree with the Bible's views on sex, Rosen, but to label them bizarre is a bit strong and more than a little absurd.

Secondly, you feel that the Bible is bigoted against women. Through much of the Bible, this is unfortunately true. But keep in mind that the Bible was written in an era when all women were second-class citizens, not just the women of the Bible. Also keep in mind that one of the Ten Commandments instructs people to honor their father and their mother. This was a major step in the recognition of women, and its truth was reiterated by Jesus Christ when he was alive. Men and women are equal in the eyes of God, and even the most superficial study into the teachings of Jesus will reveal this.

As for the Bible's intolerance of non-Jewish people, this applies only to the Old Testament. The major thrust of the whole New Testament is the preaching of the Gospel to the gentiles as well as the

Jews.

Fourthly, Rosen, unless you've got your own separate translation of the Bible, I don't know where you get the idea that the Bible glorifies war, rape and violence. It is true that many violent acts take place in the Bible, but there is always a reason or justification behind it. Not in a single instance is violence glorified in the Bible.

Lastly, would you mind telling me what is wrong with obedience to authority? Where would this country be if American citizens didn't obey the law?

Law and order are necessary to the functioning of a society.

In conclusion, Rosen, I suggest that you take your organization's own advice toward religious believers and apply it to yourself. Stop merely repeating what you've heard. Do some research yourself and discover what the Bible really says. Only then will you be qualified to make such broad statements about a book which you obviously know very little about.

Phillip K. Parkerson
Old East



Campus colors

To the editor:

We came to Chapel Hill with an open mind with regard to racism. As we were reading through one of the first issues of the *DTH*, we came across some very disturbing columns which stated that North Campus was "white" and South Campus was "black." Being freshmen, we did not know that this was the case. At first we were shocked, then angry. We couldn't believe that such a respectable newspaper as the *DTH* would print such a trivial piece of information. It had no significance whatsoever. I am sure that this is statistically true, but so what? What does it prove? It is this kind of journalism that keeps racism alive.

In another issue of the *DTH*, there were statistics on the class of 1987. Among these statistics was a figure which stated the total number of blacks at UNC. Why was this

printed? The press has a distinct influence upon the minds of the public, and the press should be the first to realize this. The press should stop printing these facts and figures, because these trivialities keep racism alive.

At election time, it is really frustrating to see the polls divided into two categories: the black vote and the white vote. Why can't the press treat people equally? Why do they always insist on creating distinctions?

This country was built on the fact that all men are created equal. Isn't it about time we started practicing what we preach? From now on, let's print the *DTH* in black and white, not the articles.

Paul Heist Jr.
Robert Williams Jr.
Granville West

Letters?

The *Daily Tar Heel* welcomes letters to the editor and contributions to columns for the editorial page.

Such contributions should be typed, triple spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing. Contributions

must be submitted by noon the day before publication.

Column writers should include their majors and hometown; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.

What if he's wrong?

To the editor:

This is in response to Allan Rosen's letter ("American Atheists not intolerant of others' religious beliefs," *DTH*, Oct. 10).

Allan, you and your organization, American Atheists, have many positive attributes. You have convictions in your heart and you are willing to stand up for them. When you don't like something or don't like the way things are going, rather than complaining, you're willing to try to change things. You want to make the world a better place to live. You are convinced you are right. Your organization believes there is no God, that religion is harmful to society, and that we would be better off without it.

I, too, have convictions in my heart and am willing to stand up for them. When I don't think something is right, I try to change it. I want to make the world a better place to live in. I am convinced that I am right.

I believe in God. I know him. I talk to him everyday — and he talks back.

This God has given hope to the hopeless, food to the hungry, sight to the blind, love and acceptance to the lonely and rejected. He's healed lepers, made the lame to walk, and given the dead back alive to their loved ones. He's brought good news to the afflicted, bound up the brokenhearted, and proclaimed liberty to captives.

The nuclear blues

By CHRISTINE MANUEL

The nuclear blues,
They're getting me down;
Pretty soon New York will be
A tiny little town.

That's the chorus from a song called "Nuclear Blues," which my brother Johnny, 11, wrote and recorded on a small tape player at home. Johnny laughs when he plays the tape, which by the way is called "Run for It," because he says he's off-key. But words reveal a real fear Johnny has, a fear that someday he'll see a nuclear war.

Johnny epitomizes the All-American kid — intelligent, athletic, sensitive and slightly self-conscious. He has that wonderful, special ability of laughing at himself, and like all children, Johnny has hopes and dreams for his future.

But like others in his generation, Johnny wonders if he'll ever get the chance to grow up and fulfill his dreams. Recently, a group of youngsters testified before a U.S. House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, telling the congressmen that the children and their friends were afraid of nuclear war.

"It's scary to think about the world being destroyed and nothing is left," said an 11-year-old from Iowa.

Another child from New York City appealed to the committee, "You are parents, let your children live."

A number of researchers conclude that many children

have prepared themselves for the "nothingness" that would follow a nuclear holocaust.

Children are naturally curious, and in our media age they are kept well informed about world events. Yet the defense budget, our chilly, belligerent relations with Moscow and U.S. military involvement around the world is rarely explained to our youngsters.

"It's not like we don't hear about nuclear weapons," said a 16-year-old from Oakland, Calif. "It's on the news, it's in the papers, it's on television. But people act like we aren't supposed to talk about it."

Adults try to shield the realities of war from their children, so children don't get the explanation they seek.



Yet most adults probably don't quite understand our defense system any better.

Kids have simple, yet logical, ways of thinking. To them, building thousands of megaton bombs does not make sense. Spending billions on arms to destroy when budgets for education, Social Security and the environment are meager seems irrational.

When President Carter debated Reagan in 1980, he mentioned that his daughter Amy thought that nuclear proliferation was the gravest problem facing our nation. The remark became a national joke and destroyed Carter's appearance in the debate. Yet perhaps he had a point. Carter was attempting to bring to the attention of the entire nation that our children fear the power of our nuclear capability.

The fear our children have isn't a "joke." The emotional testimony the children gave on Capitol Hill went unnoticed to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That same day they rejected two nuclear arms control resolutions.

Maybe it's time we listened to our children, who don't get caught up with politics and parties and ideologies. They care about the world's future — their future. And our children speak for many people.

Johnny was glad those children testified in Washington: "I hope the congressmen listened to them."

Christine Manuel, a junior journalism and political science major from Fayetteville, is state and national editor of The Daily Tar Heel.