

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor

STUART TONKINSON
Managing Editor
BEN PERKOWSKI
Associate Editor
DICK ANDERSON
Associate Editor
JANET OLSON
University Editor
STEVE FERGUSON
News Editor
VANCE TREFETHEN
State and National Editor

LEIGH WILLIAMS
City Editor
MARK POWELL
Business Editor
LEE ROBERTS
Sports Editor
FRANK BRUNI
Arts Editor
SHARON SHERIDAN
Features Editor
LARRY CHILDRESS
Photo Editor

Let's change our tune

The voice of the people is being heard in Washington's state capital, and it's singing "Louie, Louie." With wide support from elected officials, residents there want the official state song changed from the 35-year-old "Washington, My Home" to the increasingly popular '60s rock classic.

It prompts a review of our own state song, "The Old North State." You remember, the one written in 1926 by Mrs. E.E. Randolph that goes, "Carolina! Carolina! Heaven's blessings attend her. While we live we will cherish, protect and defend her... Hurrah! Hurrah! The Old North State forever. Hurrah! Hurrah! The good Old North State."

Not only do few people know its tune or lyrics, but there's nothing Northern about North Carolina that UNC and Duke students don't bring down with them.

"Carolina in My Mind" is the immediately apparent choice as the replacement. Written and sung by James Taylor, a former Chapel Hillian, the song is tuneful, sentimental and beautiful. But except for the chorus, it's also unsingable, with lyrics as difficult to learn as those rasped in "Louie, Louie." Once learned, they don't make much sense, either: "Karin, she's a silver sun. You'd best walk her away and watch

For those tying knots

As we approach the end of another academic year here at UNC, students' thoughts, while they're not worrying about doing a semester's worth of reading in one week, are beginning to turn to the future. For some, there is just the immediate future to be concerned about — summer jobs, beach trips, summer school, etc. Yet for others, seniors mostly, the future has become The Future.

Jobs are no longer jobs for graduating seniors, but 'careers.' Every conversation seems to include the obligatory, "So what's gonna do when you get out?" And while "I don't know" always ranks as one of the most popular — or at least most frequent — responses, another reply seems to get a lot of airtime this time of year — "Getting married."

With all the jokes about pre-wedders going around, the ones about pre-wedders are about as common each year as graduation approaches (coupled with feelings of insecurity about The Future) and an inordinate number of seniors become surprisingly serious about their dating partners. We are not trying to suggest anything here about the legitimacy or quality of these relationships, but just to point out a well-recognized phenomenon and maybe give some helpful hints, via some recent research into happy marriages, about The Future

Governed or ruled?

Medical advances have given doctors new opportunities to intervene on behalf of unborn children. However, new problems have also arisen, as courts and legislative bodies grapple with the question of whether a pregnant woman can be forced to undergo treatment or to change her habits for the sake of the fetus within her.

Several courts have already ruled that the government can force a woman to give birth by Caesarean section or accept blood transfusions to save the fetus.

Some industrial plants have barred pregnant women from working on jobs or in toxic environments considered dangerous to their unborn children.

In New York City, a new ordinance requires restaurants, bars and other businesses serving liquor to display the following sign: "Warning: Drinking alcoholic beverages during pregnancy can cause birth defects."

As the process of fetal development becomes less mysterious, it is becoming easier to define precisely what a pregnant woman should do for the sake of her child. While pregnant women have known for years that they should pay special attention to nutrition, it may someday be possible to specify a particular diet that provides optimal nutrition for the developing child.

her watch the morning come." It doesn't even rhyme.

To do Washington one better, we need a tune with catchy lyrics. Famous is "Nothing be could finer than to be in Caroliner in the morning." And nothing could, unless you'd prefer not to wake up in chilling dampness with a cough or you find grits at breakfast repugnant. Besides, the rhyme forces native singers to pronounce their beloved state's name like one of those Northern UNC or Duke students.

Something topical might make the state song more popular, perhaps one dealing with North Carolina's tobacco woes. If residents could tolerate the pun, The Buckingham's '60s hit "Kind of a Drag" sounds like a winner. Or revise the lyrics of Deep Purple's "Smoke on the Water" to "Smoke on the rocks, and fire's in their eyes."

But after all, the state song is essentially a political anthem, performed most often at official state functions. Politicians are the ones who change it, too, and it couldn't hurt to make them a part of the song. So let's end the debate by choosing a song to honor the greatest politician representing North Carolina at our nation's capital — the honorable Sen. Jesse Helms. The Beatles sang it in 1967. It's called "The Fool on the Hill."

after all, the DTH is supposed to be

"serving the students and the University community..." and we do try to hit issues that affect students.

Anyway, after that long-winded preamble, this new research shows that two of the best indicators of the happiness of a marriage are the couple's ability to talk over problems effectively, even more crucial than how much in love they are, and how well the couple communicated before they were married. The frequency of sexual intercourse was found to have almost no bearing on marital bliss.

Also, the notion of compatibility being linked to certain personality traits that fit together was found to have no clear relationship to happiness in marriage. As one of the researchers said, "What counts in making a happy marriage is not so much how compatible you are, but how you deal with incompatibility." Sounds like words to live by to us.

Well, now that we've done our bit of marriage counseling for the year, we'd like to add our good wishes for a happy Future to all those with and without wedding plans. Of course, we could always get on another high horse and do some career counseling, but since we're not, good luck there too.

Some say the government's interest in protecting a child from maternal neglect is just as strong before the child is born as afterward. Others, including many feminists, say a mentally-competent woman should have the right to conduct her pregnancy as she wishes.

Valid arguments exist on both sides. Certainly, pregnant women have a strong obligation to do what they can for their unborn children. But the question of what they should or should not do is not an appropriate one for governments to decide. It is difficult to fairly measure how well a pregnant woman is caring for her fetus, and a rule requiring a high level of care would be impossible to enforce. The government should not be in the business of monitoring what pregnant women eat, how much they drink, or how many aspirin they swallow after a hard day at the office.

A woman who chooses to commit nine months of her life to a developing child would logically want to do the best she could for the child. The government's role, on the other hand, should be that of providing information and financial support for the mother as she attempts to do the best thing, rather than punishing her if she falls short of the mark.

Against the plan is against the offs

By SCOTT CANTERBERRY

Once upon a time, there was a dreadful meal plan that the big, bad administrators tried to force on poor, helpless on-campus students.

Right before the mean, old establishment got their final wish (therefore filling their barren treasuries), three heroes emerged from the Pit with a flailing report, that sent the bad guys back deep into their offices and momentarily saved the helpless on-campus residents.

Familiar? Of course. That's been the general haunting story that many of UNC's on-campus students have been supposedly losing sleep over the past few weeks.

But during the mounting controversy, no mention has been made of the group that may be most affected by the \$100 mandatory meal plan — and that, surprisingly, is the off-campus students.

Off-campus students, who help pay for cafeteria renovations just like their on-campus colleagues, probably have been considered apathetic towards this entire ordeal. But a recently-completed report concluded that these seemingly uncaring individuals also have a vested interest in the passage of the meal plan, with the result being the newly-formed vigilante group, STAMP (Students Taking Action for the Meal Plan).

No way, you say. Well, consider the latest findings by the unofficial Zimmerman/Maloney/Canterberry Report and you may not be so convinced after all.

A mandatory meal plan would further clear the streets of on-campus residents (subsequently referred to as "ons") during meal time. While "ons" are enjoying one of their full-course meals with their \$100 at one of the campus' cafeterias, "offs" could rule Franklin Street eating establishments with a vengeance. Consider the luxuries of not having to wait for tables nor eating two pounds of chips and guacamole dip while orders are lost in a mass of shuffled tickets nor reverting to some junior high school tricks with the low-wicked candle on the table.

Instead, these individuals can enjoy one of the finest pleasures of living off campus without the nuisance of dorm residents (who probably should be eating on the campus anyway since their parents did buy them a supplementary \$200 cafeteria plan). Quite simply, "offs" want what they deserve — restaurant eating for the "offs" and University eating for the "ons," with the exception of late-night deliveries of course.

A vote against the mandatory meal plan is a vote against off-campus living. Forget the freedom to choose where you would like to eat; rather consider the dire need of the emaciated "off" to eat his first well-balanced meal in two weeks at his favorite restaurant. Now the "on" must ask himself, "Do I want to deny this poor individual his deserved right to an uninhibited

READER FORUM

Dibbert misconstrues the UNC Honor System

To the editors:

Though it was difficult to grasp the intention of Billy Dibbert's letter ("Is the Honor Code doing what we want," April 15), it seems that he is raising two issues regarding the Code of Student Conduct: 1) the code's effectiveness in controlling cheating, and 2) the question of whether students internalize the code's ideals or just passively comply with it.

In discussing the efficacy of the code in deterring cheating, a few things must be considered. A college atmosphere is one in which many great personal choices are made: what classes to take, what major to pursue, what extra-curriculars to join, what career or graduate school to vie for, etc. Likewise, the issue of whether to cheat or to earn a grade honestly is also a matter of personal choice. The Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, the document that defines the Code of Student Conduct, recognized this

matter: "the guiding principle of University regulation of conduct shall be that of the responsible exercise of freedom." The key word here is "responsible." It is a student's responsibility to choose not to cheat, but if cheating occurs, that student is responsible for the consequences he/she faces.

Dibbert argues this last point with, "It is discouraging that the University attempts to dictate morality, values, 'honor'..." Has anyone critically analyzed the ethical issues involved in requiring students to conform to a university-established code? In regards to academic matters, the Honor Code states basically that it is wrong to cheat once given the opportunity to learn. We find it difficult to believe that any member of the University community questions this ideal.

Based on this ideal, the Honor System does not exist to serve as a policing agent of the University. Instead, the system exists to deal

Tolerance, not bigotry

To the editors:

I am writing to express my concern about recent Campus Governing Council decisions regarding the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association.

Although I never felt that gays should be subject to institutional discrimination, I probably wouldn't have noticed discrimination in its worst manifestation. My personal attitude toward gays was just as bad and not unlike other college age males. Our behavior was abusive and humiliating to gays — not to mention how it reflected on ourselves. I wouldn't be surprised if there were those among us who were gay that engaged in our cruel games to avoid detection and certain ostracism. Where did we learn to be so mean and intolerant? In view of this daily reality isn't it obvious that gays and lesbians need an organization with which to identify and to maintain a sense of dignity and culture? It is in this sense that the CGLA is similar to other organizations for traditionally discriminated groups.

My attitudes toward gays changed in Buffalo, N.Y., where I shared a graduate student office with two other students, one of whom was gay. We all became good friends and I learned how cruel our society is to itself and to gays. My friend was divorced but until he was 30 he couldn't admit to himself something he knew all along, that he was gay. Our society's brilliant strategy is to force people to deny their own feelings. The result can be unhappy marriages, divorce and children torn from their parents.

People who want to justify their



meal, just because I voted against the meal plan and still militantly refuse to eat at the cafeteria?"

My guess says that the "on" would rather side with the "off," especially since he more than likely will become one someday. And for those of you who still have some reservations (those at restaurants), your student body president is an "off."

The Z/M/C report also revealed that off-campus residents, particularly those who can't cook, do feel slighted by their exclusion from the meal plan. The most frequent response when asked to comment on the meal plan among these individuals was, "Why don't we get to be in on this thing too?"

They reason that a vote for the meal plan could lead to an extension of the service to those needing it off-campus.

Graduate students went so far as to suggest that the mandatory meal plan be extended to all campus students, faculty, administrators, workers, Pit Preachers (including Jed — "Why let our man starve himself?"), squirrels and the families of all those mentioned above.

Considering that families that included four children could bring in a hefty \$600 for ARA services, we're beginning to be talk big bucks.

"Of course, we'll have to make some kind of special concessions for the squirrels," said one graduate student who asked not to be identified.

The Z/M/C report also showed that Granville Towers residents, who are classified as

off-campus residents by housing authorities, also favor the passage and extension of the mandatory meal plan. Chimed one Tower resident, "My daddy said if I stayed at Granville, I could have anything I wanted — and I want the mandatory meal plan." So there, what she said.

The formation of the new off-campus organization STAMP to take action immediately to protect the rights of "offs."

"We're going to fight for passage of the meal plan in order to clean up the streets... protect the rights of 'off' individuals to quality, uninhibited restaurant service," said acting president Woodrow Zimmerman.

"We're also going to fight for an extension of the plan to those who so desire it," said sergeant-of-waffles Christopher Maloney.

"We're going to stage a STAMP the CAMP rally," Zimmerman continued. "We're trying to get Mr. T and Hulk Hogan to come down here to get our message across... and well, you sure don't want to get them angry."

So students, both "ons" and "offs," vote April 18 in the mandatory meal plan referendum. It's not a light and dark situation. Go ahead, feel free and make the choice of a new generation.

Scott Canterbury, a junior chemistry/journalism major from Cary and assistant sports editor for The Daily Tar Heel, frequents the B.K. Lounge and other fine Franklin Street eating establishments. Huh, so there.

with those students who allegedly make the choice to cheat. If the system of honor was done away with at this school, any other alternative, such as placing proctors in exam rooms, would be demoralizing, degrading and would take away from one's individual freedom of choice. We, the students, who have had a large part in the development of our present-day Honor System, along with the faculty and administration, feel that self-discipline leads to self-development. In answering Dibbert's question of whether students internalize the code's ideals or just passively comply with it, we believe that through the exercise of self-governance, students can best develop a sense of what honor means. Therefore, as it exists now, the system of honor serves as an extension of the educational process itself.

Overall, Dibbert's letter is largely composed of a string of ad hominem attacks and the operation of the UNC Honor System. The pledge on an exam is a written symbol of the

student's recognition of his responsibilities under the code. It is not the be-all and end-all of the Honor System. The system is effective to the extent that it deters would-be cheaters and adjudicates cases involving students who are in fact accused of cheating.

The fact that students spend "megabucks" on their education is beside the point because Dibbert offers no alternative to replace the Honor System. As such, Dibbert is advocating throwing the baby out with the bathwater. The alternatives are to either "passively" accept (and thus condone) cheating or to "actively" monitor classroom behavior.

Although Dibbert couches his letter in terms of truth, justice and the American way, it is far from clear whether the alternatives he implies could in any way come closer to his educational and democratic ideals.

Ira Shapiro
Assistant Attorney General
Jeremy Ofseyer
Associate Attorney General

Let it be

To the editors:

Regarding Byson Fleming and Paul Laughman's letters purporting to refute Adam Falk's letter ("Number 8?" April 10): C'mon, folks, if you're going to counter a person's argument, at least try to get that argument straight. Falk did not dispute the existence or the crucifixion of Jesus Christ (although he did say that the Biblical version of the death was not verified historically, this comment, viewed in context, refers only to the account of the resurrection).

Yet both Fleming and Laughman go to great lengths — and some arguments ad absurdum — to defend these two points, which were never, in any rational reading of Falk's letter, in dispute. Either both missed the not overly subtle distinctions among existence, death and resurrection as abstract concepts, or they are setting up a straw man.

At least Laughman is intellectually honest enough to note that the Roman historian he cites "acknowledge... at least, the belief by the Christians of his resurrection," and that "at best, some of them scoff at the event." Fleming, by contrast, ignores the issue of outside corroboration entirely and relies solely on "the records of the Christian church." To "prove" that these records are truthful and non-propagandist, he cites the Gospels' depictions of the disciples in a "bad light," and in so doing displays a monumental misunderstanding of one major purpose of the Gospels — the didactic function. Thus, these "failings" of the disciples serve to emphasize the necessity of faith (the fear during the storm on the Sea

of Galilee), to set Jesus apart from mortals (Peter's failure to walk on water), and to underline the essential weakness of man and his capacity for sin (even rock-steady Peter denied Christ). These are lessons the church wants to teach, Fleming. They reflect well on Jesus and badly on man — what better propaganda can you get!

As for the "quantity of manuscripts and how close the copies are to the time of the original" — do you mean, Fleming, that if one person prints 10,000 copies of a lie around the time it originates, and another prints only 500 copies of the truth some years after the time in question, the mere quantity of repetitions of the lie makes it true? I am not arguing here that the Gospels are a lie; I'm trying to show you that your reasoning is faulty.

In the end, Falk's contention remains unassailed: there is an eighth alternative, beyond even the seven theological ones set forth by Mike Morgan, and it is given some weight by the lack of external corroboration (outside of Biblical material) of the crucifixion. The fact that this is a valid alternative does not mean that the other seven are automatically wrong: that is a point that Falk understands and concedes, but both Fleming and Laughman miss completely. Falk's position is based on reason and historical documentation, Fleming's and Laughman's, ultimately, on faith and scriptural authority. Both are valid; neither can be proved. So let it be.

Marcia Decker
Chapel Hill

Allen Rosen
Chapel Hill