

# The Daily Tar Heel

96th year of editorial freedom

JEAN LUTES, Editor

KATHY PETERS, Managing Editor  
 KAREN BELL, News Editor  
 MATT BIVENS, Associate Editor  
 KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor  
 SHARON KEBSCHULL, State and National Editor  
 MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor  
 KELLY RHODES, Arts Editor  
 MANDY SPENCE, Design Editor

JON RUST, Managing Editor  
 KAARIN TISUE, News Editor  
 AMY HAMILTON, Associate Editor  
 KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor  
 WILL LINGO, City Editor  
 LEIGH ANN McDONALD, Features Editor  
 CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor  
 DAVID MINTON, Photography Editor

## Students suffer with poor profs

At Friday's Faculty Council meeting, Chancellor Christopher Fordham reported that UNC appears ready to enroll more black students this fall than in the past. He called for stronger efforts to attract black faculty members, urging search committees to consider more black candidates for faculty positions.

Recognizing that a University commitment to retain incoming black students will demand an effort to attract and keep black professors, Fordham's request must not fall on deaf ears. The number of black UNC professors fell from 50 in 1984 to 48 in 1987. Meanwhile, the demand for top-notch black professors continues to increase.

But the difficulty of attracting black professors is a symptom of a larger problem. In the past, the reputation of the University, the strength of the faculty and UNC's setting were often sufficient to draw top-rated faculty members to Chapel Hill. Now, universities across the country are offering the same. For a professor considering positions at UNC and the University of Michigan, salary may be the deciding factor. If that is the case, Michigan wins.

Faculty salaries at UNC are becoming less attractive. In 1980, compensation at UNC ranked in the top 20 percent for all faculty positions at major U.S. research institutions. By

1986, UNC was no longer included in the top 20 percent for professors, and was not listed in the top 40 percent for associate and assistant professors.

In 1987, the average faculty salary at the University of California-Berkeley was \$54,600. At UNC, it was \$42,100.

At this month's Board of Governors meeting, UNC-system president C.D. Spangler said he is pushing a 5 percent faculty salary increase as a high priority in the General Assembly's summer session.

Spangler's push should be bolstered by student support. One possibility for action is an organized student lobby to secure the faculty salary increases. Working with the Faculty Council and other UNC administrators, the leadership of student organizations — student government and the Black Student Movement, for example — could effectively pool ideas and resources for a strong, legitimate voice in Raleigh. Legislators may be more likely to listen if the University's requests are voiced by a unified group of students, faculty and administrators.

If the University must hire mediocre teachers, it is students who will suffer the most. They should step forward and assume part of the responsibility for attracting and maintaining a diverse, committed faculty. — Kelly Clark

## Jordan sticks his foot in mouth

Hearing a politician make a candid remark is almost as rare as having the Smith Center filled with screaming Duke fans. Chapel Hill residents were treated to both last week.

The raucous Duke cheers have faded into the Carolina blue rafters, but Lt. Gov. Bob Jordan's recent comments to a group of black leaders continue to echo. It's a hollow sound.

Jordan, the likely Democratic nominee for governor, told a group of black newspaper executives and civic leaders in Greensboro that he needed the black vote to win the election. However, he said he could not support blacks on certain issues because he also needed "the white redneck vote in Eastern North Carolina." He continued: "I'm not going to come out with programs that will defeat me, no matter how I stand on that program, because I want to get elected. There may be some programs that you believe in and I believe in that will not be campaign issues, because if they are, I won't be governor."

Jordan says he was trying to tell black leaders that he must reach out for the conservative vote. But he cannot legitimately ask black voters to support him, based on an agenda he refuses to fully reveal. Such an approach implies that black-oriented

programs are not important enough to make campaign issues. It also requires black constituents to trust that, if elected, Jordan will keep campaign promises that he has not even made. Trust is one thing, but blind trust? Come on, Bob.

Calling the whites of Eastern North Carolina "rednecks" wasn't a bright move, either. Although the lieutenant governor insists that he did not use the term in a derogatory manner, calling someone a redneck is rarely a compliment. To almost everyone, it brings to mind the image of uneducated and even racist people.

Politicians have to get elected, and catering to different interest groups is a fact of life for all candidates for public office. But Jordan did more than that. He readily consented to the political tradition of doublespeak, coupling that consent with a remark that was potentially insulting to at least two large groups of constituents.

Jordan wants to be elected governor. North Carolinians may prize candor in their elected officials, but it's doubtful that they will prize stupidity. And nothing else can describe a candidate who manages, in one fell swoop, to alienate all voters who supported him based on his stated platform. — Jean Lutes

## Readers' Forum

### Rigid perspectives stifle education

Bryan Hassel  
 Symposium 1988

Rules, rules, rules. A lot of the time it seems like our whole education is nothing but the maze of rules we have to follow to graduate. "Do this, do that, and do it in such-and-such a way. And it's all for your own good." Well, let's take a closer look. Here are a few examples of how academic rules and regulations "enhance" the educational experience of students at UNC.

An acquaintance of mine is a political science major. As a graduating senior, she wanted to take a music course to broaden her horizons. But her schedule was full: she had to take a course to fulfill her Social Science perspective, even though she had had four years full of poli sci. In this way, the perspective system, supposedly designed to ensure a wide-ranging academic program, effectively narrowed the scope of her education.

I took a philosophy course one semester, and the vast majority of the students were there to fulfill a perspective. Most students approached the course as something to "get through," and the professor adopted a similar attitude. Needless to say, the class was less than stimulating. When they finished class, a lot of people who enjoy philosophy found themselves disliking Philosophy, resentful that the experience had been forced upon them.

A friend is taking a massive load of classes and recently realized the burden is too great. He wants to keep all his classes, but he's too late: he missed the deadline for declaring a "pass/fail." Now he faces a semester in which his ability to perform in all of his classes and other activities is threatened. In short, the early, strict pass/fail deadline will only serve to damage his educational experience.

These may sound like isolated cases, but my experience suggests that they are all

too common. Rules apparently intended to enhance our academic experience end up hindering our intellectual development. Furthermore, the regulations reflect a condescending attitude on the part of the "powers that be." The faculty may have an excellent sense of the general shape an education should take, but to apply this broad approach as a blanket policy to all students is to ignore the fact that individual students know themselves best. Rather than impose restrictions on the undergraduates, the faculty should find other ways to transfer their valuable experience to the students.

For instance, why not train advisers intensively on how to help students choose a direction in their education? The time advisers spend on filling out forms and ensuring compliance with all the requirements would be better spent teaching students how to use their brains to tailor an academic program to their own interests and strengths. And students can help students: a pilot program of student advising is in the works now. The rules could be abandoned; students and their advisers could be trusted to work together on an educational plan that makes sense to them.

I know this would be a big departure from current trends. In a transitional phase, requirements could be made more general, allowing individual students and faculty to design courses of study that fulfill general guidelines but meet particular needs. Restrictions (like the pass/fail drop

deadline) could be made more flexible. If students can make reasonable cases that their educations will be helped and not hindered by bending the rules, then the rules should be bent. And students shouldn't have to go through cumbersome appeals and other bureaucracy. Why can't advisers and students work these things out? Requirements and rules are not ends in themselves. If they don't achieve their intended purposes, they should be changed.

But in the long run, all academic decisions should be left up to students and faculty. I think everyone will be pleased at how well people — yes, even students — can make choices about their own lives, especially when they're guided by intelligent people who know how to give good advice. Combining the student's personal sense of direction with their peers' and the faculty's general knowledge of education would generate an atmosphere in which better decisions would be made.

Education should not be a mass production line where every product (student) must go through a series of processes to emerge as a fully formed human being. Instead, the University should be an interactive community in which its members cooperate to create an educational environment that allows both individuals and the whole to improve. Excessive rules and regulations eliminate the critical process of self-determination, which should be the very essence of education. So let's start looking at some ways to loosen the process up, giving students the flexibility they need to get the most out of what Carolina has to offer.

Bryan Hassel is a senior history major from Nashville, Tenn.

### Rally coverage one-sided

To the editor:  
 When did the DTH become a public relations agency for the Palestinians? Journalists should provide information in a way that lets readers develop their own opinions about issues. However, an article published on the March 14 front page, "Rally supports Palestinian freedom," is a one-sided view to a multi-faceted conflict and provides only a small portion of the information needed by readers.

Some people might say that the article was about a political organization, not an issue. Still, the DTH shouldn't have printed accusations of torture and human rights violations without some effort to verify the facts or at least balance them against conflicting assertions.

How difficult would it have been to find other points of view? If the reporter had called the Hillel Foundation on campus or one of the five synagogues in the Triangle Area, any of those resources would have provided information and names of people who might respond to the allegations. In fact, on March 15, the Israeli Consul General was scheduled to speak in Hamilton Hall. An interview with him or coverage of the speech would have made the article more fair.

I don't object to the article because of the position taken by the organization; rather, I object to the article because it was given the same status as any other news story even though it was clearly biased.

The DTH is a newspaper, not a position paper, and, as journalists, the staff has a responsibility to publish arti-



cles that give a balanced view of the issues involved. There is space on the back page for editorials.

HEIDI AYCOCK  
 Graduate Journalism

### More hypocrite than sinner

To the editor:  
 In response to Jeanne Newman's letter, "True Christians" (March 14), I would like to help her understand why "the entire nation is up in arms" about Jimmy Swaggart's scandal. I do not believe that Swaggart's involvement with a prostitute is the main issue. Swaggart's "pious" attitude and his holier-than-thou sermons are juxtaposed to his fascination for pornographic acts. A man who can stand in front of millions of followers, week after week, and preach about God's word while sneaking around with a

prostitute is a... dare I say it... hypocrite!

Newman's comparison of Michael Jackson to Jimmy Swaggart is ludicrous. Michael Jackson does not profess to be one of God's chosen messengers. Neither does he plead for people to send him money or attend his concerts. Swaggart has one of the most lucrative ministries in America. In addition, Swaggart must have forgotten that old Indian saying about not judging someone until walking a mile in his shoes when he, quite vocally, spoke out against Jim Bakker's sins.

Swaggart has asked for forgiveness for his sins, and I think it should be granted. However, perhaps Swaggart should take some time to re-examine the Christian doctrine of grace and redefine his principles and morals before returning to his ministry.

DEANNA RAMEY  
 Sophomore English

### Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel encourages reader comments and criticisms. We ask that you follow a few guidelines in exchange for access to this unique public forum.

■ All letters and columns must be signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter or column.

■ For ease of editing, all letters must be typed and double-spaced.

■ When submitting letters or columns, students should include name, year in school, major, phone number and home town. Other members of the University community should include similar information.

■ The DTH reserves the right to edit letters for space, clarity and vulgarity.

## Abortion is murder of the innocent

In the March 18 column, "Conflict of Rights Clouds Abortion Issue," Patricia Hurst states that by "surveying the philosophical literature on the morality of abortion, one quickly determines that the debate centers around definitions of personhood." She points out that there is broad disagreement as to what this definition is, and suggests that feminists, instead of focusing on the issue of personhood, should concentrate on the relationship of abortion to the "patriarchal domination of women."

To begin with, it is true that there is an extensive amount of debate in the philosophical literature as to the "personhood" of the unborn. However, this does not mean that the morality of abortion centers on whether the unborn child is a "person." Simply put, the annals of philosophy are incapable of disproving what science has told us and what the author herself admits: that an unborn child is a living human being and that after an abortion, that human being is dead.

An extremely odd phenomenon has occurred over the past 20 years. Before the advent of ultrasound imaging and microphotography, there were two diametrically opposed views of abortion. One view was that a fetus is a living human being and is therefore entitled to protection under the law. The other view was that there is no

Mark Yavarone  
 Guest Writer

proof that a fetus is a living human being, so abortion on demand can be justified. Since that time, a shocking number of people have synthesized these views into the position espoused by the author of the March 18 column. They admit that the victim of an abortion is an innocent, living human being, admit that we have destroyed over 17 million of these human beings since 1973, but have somehow convinced themselves that this fact is not the key issue.

Today, we know that the main organ systems of human beings are formed by the eighth week after conception. (Consult any embryology textbook.) This fact explains what we see during ultrasound imaging of even first trimester suction abortions: the dismembering of a tiny human body. Yes, people can make many seemingly convincing arguments for why abortion on demand is needed, but let's not kid ourselves into forgetting the overriding issue: abortion is the brutal killing of innocent human beings.

By now you have probably read my name and noticed that I am of the male

gender. Since I am never going to need an abortion, what gives me the right to impose my views on others? I think we need to realize that by opposing abortion, we are standing up for the rights of millions of preborn Americans — more than half of whom are female. It is paradoxical that the majority of those who claim to support women's rights also deny the most basic right of any human female — the right to life.

The column writer says that she "wonders if abortion would even be an issue if its 4,000 daily victims were capable of speaking for themselves. What gives us the right to impose our views on them?"

Abortion is admittedly a complex, emotional and controversial issue. As a society, we need to treat its root causes and to do more to provide alternatives to women with crisis pregnancies. But we cannot forget that the fundamental issue in abortion is that it kills innocent human beings. To do so is to claim that the essence of abortion is something other than abortion.

Mark Yavarone is a graduate student studying cell biology and anatomy from Belmar, N.J.

### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Kelly Clark, Stuart Hathaway and Bill Yelverton.

Editorial Assistants: Laura Pearlman and Becky Riddick.

Assistant Managing Editors: Hannah Drum, Barbara Linn, Felisa Neuringer, Laura Pearlman and Clay Thorp.

Assistant Design Editors: Cara Bonnett and Teresa Kriegsmann.

Design Assistants: Ashley Campbell, Katherine Hortenstine and Laura Ross.

News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Katie Beck, Crystal Bell, Laura Bennett, James Benton, Tammy Blackard, Patricia Brown, Brenda Campbell, Lacy Churchill, Jenny Cloninger, Staci Cox, Robin Curtis, Jackie Douglas, Carrie Dove, Laura Francis, Eric Gribbin, Amy Grubbs, William Hildebolt, Kyle Hudson, Suzette Hughes, Sonya Jackson, Helen Jones, Patrice Jones, Susan Kauffman, Chris Landgraaf, Barbara Linn, Laura Mayfield, Brian McCollum, Rebecca Nesbit, Helle Nielsen, Susan Odenkirchen, Laura Peay, Cheryl Pond, Beth Rhea, Mark Shaver, Christopher Sontchi, Laura Summer, William Taggart, Clay Thorp and Amy Weisner. Laura DiGiano, assistant city editor. Amy Winslow, assistant state and national editor. Mark Folk and Justin McGuire, senior writers. Peter Lineberry, Lisa Poole and Juliellen Sarver, wire editors.

Sports: Jim Muse and Chris Spencer, assistant sports editors. James Surowiecki, senior writer. Robert D'Arruda, Chris Chapman, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Ginger Jonas, Brendan Mathews, Patton McDowell, Keith Parsons, Andy Podolsky and Langston Wertz.

Features: Jo Lee Credle, Myrna Miller, Jim Mock, Corin Ortiam, Leigh Pressley, Carole Southern, Ellen Thornton, Linda van den Berg, Julie Woods and Holly Young.

Arts: James Burrus, senior writer. Scott Cowen, Stephanie Dean, Kim Donehower, David Hester, Julie Olson, Alston Russell and Michael Spirtas.

Photography: Christie Blom, Janet Jarman, Elizabeth Morrah, Jeff Shuler and Julie Stovall.

Copy Editors: Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Bert Hackney and Sherry Miller.

Cartoonists: Bill Cokas, Jeff Christian and Greg Humphreys.

Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg and David Starnes.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, director. Patricia Glance, advertising director. Joan Worth, advertising coordinator. Peggy Smith, advertising manager. Sheila Baker, business manager. Rita Galloway, accounts receivable clerk. Michael Benfield, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Amy McGuire, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovensky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, display advertising representatives. Diane Cheek, Stephanie Chesson, Tina Perry and Lisa Poole, classified advertising representatives; and Jeff Carlson and Kris Carlson, secretaries.

Subscriptions: Tucker Stevens, manager. Cody McKinney, assistant.

Distribution: David Eiconopolis, manager. Cindy Cowan and Billy Owens, assistants.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Genevieve Halkett, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon, production assistants.

Printing: The Chapel Hill Newspaper.