

The Daily Tar Heel

96th year of editorial freedom

JEAN LUTES, Editor

KAREN BELL, News Editor
MATT BIVENS, Associate Editor
KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor
JON K. RUST, Managing Editor
WILL LINGO, City Editor
KELLY RHODES, Arts Editor
CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor
SHELLEY ERBLAND, Design Editor

KAARIN TISUE, News Editor
LAURA PEARLMAN, Associate Editor
KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor
SHARON KEBSCHULL, State and National Editor
MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor
LEIGH ANN McDONALD, Features Editor
DAVID MINTON, Photography Editor
KELLY THOMPSON, Design Editor

Tit for tat on Capitol Hill

To the victors go the spoils, right? In this election, perhaps not.

The great mudslinging of 1988 is over, and it has left a bitter taste in the mouths of many. Voter dissatisfaction is great, according to media reports, and the effects remain to be seen. Losers suggest (and perhaps hope) that the victors, even though they won the races, will lack the popular support to be effective. Winners just lie low, relying on the suspect political memories of Americans. By the time the victors take office, their logic goes, the whole negative affair will be forgotten.

Sadly enough, this logic is probably correct. The process of negative advertising is a time-tested American political tradition, hailing back to the days of the nation's founding. As a form of speech, it's protected by the First Amendment. More importantly, it works.

This year things have taken a drastic change. The candidates are so visibly associated with the tactics of negative campaigning that voters aren't sure they like it, and the parties of the losing candidates definitely do not. Bush is already dealing with Democratic assurances of difficulty with Congress, and the traditional "honeymoon" period may be non-existent for the new administration.

Closer to home, things are even

The lessons of the Holocaust

While we in the states are preoccupied with the prospects of a Bush era in American politics, the citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany are trying to come to terms with their past, determined to see that their ancestors' mistakes shall never be repeated again.

On Wednesday, millions gathered to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Kristallnacht, a night of anti-Semitic violence that culminated in the Holocaust. In November 1938, German animosity toward Jews had peaked, for Hitler had used their alleged crimes as justification for the existence of the Third Reich.

But no one could predict the explosion that occurred on Nov. 9 of that year, after a Jewish man murdered a German official. Spurred by the emotional pleas of their Fuhrer, the entire country erupted, resulting in an orgy of looting and burning. The synagogues and all other manifestations of a once-thriving Jewish culture were gutted.

Fifty years later, the mental scars from that night are as deep as ever. Most, but not all, who participated in the persecution have long since passed away, leaving their children to suffer the guilt for their sins. But the ramifications of the Holocaust did not end at the German border.

As World War II came to a close, the Allied armies slowly began to

more complicated. Jim Gardner, newly-elected lieutenant governor, has a long and winding road ahead of him. Democrats, strongly aligned with Gardner's opponent, Tony Rand, and infuriated with Gardner's behavior, have vowed to strip Gardner of his strength in the General Assembly. Gardner's infamous "drug accomplice" commercial, which prompted Rand to file a libel suit, has many Democrats convinced that they are entirely justified in attacking Gardner, even if it stagnates state business. Public opinion as it stands now would do little to prevent such an occurrence.

And that's the danger of negative advertising. Revenge and recriminations, admittedly, are not the proper business of a government, but Democrats feel they must make the Republicans feel the consequences of their tactics. Tit for tat on Capitol Hill.

Solving the problem is nearly impossible. Nationally, Congress is talking about withholding federal matching funds unless a candidate participates in a required number of debates. That does nothing for the problem on a state level, however.

The only other solution is that voters end the process themselves, by proving that misleading and malicious advertising will do candidates more harm than good. Otherwise, it will be more of the same in 1992. — David Starnes

uncover the atrocities in concentration camps, such as Dachau and Auschwitz, all across Eastern Europe. Most shocking was the fact that as the Nazi war effort bogged down, the pace of the killings actually quickened, perhaps in the futile hope that none could live to speak of these heinous crimes.

Following the war, the Jews that remained were left without a home, leading the British to donate the state of Palestine as a homeland, displacing a large number of Palestinians, who have been fighting the Israelis ever since.

Isn't it amazing that an entire race of people, who only 40 years ago had no homeland, is among the most powerful on the face of the Earth? Isn't it also ironic that this very country, whose founding fathers survived the terrors of Nazi Germany and the death camps, now insist on persecuting a different race of people, even though the Palestinians were there first?

The Kristallnacht, which began as an excuse to exterminate an entire race, is now creating problems in a completely different part of the world — only this time the Jews are the oppressors. Let us not forget the pitfalls of acting on the emotions of hatred and violence. The Holocaust should serve as a firm reminder for anyone who still wishes to callously persecute the meek. — Dave Hall

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Louis Bisette, Sandy Dimsdale, Dave Hall and David Starnes.

Assistant Editors: Jenny Cloninger and Justin McGuire, university; Staci Cox and William Taggart, state and national; Felisa Neuringer, managing; Dave Glenn, Andrew Podolsky and Chris Spencer, sports; Brian Foley, photography.

News: Lynn Ainsworth, Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, John Bakht, David Ball, Crystal Bernstein, James Benton, Tammy Blackard, Patricia Brown, Charles Brittain, James Burroughs, Sarah Cagle, Brenda Campbell, Julie Campbell, Lacy Churchill, James Coblin, Daniel Conover, L.D. Curle, Karen Dunn, Erik Flippo, Laura Francis, Lynn Goswick, Eric Gribbin, Susan Holdsclew, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Chris Landgraff, Jessica Lanning, Bethany Litton, Dana Clinton Lumsden, Helle Nielsen, Glen O'Neal, Simone Pam, Dana Primm, Beth Rhea, Thom Solomon, Will Spears, Michael Spirtes, Larry Stone, William Taggart, Laura Taylor, Kathryn Tovo, Amy Wajda, Sandy Wall, Andrew Waters, Amy Weisner, Leslie Wilson, Jennifer Wing, Amy Winslow, Nancy Wykle, Elizabeth Bass, Laura Hough, Dorothy Hutson and Peter Lineberry, wire typists.

Sports: Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, John Bland, Robert D'Arruda, Scott Gold, Doug Hoogervorst, Bethany Litton, Brendan Mathews, Jay Reed, Jamie Rosenberg, Natalie Sekicky, Dave Surowiecki, Lisa Swicegood, Eric Wagner and Langston Wertz.

Features: David Abernathy, Cheryl Allen, Craig Allen, Jo Lee Credle, Jackie Douglas, Mary Jo Dunnington, Hart Miles, Myrna Miller, Kathy Peters, Cheryl Pond, Leigh Pressley and Ellen Thornton.

Arts: Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Cara Bonnett, Beth Buffington, Ashley Campbell, Elizabeth Ellen, Andrew Lawler, Julie Olson, Joseph Rhea and Jessica Yates.

Photography: Steven Exum, David Foster, Becky Kirkland, Tony Mansfield, Belinda Morris and Dave Surowiecki.

Copy Editors: Cara Bonnett, Michelle Casale, Yvette Cook, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Joy Golden, Bert Hackney, Susan Holdsclew, Anne Isehower, Gary Johnson, Angelia Potate and Steve Wilson.

Editorial Assistants: Beth Altman, Mark Chilton, Jill Doss and Sandi Hungerford.

Design Assistant: Mary Dillon.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Trey Entwistle, David Estoye, Luis Hernandez and Greg Humphreys.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Christy Mennitt, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Dawn Dunning, Beth Harding, Sarah Hoskins, Amy McGuire, Maureen McIntyre, Denise Neely, Tina Perry, Pam Strickland, Amanda Tilley and Joye Wiley, display advertising representatives; Leisa Hawley, creative director; Dan Raasch, marketing director; Stephanie Chesson, Alecia Cole, Genevieve Halkett, Camille Philyaw, Tammy Sheldon and Angela Spiney, classified advertising representatives; Jeff Carlson, secretary, and Allison Astworth, assistant.

Subscriptions: Cody McKinney, manager; Ken Murphy, assistant.

Distribution: David Econopouly, manager; Cindy Cowan, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, coordinators; Anita Bentley, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Leslie Sapp, assistants.

Printing: The Village Companies.

Learning something outside the classroom

Bill Yelverton

Notes from the Abyss

It happens every time I get an exam back. There is always someone sitting in the next row trying casually to look over my paper and check my grade. If I am dumb enough to hide it from them, they simply ask, "How'd you do?" I try to look annoyed, which never quite works, and tell them that I'm satisfied with what I got. They react like sharks who smell blood: "I'm sorry you didn't do that well," they say with insincere concern. Then I break down and tell them my grade — I honestly don't care what it is, as long as I feel that I have learned something.

After all, that is the true purpose of a university, to bring people together to disseminate knowledge and to assimilate more knowledge. Unfortunately, many students have lost sight of this goal. They see the university as their ticket to graduate and professional schools and high-salaried jobs. Instead of seeking to broaden their knowledge, they strive to push up their grade-point averages. Rather than work to enrich the educational environment around them, they work to keep themselves on top of the numbers heap.

This grade consciousness is not only detrimental to the students' education but also to the classroom setting. In a competitive environment students are less likely to speak out and risk being wrong. Professors who are not constantly being challenged by their students are less likely to challenge the students in return. This leads to large classes composed of students learning the material by rote so they can regurgitate it on exams.

Good professors will continue to challenge their students, patiently awaiting a glimmer of understanding in return. Those who do not care as much will simply lecture to their bored audiences and pursue their

own research. There are challenging classes and interested faculty members on this campus; however, they are not everywhere. Students interested in learning will seek them out, and those interested only in grades will continue to avoid them.

At any university, students have opportunities to learn outside the classroom. A great deal of the education we receive is from the other members of the community. This external opportunity varies from year to year, but is always available in some form.

I'm not talking about the education we receive simply by being away from home. Learning to balance a checkbook, looking for a place to live, reading the instructions on the back of a box of laundry detergent, are all valuable experiences. But in themselves, they rarely challenge us to seek out more knowledge or reach deeper understanding.

Those who aren't fulfilled in the classroom should check out all the different student groups working on this campus. By and large these students are working to better the university community and in the process educate themselves.

For instance, the Carolina Union Activities Board offers a variety of programs which educate and entertain, such as the Performing Arts Series.

When the Executive Branch of student government worked to change the noise ordinance, students had to research the workings of town government and then work within the system. And to change

the University's perspective requirements, students are conducting surveys and consulting other universities. The knowledge of the process is something that can't be learned in the classroom.

Human Rights Week '88, sponsored by the Campus Y, offers another opportunity to learn outside the classroom. Throughout the year, 30 committees at the Campus Y work with groups to increase awareness of problems on the local and national level. Human Rights Week provides a concentrated forum for all university groups to explore these important issues.

Each day next week will be full of programs discussing issues such as racism, U.S. foreign policy, women's rights, illiteracy and problems of the handicapped. Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young will deliver the keynote address Wednesday night. As a civil rights leader, former U.N. ambassador and former congressman, Young offers a unique perspective on social change.

Those who have worked on Human Rights Week '88 have already achieved some benefit in the process. However, their goal is not only to benefit themselves but to provide others with the chance to learn. It is up to us to use that opportunity, for it is something that will not always be available.

The groups I have mentioned do not nearly encompass the scope of student activity on this campus, and many others are worthy of attention. Thoughtful participation both inside and outside the classroom is essential to getting the most from your education.

Bill Yelverton is a senior English major from Darien, Conn.

Readers' Forum

DTH coverage biased

To the editor:

For the past two months, since I have been a student at Carolina, I have noticed that the DTH has favored Michael Dukakis much more than George Bush. Especially in the last two weeks this fact has become evident. There is a significantly larger presence of "pro-Dukakis" articles written in the newspaper, not to mention the overwhelming majority of "pro-Dukakis" letters and columns printed on the editorial page.

I, along with many others, have always believed that when reporting current events the articles should remain impartial. And even though I have tried to disregard the greater amount of articles supporting Michael Dukakis before this election, I could not tolerate reading the election results article in the Nov. 9 issue.

First of all, the title, which reads "Bush, Quayle trounce Democrats," is misleading. As many of us know, George Bush and Dan Quayle beat Mike Dukakis and Lloyd Bentsen, not "the Democrats." As a matter of fact, the Democrats gained seats in both houses of Congress. Next, only one-quarter of the article is dedicated to George Bush's victory speech whereas over half the article gave quotes from Michael Dukakis' speech. The



quote taken from Bush referred to Dukakis, saying how great he (Dukakis) was and how proud he (Dukakis) should be. The quotes taken from Dukakis were all dealing with how hard Dukakis tried to win the election and how close he came, with emphasis on the line when the crowd chanted "92." George Bush won the election, and the DTH avoided saying anything positive about him.

Finally, the DTH failed to report many of the numbers in this election. They did give the electoral vote margin (300 votes), and they did report that with 77 percent of the precincts reporting, Bush had six million more popular votes than did

Dukakis. But they did not report the fact that Bush won the election with a lead of eight percentage points (much higher than the predicted four percentage point margin). And the DTH failed to report that since the Democratic convention in Atlanta (where Dukakis had a 17 percentage point lead), Bush has made up 25 percentage points to win the election.

In the future, I strongly suggest and hope that the DTH take a non-partisan stand toward political issues.

BORIS BUNICH
Freshman
Pre-law

Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. When writing letters to the editor, please follow these guidelines:

■ The DTH reserves the right to edit letters for space, clarity and vulgarity. Remember, brevity is the soul of wit.

■ Students should include name, year in school, major, phone number and home town. Other members of the University community should include similar information.

Don't say 'liberal' for 'statist' or 'socialist'

Anthony Woodlief

Guest Writer

After wading through several pages of superfluous esoteric garbage in Gray Styers' attempt to redefine the word "liberal" in his own terms ("Liberal" means innovation and vigor," Nov. 3), I found a few blatantly ignorant assertions with which I would like to take issue. Styers provides us with the dictionary definition of "liberal," essentially a political philosophy centering around individual liberty and representative government. He then attempts to extrapolate from this definition a broadened meaning. The meaning that Styers attempts to attach to the word "liberal," however, is one involving an abrogation of individual liberty and the imposition of government intervention in the economy, the very antithesis of liberalism.

Styers offers what he considers examples of liberal programs, such as public education, labor laws, the minimum wage, Social Security and Medicare. These are indeed commonly considered "liberal," yet they fly in the face of the definition of "liberal" that Styers himself asserts. All involve the intervention of the State in the economy, and a resulting violation of individual liberty. These programs are examples of a coercive State expropriating the property of some for the benefit of others, detailing to individuals how they will conduct their business, and creating masses of people dependent upon rulers for their well-being. As such, these programs can hardly be considered to be in keeping with a philosophy that advocates the freedom of the individual.

In addition to his ideological perversion of the word "liberal," Styers gives us a short list of "liberals" to whom we should feel indebted. Among these are three individuals who cannot go without mention: Andrew Jackson, Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy. A brief comment on each

will demonstrate to some degree the blatant disregard these men had for the principles embodied in the definition of "liberal."

Andrew Jackson, better known as the "Great Indian Fighter," was responsible for the murders of thousands of American Indians. When the U.S. Supreme Court under John Marshall ruled in *Worcester vs. Georgia* in 1832 that Georgia's removal of over 15,000 Cherokee Indians to allow white prospectors to pan for gold was illegal, Jackson responded to the decision by saying, "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it." Apparently Jackson didn't feel individual rights applied to Indians, or that he was obligated to respect the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. One wonders what principles of liberalism Jackson did adhere to, and why he is included in Styers' list.

Styers' second example of a liberal to whom we are indebted, Franklin Roosevelt, is an even more blatant divergence from the true definition of "liberal." Roosevelt, the closest thing to a fascist dictator this country has ever seen, demonstrated his disregard for the principles of liberalism by creating organizations such as the NRA and the AAA to control and direct the U.S. economy in a disastrous manner, one similar to the economic plans of other fascists of the day, such as Hitler and Mussolini. Through his commitment to price and wage control and his disregard for the free market, Roosevelt took his predecessor's economic intervention to a new high, prolonging the depression of the 1930s and steeping the

nation in unnecessary misery. Roosevelt demonstrated his disdain for the liberal idea of representative government by becoming the first president ever to veto financial legislation, generally regarded as the domain of our House of Representatives. His contempt for judicial procedure can be seen in his infamous court-packing scheme of 1937. No matter what one chooses to call Roosevelt, it certainly can't be "liberal."

In John Kennedy, Styers' third "liberal," we find a man who as President made several attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro and who initiated the murderous policy of sending troops into Vietnam. Apparently murder and military intervention were part of Kennedy's definition of "liberal."

Styers is certainly right in his assertion that conservatives do not know the true meaning of the term "liberal." For all of his eloquent rhetoric, however, Styers is no better. He and others apply the term "liberal" to people and programs that may more correctly be identified as "socialist," or "statist," terms that have justly acquired a negative connotation. It is unfortunate that they have appropriated the term "liberal" to lend credence to political theories of government intervention. By doing so they distort the true ideals of liberalism, which involve freedom and individual choice — ideals that are trampled upon by so-called liberals as well as conservatives. I advise Styers to read more closely the definition of "liberal" that he gives to us, for the word as he uses it has nothing to do with individual liberty, and everything to do with authoritarianism.

Anthony Woodlief is a junior political science major from Winston-Salem.