

The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, Managing Editor

LOUIS BISSETTE, *Editorial Page Editor*
JUSTIN MCGUIRE, *University Editor*
TAMMY BLACKARD, *State and National Editor*
ERIK DALE FLIPPO, *Business Editor*
CARA BONNETT, *Arts and Features Editor*
JULIA COON, *News Editor*

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, *Editorial Page Editor*
JENNY CLONINGER, *University Editor*
CHARLES BRITTAIN, *City Editor*
DAVE GLENN, *Sports Editor*
JAMES BENTON, *Omnibus Editor*
DAVID SUROWIECKI, *Photography Editor*

KELLY THOMPSON, *Design Editor*

Project outlook far from rosy

In 1985, developers and the Chapel Hill Town Council reached an agreement on a plan to alleviate the parking problem in Chapel Hill. Now, four years and several deadline extensions later, the Rosemary Square project is mired in financing problems which leave the future of the project uncertain — apparently all because of poor planning.

The sale of 188 units in a proposed condominium complex, The Chapel Hill Inn, originally was to provide funding for the project. Initial response to the units, which went up for sale in early January, was purported to be good. Developer Whit Morrow said that if sales were as brisk as expected, construction could begin by early summer — "By the time students come back in the fall we should be well underway." Evidently, Morrow and others involved in the financing of the project did not anticipate the problems that were to arise.

Last week, Morrow announced that the Rosemary Group developers "have suspended sale of the units until another way of financing has been chosen." It has been rumored that only six of the 188 units were sold. Town officials are now waiting for the developers to come up with a new plan for funding the project, and it appears that the town council may be faced with a request to extend the Sept. 30 closing deadline yet again.

Paying for public education

President Bush made a welcome departure from the policies of his predecessor earlier this week by rejecting tax breaks on tuition for private schools. In doing so, he acknowledged the primacy of public education in the United States, a long-overdue and badly needed endorsement for the system.

While Bush was visiting with 75 children, one boy who attended private school asked if his parents deserved a tax break on tuition. Bush's response was emphatic: "No, they shouldn't. I think it is the obligation of all tax payers to support the public education system in order to have the best." That attitude is rare for Washington and politicians in general these days; if Bush can make it catching, public school administrators everywhere should rejoice.

During Ronald Reagan's administration, the White House and Congress adopted a series of conflicting stances regarding public education, in effect leaving the institution in limbo. Denunciations of public schools became popular in the wake of a government report, and Washington seemed to be paving the way toward extending a helping hand. Then, in almost the same breath, Congress declared tuition to private institutions tax-exempt and in essence froze federal support for educational programs. The message seemed clear:

It is unclear how the developers could have made such an error; they hardly seem to have done any research to estimate the success of the condo sales before committing to the plan.

Morrow had expressed optimism over the sale of the condominium hotels, which has become a popular financing method in ocean resort areas such as Hilton Head, S.C. "Chapel Hill operates a little like a resort," he explained. A little, maybe, but obviously not enough.

Granted, the developers need not shoulder all of the blame for the funding failure. The Rosemary Square project is a joint venture between the public and private sectors. The developers were placed under constraints, especially time limits, that impeded their success, and the town council should have realized how unfeasible the plan was.

But after four years of no progress, Chapel Hill residents deserve more from a project so vital and urgently needed for downtown development. The town council should be cautious about granting another extension in September. The project has already had four years to succeed — patience and time are running short. If the town is willing to give the developers another chance, the council must insist on better planning in the future. — **Louis Bissette**

public schools are inadequate, so instead of doing something about it, send the kids somewhere else. That resulted in a loss of credibility and political support for public education, which translated into more financial difficulties.

Unfortunately, even with a tax break, private schools are an option reserved for very few families, and an overwhelming majority of Americans must make do with an educational system that is feeling a strong financial squeeze. Harold Hodgkinson, a nationally recognized demographer, estimates that in 20 years a majority of voting-age Americans will come from disadvantaged backgrounds and will be educated by under-funded, inadequate public programs. Clearly, education needs strong support on all levels, both political and financial, and the direction of that support must begin with the most visible of this nation's leaders.

Although removing tax-exempt status from private school tuitions certainly will not generate much money, the substance of Bush's stand loses nothing in its symbolic significance: public education is everyone's concern, regardless of direct participation. Perhaps Bush's statement even reflects Washington's belated willingness to address a growing national problem which is sowing some ominous seeds. — **David Starnes**

UNC owes Inn employees more respect

The Carolina Inn is in financial trouble — which means it is currently profitable, but future deficits are projected. Both the University and the Inn's management have reacted to this situation in a way that proves the truth of the old saying: when the going gets tough, the tough blame their employees. Managers say that state employees' salaries are too high.

The state employees who staff the Carolina Inn are among the lowest-paid workers on the University payroll. Many of these salaries would need to go up just to reach the federal poverty level. The employees also do some of the least attractive jobs around.

But this is not enough. They also have to worry about being thrown to the tender mercies of an outside contractor, who will want to cut wages and degrade working conditions in order to make the Inn more "competitive." Or they might simply be pulled out of the state personnel system,

Peter Schledorn

Guest Writer

with the same ultimate effect. Both the first option (which the University seems to favor) and the second (preferred by the Inn management) boil down to the same thing — a license to exploit the Inn's employees. They will be expected to save the hotel by lowering their standard of living.

Don't University officials feel the slightest embarrassment when they recommend 20 percent raises for the highest-paid faculty in the UNC system but claim that the salaries of \$6 per hour maids are too high to bear? Doesn't this make all the talk of a "University community" sound a little hollow?

The state employees who staff the Inn and the rest of the University have done

more than their share of sacrificing already. You would never know from University sources that the "annual salary increases" which are supposedly "running the hotel into the ground" actually represent a loss of real base salary since 1973, or that all state employees have been caught in a merit pay freeze since 1982, or that last year's state employee pay raise was lower than the general increase of wages in North Carolina, or that a raise that doesn't meet the inflation rate is no raise at all.

An institution such as this University has an obligation to act according to the ideals it professes. There is no future for any of us in turning UNC into the Eastern Airlines of academe.

Peter Schledorn is a technical assistant in the collection development department of Davis Library from Mebane.

Readers' Forum

Don't be quick to cry apathy

To the editor:

I am writing in response to the cartoon which ran in place of the Reader's Forum Tuesday (March 28). "Closed due to severe apathy," read Pete Corson's effort for that day. I am assuming that no letters were available for print that day, so the editorial staff chalked another one up to student apathy.

There are other reasons which may account for this apparent calamity. We had just come off a long weekend. Since no paper was printed on Friday, there was no Friday paper to respond to. It is doubtful that those who wished to respond to Monday's DTH were able to compose a thoughtful letter, transfer those thoughts onto dainty, double-spaced, typed pages (which are required to merit the mighty editor's attention), and still meet the afternoon deadline for Tuesday's paper. If any responses to Monday's paper were written, they will probably appear in Wednesday's DTH.

Furthermore, there are other ways of expressing ideas than writing letters to the DTH. My friends and I have had countless discussions and arguments where we expressed our ideas and tested our views against one another, yet we did not feel it necessary to send in our ideas to be edited "for space, clarity and vulgarity." I realize that not all letters received are in response to articles in the DTH, but the volume of mail received is not a universal gauge of student concern. Student groups can often become very smug about themselves, and when people do not embrace their programs, such as the "Reader's Forum," they are quick to cry "student apathy." Do not be so dogmatic as to believe that a lack of letters is equal to a lack of thought, debate or concern.

ROBERT DEROSSET
Sophomore
English

Pick adoption, not abortion

To the editor:

The letter in the Reader's Forum "Pizza where your mouth is" (March 1) by Tracy Matcham, is a joke! Her reference to "anti-choice" and her threats against Domino's Pizza



are typical of the National Organization of Women supporters. The pro-life movement is aimed at saving life, not killing it. Her pro-abortion brothers and sisters are missing the whole point of the matter.

Abortion is killing a living person. No matter what you call the person in a woman's womb — a fetus, a piece of protoplasm, a baby — it is still a life. The pro-abortion movement is selfish! It says that since it is not convenient, not wanted, unplanned, kill it! Where is their sense of responsibility? Where is the "choice" of the unborn baby, its right to life? If a newborn baby, one hour out of the womb, was not wanted and it were killed, our society would be in an uproar! But, if we haven't seen the baby because it's not born yet, it's okay to kill it. Right? Wrong! First of all, babies are fully formed very early. Usually when an abortion is done the pieces of the baby are formed — hands, fingers, fully formed. We do not have the right to kill someone because it's not convenient. Could we not develop the attitude that since certain people in our society can't care for themselves, and they're unwanted, then why don't we just abort them?

Ms. Matcham, I would challenge you to look into what happens at an abortion. Why don't you watch the movie "Silent Scream," or go to an abortion clinic for a look at what you support. I've seen what happens; it is horrible! We should also look at the abortion industry, which is billions of dollars strong. They are out to make money, and they do. Let's wake up, let's seek alternatives, like adoption. I would adopt a baby doomed rather than see

it aborted. Because just as we have a right to life, so do those unborn millions whose rights have been denied completely.

CRAIG TIDWELL
Graduate
Education

Don't root for Duke

To the editor:

The average Carolina fan could be described as polite, classy, socially and morally conscious, and maybe even loyal. These are definitely not characteristics of any truly loyal fan of anything. How can anyone claiming to be a loyal Tarheel fan pull for Duke in the Final Four? "But, they're ACC," you say. "They're from North Carolina." Who cares?

People, take a No-Do! These are Dookies! Our worst, hated enemy. Why should we, all of a sudden, pull for them? We all know that they would never do the same thing for us? Duke University probably had an all-campus bash when we lost. After all they've done to us, why now turn the other cheek? It's not loyalty to the ACC or the state of North Carolina, it's treachery to Carolina.

Remaining true and loyal to anything means sticking by it always. Over spring break, I got in a discussion with some guys from Dartmouth who was a better school, Duke or Carolina. Of course, there was no comparison and I shouldn't have even have wasted my breath because they had no idea what they were talking about. They're not even ranked. But it was a profitable contest because it made me realize how

lucky I am to go here and just how much I dislike Duke.

However, that's just me. In a better, more typical Carolina fan atmosphere, a friend of mine was watching the ACC Championship game with about 50 Carolina students and 50 Dookies in the Bahamas. After the game over, not one Carolina student said anything to the Dookies. Why not? You know that if Duke had won, they'd have been in all our faces.

So, now, why all of the wishy-washiness? There is no excuse in the world for any true Carolina fan to want Duke to win the NCAA Championship. Actually, I do want them to make it to the championship game — then lose! So, while you're watching the Final Four games, remember these famous words — Duke sucks!

SUZIE SALDI
Junior
Political science/Spanish

Letters policy

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

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

■ All letters must be typed and double-spaced, for ease of editing.

■ Place letters in the box marked "Letters to the Editor" outside the DTH office in the Student Union.

Protesters act out of concern for campus

To the editor:

In a recent column ("Don't rush four years in Chapel Hill," March 29) Mr. Callinicos made the rather obvious statement that students should appreciate their stay in the Southern part of heaven. I'm glad Mr. Callinicos enjoyed his stay in Chapel Hill. I'd like to point out that it is possible for those who aren't avid supporters of Ronald Reagan to enjoy Chapel Hill. I voted for Michael Dukakis, and the item of pop culture that will always remind me of Chapel Hill isn't a James Taylor song but rather the Jack Nicholson quote, "They used to hang people for having this much fun." My first memory of Chapel Hill was seeing Memorial Hall explode during an electrifying Lou Reed concert in November of 1984. I could cite several more examples of great music moments I've observed in and around campus, but this is intended for the editorial page, not an entertainment page.

Mr. Callinicos wants to know why people who were displeased with certain actions of the administration didn't go to school somewhere else. I can't speak for all protesters but I would like to try and explain to Mr. Callinicos why occasionally I have protested actions of the adminis-

tration. I try to treat the University the same way that I try to treat people I care about. When I see someone engaging in behavior that's self-destructive I do whatever I can to prevent this behavior. For example, if a friend of mine has too much to drink at a party, then I don't avoid him — I try to get him home safely. I care about this university and I would never abandon it just because it did a couple of stupid things. People and institutions aren't perfect; every once in a while they need constructive criticism. Every protest I've participated in was due to my sincere conviction that the administration was behaving in a manner that was not in the best interest of the University.

I, too, am embarrassed by students who couldn't find South Africa on a map or who think all white South Africans are racists (and by the way, all protesters are not Dale McKinley clones — a lot of protesters disagreed with him on a lot of issues). But one of my favorite things about this university is its diversity, and a consequence of that diversity is that someone will always be doing something that's embarrassing someone else. Personally, I got disgusted when I saw a fellow

student cheering at the sight of a human being writhing in physical pain. (It was an injured Duke basketball player.)

Now that I've attempted to explain to Mr. Callinicos why protesters don't leave this university, I would greatly appreciate it if Mr. Callinicos would explain to me why conservatives insist on quoting songwriters who disagree with their political views. In both the 1984 and 1988 campaigns, a couple of songwriters had to complain about being mentioned during Republican campaign speeches. (To save them from further embarrassment I won't name them.) I haven't kept up with James Taylor's career lately, but he'll always remind me of June 12, 1982. On that day 750,000 people gathered in Central Park to call for an end to the nuclear arms race that Reagan was avidly supporting. James Taylor performed that day. It was a day I'll never forget, probably the nicest day of my life — except of course for the days I've spent in Chapel Hill.

ARTIE SPARROW
Senior
Undecided

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Kimberly Edens, Chris Landgraaff and David Starnes.

Assistant Editors: Jessica Lanning, city; Myrna Miller, features; Staci Cox, managing; Anne Isenhower and Steve Wilson, news; Ellen Thornton, omnibus; Andrew Podolsky, Jay Reed and Jamie Rosenberg, sports;

Karen Dunn, state and national; James Burroughs and Amy Wajda, university.

News: Craig Allen, Kari Barlow, Maria Batista, Crystal Bernstein, Victor Blue, Heather Bowers, Sarah Cagle, Brenda Campbell, James Coblin, Staci Cox, L.D. Curle, JoAnna Davis, Blake Dickinson, Jeff Eckard, Karen Entriken, Deirdre Fallon, Lynn Goswick, Joey Hill, Susan Holdscrow, Jennifer Johnston, Jason Kelly, Tracy Lawson, Rhea Logan, Dana Clinton Lumsden, Jeff Lutrell, Kimberly Maxwell, Helle Nielsen, Glenn O'Neal, Simone Pam, Tom Parks, Jannette Pippin, Elizabeth Sherrod, Sonserae Smith, Will Spears, Larry Stone, Laura Taylor, Kelly Thompson, Kathryn Tovo, Stephanie von Isenburg, Genie Walker, Sandy Wall, Sherry Waters, Chuck Williams, Leslie Wilson, Jennifer Wing, Katie Wolfe and Nancy Wykle.

Sports: Mike Berardino, senior writer; Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, John Bland, Christina Frohock, Scott Gold, Doug Hoogervorst, David Kupstas, Bethany Litton, Brendan Matthews, Bobby McCruskey, Natalie Sekicky, Dave Surowiecki and Eric Wagnon.

Arts and Features: Kelly Rhodes, senior writer; Cheryl Allen, Lisa Antonucci, Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Adam Bertolett, Roderick Cameron, Ashley Campbell, Pam Emerson, Diana Florence, Laura Francis, Jacki Greenberg, Andrew Lawler, Elizabeth Murray, Julie Olson, Lynn Phillips, Leigh Presley, Kim Stallings, Anna Tumage and Jessica Yates.

Photography: Evan Eile, Steven Exum, Regina Holder and David Minton.

Copy Editors: Karen Bell, B Buckberry, Michelle Casale, Yvette Cook, Joy Golden, Bert Hackney, Kathleen Hand, Angela Hill, Susan Holdscrow, Karen Jackson, Janet McGirt, Angelia Poteat and Clare Weickert.

Editorial Assistants: Mark Chilton and Anne Isenhower. Amy Dickinson, letter typist.

Design Assistants: Kim Avetta, Melanie Black, Del Lancaster, Nicole Luter, Bill Phillips and Susan Wallace.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Bryan Donnell, Trey Entwistle, David Estoye, Grace Humphreys and Mike Sutton.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, classified manager; Stephanie Chesson, assistant classified manager; Chrissy Mennitt, advertising manager; Sabrina Goodson, 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; Genevieve Halkett, Camille Philyaw, Tammy Sheldon and Angela Spivey, classified advertising representatives; Jeff Carlson, office manager and Allison Ashworth, secretary.

Subscriptions: Ken Murphy, manager.

Distribution: David Econopouly, manager; Newton Carpenter, assistants.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, managers; Tammy Sheldon, assistant manager; Anita Bentley, Stephanie Locklear and Leslie Sapp, assistants.

Printing: The Village Companies.