

# The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, Editorial Page Editor  
 JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor  
 KAREN DUNN, State and National Editor  
 TOM PARKS, Business Editor  
 DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor  
 MELANIE BLACK, Design Editor

TAMMY BLACKARD, Editorial Page Editor  
 WILLIAM TAGGART, University Editor  
 JESSICA LANNING, City Editor  
 CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor  
 KELLY THOMPSON, Omnibus Editor  
 DAVID SUROWIECKI, Photography Editor

JULIA COON, News Editor

## Staff issues ignored

### New vice chancellor long overdue

Amid continuing publicity over the comparatively low pay and benefits for

**board opinion**

UNC faculty, a similar problem — though virtually unknown to many — has for too long received little attention from state officials. Throughout the past 20 years, inadequate personnel operations have often overlooked the interests of many of the UNC's 5,300 staff members, including clerks, secretaries, housekeepers, food service workers and groundskeepers. Public protests, petitions and embarrassing media coverage have made this institution often appear unconcerned with its employees. But at last these people will be granted administrative representation through the creation of a new post — the vice chancellor of human resources. After all these years, it's about time.

The new position, to be filled within a few weeks, was created on the recommendations from a study by an outside consulting firm. According to the study, the University has neglected training programs and has poor employee benefits and inadequate grievance procedures, among other problems. Such problems threaten the mission of this University.

Chancellor Paul Hardin speaks of service as one mission of the University, yet no "service" is shown toward such UNC housekeepers as Clementine Jones, a single mother of four who receives a yearly salary well below the poverty level for her 14 years of service to the University. Many food service workers, groundskeepers and housekeepers have trouble finding other jobs and are locked in to these low wages.

One out of five staff employees leave the University each year, and vacancies in

these positions have neared 300 in recent years. Until now, no official has spoken directly for the interests of these important yet largely unappreciated members of the community.

Relations and communication between University staff and administrators have long been strained. In 1969, 114 food workers went on strike to demand a 20 cent pay raise to a \$1.80 minimum wage. The workers received their demands, but not without the closing of Lenoir Hall, violence among students and National Guard soldiers lined up in the Pit. Clearly, the conflict could have been lessened by an administrator whose job was to deal with workers' concerns.

Two years ago, the Office of State Personnel authorized pay raises for UNC secretaries and clerks, but when the state did not deliver the raises, more than 500 employees gathered around South Building to protest. Many of these people had been faithful to UNC with years of service but were being punished by the loss of University purchasing power. Again, had there been a vice chancellor of human resources, he or she could have addressed the protesters and fought for their interests.

Most recently, the lack of administrative support for employees filing grievances contributed to a fiasco within the University police department and the reassignment of the department's director. The episode might have been avoided had there been a watchful eye in South Building.

UNC's staff members play an important behind-the-scenes role in the school's daily functions. The new post of vice chancellor of human resources is a belated, much-needed way to provide a voice to those who have gone without for so long.

## Too little, too late

### Navy 'stand-down' not soon enough

Leaving no stone unturned, the U.S. Navy ordered a 48-hour "stand-down" to review safety procedures following a series of serious accidents within the past three weeks. While the Navy should be commended for taking action, two days of safety classes and review of equipment operations may be too little and too late.

This temporary freeze of the Navy means 599,000 sailors, both ashore and on 566 ships, will spend two days in special training sessions and equipment operations classes reviewing basic safety procedures. But placing new emphasis on safety now is similar to closing the barn door after the cows have wandered away.

There have been 102 deaths this year relating to Navy accidents. While 47 of these deaths resulted from the April 19 explosion on the USS Iowa, the average number of deaths per year since 1984 is 69.5. Why have Navy officials waited so long to make safety a priority? Since the USS Iowa tragedy, 25 major accidents involving Navy personnel have occurred around the world.

This week's unprecedented stand-down came only after seven serious mishaps in three weeks, five of which occurred this week.

On Nov. 12, the Destroyer USS Kinkaid collided with a merchant ship off the coast of Malaysia, killing one U.S. sailor. On the same day, a sailor from the USS Forrestal died four days after an armored hatch hit his head.

On Nov. 13, two Navy attack jets overshot their practice range and dropped 12 500-pound bombs on a desert campsite in California. One man was slightly injured and a mobile home was damaged.

At least 29 people were injured in a fire aboard the USS Inchon during shipyard maintenance in Norfolk, Va. An F-14 jet crashed off the coast of Florida. The crew escaped.

When people join any branch of the U.S. Armed Forces, they are expected to make sacrifices for their country. Yet lives should not be the price of poor training and maintenance. In a country not at war, too many sailors have died, while the Navy blames the accidents on bad luck and coincidence. Some of these accidents and deaths cannot be explained away.

On May 1, two sailors were washed overboard, and officials are investigating a report that their submarine was diving while the crewmen were on the deck. Such incompetence would not be tolerated in a private enterprise, and it should not be accepted in the U.S. military.

Navy veterans, officers, sailors and their families blame the increase in fatalities on relaxed training methods, inexperienced personnel and sub-standard maintenance. There has been criticism that training standards have fallen within the past five to 10 years. Experts are also arguing that experienced sailors are being sent into situations above their capabilities.

The Navy must take responsibility for these accidents and stop this cycle of needless deaths. While doing so will not return the deceased to their families, it will ensure that these sacrifices do not continue. The stand-down is a start, but only with a program of active inspection, intense safety training and high standards can the Navy regain its prestige as a respected pillar of the U.S. military. — Charles Brittain



## A career is no good without self-knowledge

To the editor: In response to the Nov. 10 editorial, "Breeding boredom: Students ignore education's purpose" by James Burroughs, I am coming to the defense of those "career-oriented" students he refers to as ignoring the purpose of education. Sure, many students misunderstand why they are attending the "University of So-and-So," but they do not ignore the purpose for having a higher education. To career-oriented students and according to the advice of many of their influences, a college/university education is job training.

Before entering a college/university, career-oriented students learn that a higher education is "a leg up on the competition," a way to "get ahead." High school guidance counselors claim that a college education will get a person a "good," "successful," high-paying (the key objective) career and that graduation from a well-known or any acceptable college is a strong credential on a resume. So, a lot of students come to schools, such as UNC-CH just to say, "Kilroy was here — 2/17/90." They waste four years and \$10,000-plus on job training.

Even after career-oriented students arrive at "So-and-So State University," they are provided with career fairs and career lectures to inform them of what needs to be done to get their desired career. Posted flyers remind upperclassmen to prepare that resume now or

face the consequences (yeah, you might not get that job you weren't going to get in the first place). Getting some type of internship or entry-level position during school is advised. The schools of journalism, business, education, law, medicine, nursing, pharmacy and public health are job-training schools. Career orientation is supported by reminders, advice and major departments. No one reminds career-oriented or non-career-oriented students that they were admitted to "Susie Q. College" for the sake of obtaining knowledge that builds a basis for more intelligent thought. No one advises students to go beyond their class studies to explore Davis — or any of the other 16 UNC-CH libraries — for untaught facts and truths nor are students given time for extracurricular bookworming. Not many departments at UNC-CH (folklore, comparative literature) are non-career-oriented.

Everyone is aware of the poor values transmitted through radio, television and cinema films. A song played on the radio this weekend, one line of which went "I want to be rich." How can a person get rich? By inheriting wealth or obtaining it legally or by picking a good major (medicine, perhaps)?

Finally, as hard as it is to admit, parents help create career-oriented students. "Go to school, Johnny, and get a degree so that you can be somebody [important] and have a better life

than we did." To which Johnny should reply, "Am I not someone [important] now? Will I be doing anything so different than what you guys have done ... surviving within a mind-poisoning, hypocritical society that does not even know that it is being controlled by forces (we believe to be) beyond our control?" Parents say what they do out of love. They are not to blame for how they think (the same bad influences affected them), but they are partially at fault for what they have done to their child (or children).

Some of the blame can be placed on the career-oriented student. They are old enough to think for themselves. Aren't they? Consider that all the major influences of most students brainwash them into thinking the way they do and hypnotize them on a set path for set treasures. Also, remember that a higher education must be paid for, so a high-paying (but not necessarily stimulating) career comes in handy. So, let me be one of the first, if not the first, to tell career-oriented students that whether they get \$100,000 with Merrill-Lynch or \$12,000 with Polanski Cleaning Services there is no happiness or success without knowledge of the self and the world. Get an education. Why not? You're paying for one.

ANTHONY CARTNAIL-BATES  
 Sophomore  
 RTVMP

## Readers' Forum

### Speakers like Gandhi are special privilege

To the editor: Monday night at Memorial Hall, Mr. and Mrs. Arun Gandhi delivered Human Rights Week's keynote address on "Human Rights and Racism." Astounding in its simplicity and appeal to human compassion and wisdom, rather than to politics, their message was moving and thought-provoking as well as informative. Following the address, the audience was so involved that they continued to sit for an animated discussion with the Gandhis. It was the University's honor to have two such inspiring individuals on campus. It was unfortunate, however, that only one third of the hall was filled.

It seems that one of the finest aspects of attending such a large, diverse university is the incredible opportunities open to its students. Such an event as Human Rights Week provides an invaluable forum for extra-curricular education; the speeches, workshops and cultural presentations are all free and open to everyone. It is a shame that more students and faculty do not take advantage of the new

opportunities and experiences which have been virtually brought to them. We hope that the events later on this week, including the second keynote address, will be better attended. Those students who saw the Gandhis speak Monday were not a privileged, specially informed few. Rather, they were the few who took advantage of our special privilege — to become informed.

MELISSA WILLARD  
 Freshman  
 Undecided

ROBIN SPENCE  
 Freshman  
 Undecided

### Uninformed attack makes little sense

To the editor: This letter is in response to Daniel Rundquist's uninformed letter entitled "UNC makes turning a profit top priority" in the Nov. 14 DTH. Displaying a firm grasp of Econ 10 concepts, Daniel alleges that "any intelligent person will realize" UNC acts as a profit-maximizing firm. Daniel, please do not count me as one of

the intelligent people who feel this way.

UNC obviously is not out to maximize profits. If it were, UNC wouldn't turn so many applicants away each year. Instead, it would increase tuition prices up to the point that affording tuition was the only entrance requirement. Present excess demand would be converted directly into revenue. This, my friend, is how a true profit-maximizing firm would act. Daniel also refers to "astronomical rates" paid by out-of-state residents due to some "ambiguous rule." He must have missed the day when Dr. Waud discussed a subsidy. The state of North Carolina actually pays for part of its residents' tuition at UNC. Being from Atlanta, I must pay the full cost of my tuition, which explains the discrepancy Daniel noticed.

To say that we pay "tremendous amounts of money" to attend UNC is absolutely ludicrous. I think a quick look at our neighbors' tuition costs down 15-501 should be enough to settle this. UNC is clearly one of the biggest bargains in the country in higher education.

I'm not trying to say that UNC is without problems, but uninformed attacks don't solve any of

them. I hope that in the future people will not be so quick to criticize the University. Irrational arguments like Daniel's stating that we students are "victims of legal extortion" are counterproductive. They only serve to divert students from real issues on campus and to devalue our diploma which is surely "more than a piece of paper."

BILL CRAVER  
 Junior  
 Economics

### Letters policy

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

■ All letters must be dated and signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter.  
 ■ All letters must be typed and double-spaced, for ease of editing.

■ Letters should include the author's year, major, phone number and hometown.

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

## UNC exists to educate, not to turn a profit

To the editor: If one were to believe Daniel Rundquist ("UNC makes turning a profit top priority," Nov. 14), then they'd have to conclude that there are a lot of unintelligent people in the world. Many of us "unintelligent" people will be receiving our MBA's in May. I'm referring to Mr. Rundquist's grand assertion that "any intelligent person will realize that this University is a firm ... which is in business in order to maximize profits like any other firm."

A firm, Mr. Rundquist, is an entity which a) is owned by one or more individuals; b) seeks to maximize the wealth of those owners; c) in the case of non-profit firms, seeks to equalize revenues and expenditures while providing a service; d) charges a price for its product or service; e) has its viability determined by market forces (exceptions include public utilities and American farmers).

While private schools exhibit some of these characteristics, UNC exhibits none. First, UNC is merely a cog in a larger governmental bureaucracy. Second, UNC does not strive to maximize the wealth of anyone (and if it does seek to do this, it has done a very poor job of it). Third, UNC does not strive to equalize reve-

nues and expenditures like private non-profit firms. Instead its purpose is to provide a reasonably priced, quality education for citizens of North Carolina. An indication of this is the fact that UNC charges different tuition rates based on where a student's home is. If the University were truly a firm it would charge different tuition rates for different majors — surely it costs more to educate a chemistry major than it costs to educate a history major. Finally, we will never see UNC go out of business due to market forces. It will remain an entity because it is supported by the taxpayers of North Carolina and by generous alumni.

Mr. Rundquist's next assertion that "students at UNC ... might be thought of as victims of legal extortion" would be ridiculous were it not so funny. Students choose to come here. If we feel like we don't want to pay the price (both monetarily and non-monetarily), we can simply leave. No one forces us to stay here, and no one forces us to take more classes to "make us more intelligent." The University merely provides a forum for us to develop our minds, but becoming more intelligent is up to each of us.

We should, as Mr. Rundquist says, encour-

age UNC to improve its faculty, help its students and lower the student-to-teacher ratio. All these efforts, however, cost money. Since the state legislature is being less than generous in their allocation of funds, UNC will have to depend more on contributions from alumni to achieve its goals. Therefore, it is in our best interest to not constantly engage in alumni bashing. The University is not and should not be just for the students, as Mr. Rundquist states. The alumni are an important part of the University as well. Surely the alumni shouldn't be given keys to the store, but we should take into account their needs and desires and find a way to integrate them with the needs and desires of students (firms call this "goal congruence").

Concerned students like Mr. Rundquist need to form alliances with the alumni instead of encouraging an adversarial relationship with them and the administration. Doing so will give students more credibility than will writing letters which contain highly erroneous assertions.

J.L. WESLEY III  
 Graduate student  
 Business administration

## The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant editors: Diana Florence and Jessica Yates, arts and features; Karen Dennis and Wendy Johnson, design; Charles Brittain, editorial page; Staci Cox, managing; B. Buckberry, JoAnn Rodak and Steve Wilson, news; Lisa Reichle and Richard Smith, omnibus; Evan Elle, photography; Andrew Podolski, Jay Reed and Jamie Rosenberg, sports; Kari Barlow, state and national; Sarah Cagle, Will Spears and Amy Wajda, university.

Editorial writers: James Burroughs and Jennifer Wing. University: Cathy Apper, Marcie Bailey, Debbie Baker, Lynette Blair, Robert Brown, Chris Helms, Jeff D. Hill, Joey Hill, Katherine Houston, Stephanie Johnston, Stacey Kaplan, Jason Kelly, Dionne Loy, Kenny Monteith, Simone Pam, Jennifer Pilla, Myron B. Pitts, Mike Sutton, Bryan Tyson, Nancy Wykle. City: Steve Adams, Tim Bennett, Julie Campbell, Jennifer Dickens, Jeff Moyer, Sheila Long, Erik Rogers, Katherine Snow, Cameron Tew.

State and National: Crystal Bernstein, Robert Berry, Jennifer Blackwell, Wendy Bounds, Wagner Dotto, Julie Gammill, Eric Lusk, Alan Martin, Kimberly Maxwell, Jeff Moyer, Glenn O'Neal, Kyle York Spencer, Emilie Van Ponce, Sandy Wall, Chuck Williams.

Business: Craig Allen, Heather Clapp, Victoria Davis, Kevin Greene, Lloyd Lagos, David Lloyd, Becky Riddick, Vanessa Shelton.

Arts and features: Cheryl Allen, Lisa Antonucci, Noah Bartolucci, Shields Brewer, Gretchen Davis, Cricket French, Wendy Grady, Vicki Hyman, Mara Lee, Tim Little, Matthew McCafferty, Carrie McLaren, Elizabeth Murray, D'Ann Fletcher, Leigh Pressley, Eric Rosen, Hasie Sirisena, Heather Smith, Brian Springer, Bevin Weeks and Lauri Williams.

Sports: Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, Jason Bates, John Bland, Laurie Dhue, Chris Fialko, Christina Frohock, Scott Gold, Warren Hynes, Doug Hoogervorst, David Kupstas, Bethany Litton, Bobby McCroskey, Brock Page, Natalie Sekicky, Eric Waggon and Steve Walston.

Photography: Jodi Anderson, Schuyler Brown, Gina Cox, Steven Exum, Sheila Johnston, Tracey Langhorne, Kathy Michel and Catherine Pinckert. E. Joseph Muhl Jr., photographic technician.

Copy Editors: James Benton, Rebecca Duckett, Joy Golden, Stephanie Harper, Angela Hill, Susan Holdscrow, Jennifer Kurfees, Lisa Lindsay, Walter McNairy, Elaine Mosley, Debrah Norman, Heather Patterson, George Quintero, Kristin Scheve, Joe Seagle, Bobby Seedlock, Kelley Shaw, Chrissy Stidham, Clare Weickert, Bruce Wood, Steffanie Woodfin and Cameron Young.

Cartoonists: George Brooks, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Alex De Grand, David Estoye, Greg Humphreys and Mike Sutton. Production: Stacy Wynn, manager, Greg Miller, assistant.