

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

Architectural integrity Trustees need to heed SRC choice

In the next few years, this campus will see a surge of construction, and students need to be concerned about the effects of this on the campus' aesthetics. One of the most visible new buildings will be the Student Recreation Center, for which an architect will soon be chosen by the Board of Trustees (BOT). While the trustees should not be a rubber stamp for the recommendations they receive, in this case they should accept the one of the three architect recommendations from the Building and Grounds Committee.

board opinion

The BOT voted in October to send the grounds committee's recommendation back for further study. The board gave little explanation for the vote, which was taken in executive session. After another month of study, the committee has decided to submit the same three names to Chancellor Paul Hardin, who must choose whether to pass them along again to the BOT. Assuming that he does, BOT members must offer solid reasons if they choose again not to accept the choices. Otherwise, they should agree to one of the choices and let plans for the recreation center (SRC) get going.

The grounds committee, which began with a review of 50 architectural firms before narrowing the list down to three choices, obviously put a great deal of thought into the recommendations. The committee is led by John Sanders, the director of the Institute of Government and someone who cares deeply about this uni-

versity, and it includes student representatives who also care about the appearance of this campus. The SRC will go in the center of campus next to Fetzer Gym. In such a prominent location, architectural designs are of prime importance.

BOT members may have felt that not enough study went into the recommendations the first time around. The move to send the choices back, however, was almost unheard of. The board has the option of choosing an architect not recommended by the committee, but with the same three choices resubmitted, Hardin and the trustees should feel confident that the architects are the best possible choices.

One committee member, Gene Davis, speculated that the BOT made its decision to return the recommendations based on a political dislike for the top choice, the Norma Burns Studio of Raleigh. Davis has no solid proof that the trustees turned down Burns because of her feminist views and her position on the Raleigh City Council, but trustees have given little reason to dispute the claims that they had political motives in their vote. Certainly the BOT is a political body, as the members are chosen by the governor, but we would hope that they can keep political games out of University concerns.

It's time to get on with the plans and construction for the SRC. BOT members have a right to take their time in examining the choices of an architect, for they too should be concerned about the campus' appearance, but they should also trust the bodies that advise them.

Published provocation Duke editors insensitive to minorities

Complaints of racism at UNC-Chapel Hill are often justified, and most students and administrators will admit we need vast improvements in race relations, but recent protests at Duke University demonstrate that the situation is no better at other campuses. Almost 200 angry students and employees gathered Wednesday to express their disdain for the November issue of a student satire magazine which printed articles parodying the university's black food service workers. The editorial staff of the magazine, The Jabberwocky, must take full responsibility for its insensitivity and stupidity, and a full public apology and immediate resignation are in order.

The articles, which depict the workers as poorly educated and lazy in their work, have drawn sharp criticism from virtually every black student and faculty leader on campus, but the complaints do not stop there; concerned people of all races demonstrated on Wednesday, and with good reason. A university with a national reputation for its academic excellence and outstanding student body has suffered a major blow to its proud image.

In the words of the director of Duke's Center for Black Culture, "there are still some places in America in which Black Sambo is alive and well. Unfortunately, Duke University is one of them."

The editor of The Jabberwocky, Marty Padgett Jr., said the magazine will print two apologies, one in The Jabberwocky and one in the campus newspaper, but he refuses to resign amid the strong demands of the protesters and the recommendation of the school's publications board. The editor of any publication is ultimately responsible for material published,

and in this case the decision to print articles with little comic merit and highly offensive subject matter was unwise, to say the least.

Padgett contends that the staff "just didn't think that much about it," but this by no means excuses his poor judgment. The fact that someone in an editorial position did not consider the repercussions of his decision is reason enough for that individual to step down. The magazine is designed to serve and entertain the students, but in this case it succeeded only in offending and alienating a large percentage of its audience.

Padgett said instead of resigning, he must uphold the merits and purpose of the magazine to regain credibility. But if he and his staff care about the future of The Jabberwocky, a resignation is necessary to rebuild confidence in its work. As long as the current leadership remains at the helm, few decent people will support a publication with little concern for the feelings of its readers.

Whether the articles were intended to be racist — and Padgett said they were not — is not the problem here. In a community where tense race relations lie subtly below the surface, occasionally rising to the top, published material such as that in The Jabberwocky only inflames an already sensitive issue. Failure to recognize this tense situation only demonstrates incompetence and irresponsibility.

The local problems of race relations are certainly not limited to The Jabberwocky issue. Students and members of the university community must continue efforts to fight racism in the long term; in time, events like the Duke protest — which never seem to go away — may someday be a thing of the past. — James Burroughs



Readers' Forum

Critics don't understand chairman search

To the editor:

I write to set the record straight on the question of the search for the new chair of the Curriculum of African and Afro-American Studies. I served as chair of the curriculum from 1980-88. For the period 1986-88, I combined my duties as chair of the curriculum with those as chair of the Department of History. I did this at the request of Dean Gillian Cell and the faculty in the curriculum, although I was perfectly willing to relinquish my administrative duties in the curriculum in 1986. Thus, it is not entirely accurate to say that the curriculum has been without a chair for four years.

The first acting chair was appointed in 1988 and he served for the duration of the academic year 1988-89. That individual subsequently resigned to accept a position at the University of Michigan. A second acting chair, Professor Robert Gallman, was appointed in August 1989. Professor Gallman, the subject of a regrettable controversy, has been a member of the Curriculum's Advisory Committee for nine years and has served that academic unit with distinction. A white male, Professor Gallman

reluctantly agreed to serve as acting chair only after two black faculty members declined the dean's invitation to do so.

It is important to point out that two search committees have tried to identify candidates for the position of chair. The first search committee, headed by Professor Charles Long, was unsuccessful in its efforts. The second committee, chaired by Colin Palmer, recommended the appointment of a black male currently at the University of Connecticut. This individual declined the dean's offer in April 1989 and the search committee presented the names of three other black males in ranked order to Dean Cell on June 1, 1989. These candidates received the endorsement of the curriculum's Advisory Committee. Eight members of the Advisory Committee supported the recommendation, no one opposed and there was one abstention. Of the nine individuals present and voting, five were black. The three tenured faculty members of the curriculum who were present on that occasion voted in the affirmative. The curriculum's fourth tenured faculty member was away on leave in Africa. In the aftermath of this recommendation to

the dean, some members of the University's faculty and staff have expressed strong opposition to the appointment of the individual who was ranked first. As far as I know, the dean has not acted on the committee's recommendation and may be exploring other ways to resolve the situation. In view of certain statements that were made in the press, I should emphasize that the seven candidates who were interviewed for the position strongly supported the curriculum's existence, although there was some disagreement as to whether it ought to remain a curriculum or achieve departmental status.

One final note. Your recent editorial ("Cell deserves position: But student concerns need attention," Nov. 17) claimed that the curriculum has experienced low student interest in recent years. Quite the contrary! This is one of, if not the largest academic unit of its kind in the country. Even with a small faculty, it teaches 1,500 to 2,000 students annually and I think it enjoys a fine reputation on the campus.

COLIN PALMER
Chairman
History

DTH should cover El Salvador more

To the editor:

The Daily Tar Heel is admittedly and rightfully campus-oriented, so that I should not expect extensive coverage of foreign news, even when the United States is directly involved, but your treatment of events in El Salvador boggles the imagination. For days I scanned the Tar Heel looking for some report, if only in the "also ran" column "News in Brief." Even when the death squad struck the campus of the Central American University, the Tar Heel couldn't cover it even under "News of Other Campuses." Finally, El Salvador appeared, but only on the Op/Ed page in the form of a deliberately apologetic human interest story and in commentary by the UNC Republican spokesperson.

Without taking sides, the Tar Heel could assume an educational role in providing some in-depth factual coverage, not to mention the expert analysis available from the Program in Latin American Studies. Yet another source would be representatives of the churches caught in the cross-fire. I enclose a

copy of such a report from the North Carolina Catholic whose offices are in Raleigh. I'm sure they would be happy to be quoted or to provide more complete information.

JIM STASHEFF
Professor
Mathematics

Journal articles show animal research vital

To the editor:

I would like to respond to the article "SETA proposal to work toward changes in research" which appeared Nov. 28. I believe there were several erroneous statements in the article regarding the use of animals in biomedical research which need to be addressed. It appears that members of the Students for the Ethical Treatment of Animals believe that there is a lack of research and information on alternatives to animal research. I would encourage these persons to visit the Health Sciences Library and read any of a number of recent scientific journals, which I might add that anyone, not just biomedical researchers, may sub-

scribe to. I might suggest beginning with the Oct. 26 issue of Nature, in which an alternative to the LD50 test is discussed. Not only are experiments being performed to develop alternatives to the use of animals in research, but this research is widely reported in leading scientific journals.

In addition, I don't believe I have ever seen a scientific report which attempts to justify the use of animals in research because research "needs to be updated every five years." Typically, multiple animals are used in experiments to take into account the variation between individual animals so that statistically valid data may be obtained, and to verify the results of other laboratories. Moreover, I might point out that animals are used in research to develop and test drugs and vaccines, and to understand basic biological mechanisms.

This year's Nobel Laureates, Harold Varmus and J. Michael Bishop, would not have been able to conduct their research, which identified genes responsible for causing cancer, without the use of experimental animals. Likewise, vaccines for polio, measles, smallpox, tetanus and a large number of

other infectious diseases would never have become available without the use of animals.

When alternatives become available to the use of animals in research, I feel certain that biomedical researchers, many of whom are pet owners and like animals, will adopt these alternative methods. In many cases, however, alternative methods do not exist. For example, the organism which causes syphilis, a disease that afflicts 40,000 Americans yearly, can only grow in humans and rabbits. Millions of dollars have been spent trying to develop a tissue culture system for the study of syphilis, but so far none of these efforts have met with success. Thus in many cases, alternatives may not be available in 20 years or even longer.

I would encourage all persons interested in the use of animals in biomedical research to keep abreast of current scientific literature, since this constitutes an existing "data base" regarding animal research and its alternatives.

JOHN PUZISS
Graduate student
Microbiology/immunology

College Republicans active, have projects

To the editor:

The recent weeks have been filled with criticisms of the UNC College Republicans and their actions. As a member of the Executive Board of the UNC CRs, I felt compelled to respond and correct some of the misperceptions that have been spread about our group. The most recent attack comes from Wayne Goodwin, a past president of the UNC Young Democrats, and Mike Dickey, the current vice president of our notable adversaries, in their guest writer column of Nov. 20, "College Republicans Reactive, Not Active."

In their column, Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Dickey make a number of indictments concerning the College Republicans and the way we run our organization. The central complaint the two Democratic leaders seem to have is that the College Republicans have this nasty habit of upstaging the Young Democrats and stealing their press coverage at rallies organized by the YDs themselves. They cite incidents of the "Berlin Wall," the Democratic Youth Rally of last year and finally, the recent "Beat Jesse (Helms)" rally, and several others. Each of these cases, however, only goes to emphasize the differences between the two organizations. Can you name any Young Democrat projects?

Yes, it is true, in addition to our own programs, the College Republicans have reacted to most of the rallies and events put on by the YDs. We do that in order to show the state and the nation as a whole that there is a Republican, conservative voice at the "Berkeley of the

South." I must also add that at the recent "Beat Jesse" day in the Pit, at which the Young Democrats by their own admission had organized for more than three weeks and yet only had approximately 10 supporters, the College Republicans had a presence of more than 30 by our count, and we found out about the event only two days before it happened. One has to wonder, is Wayne Goodwin upset because we reacted to his rally, or is he just mad because we beat him, again.

The CRs have also been chastised for a poster that was sponsored by our state organization, the N.C. Federation of College Republicans. Many things have been said about this poster. It seems that a recurring theme in the criticism is that it in some way defamed the CIAAC. Webster's Dictionary defines defame as "to harm the reputation of by libel or slander." Therefore, the NCFCR poster did not defame the CIAAC because every charge made on it was the truth, as verified in our beloved Daily Tar Heel. As for the situation with Honor Court, that subject was breached by Speaker of the Student Congress Gene Davis, the man with a quote for all occasions, who is affiliated with neither group and was in no way related to the incident. No one else raised the subject.

I would also like to point out to Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Dickey that the "God made Adam and Eve..." fliers were distributed last spring, not two years ago as they claim. Come on fellas, if you're going to whine, at least be accurate!

Finally, I would like to point out that the College Republicans do other things besides picket and protest. At the close of the school last year, the College Republicans collected canned food to be donated to the less fortunate. We did this quietly, mostly among members. We felt no need to send press releases and publicity fliers to the four corners of the planet because we were trying to help someone. This year, we sponsored speeches by Rep. Skip Stam, who spoke about the latest legislative session including the status of abortion regulations, and Claude Allen, former press secretary for the 1984 Helms for Senate Campaign, who spoke about being a black Republican. A few of the other productive things we do include voter registration drives during the campaign season and providing valuable support to the senior party for the campaigns. Contrast this record to that of the UNC Young Democrats. The Nov. 10 rally was the first peep heard from them all year, and, by judging by the dejected look many of them had after it, probably the last.

Clearly, the UNC College Republicans is an "active" organization. And it is not a small group who consider us to be "positive" as well. I challenge Mr. Goodwin and his fellow Young Democrats to practice what they preach. Take some positive action for your party and your candidates, and stop crying when you get beat!

CHARLES LEE NEWCOMB
Sophomore
Economics/political science

Seasonal snippets Tackiness and bad judgment abound

As the season of yule, tinsel and merriment slowly tightens its grip on our wallets, it is time once again for a healthy dose of good clean family fun. While students across campus try to forget that final exams are less than two weeks away, the DTH editorial board decided there was no better time to attack the traditions and little annoyances of the holiday season.

Have you ever wondered . . . why some people lose all taste during the yuletide season? These are the same trendsetters who decide Christmas isn't complete without 1,000 feet of multi-colored blinking lights, gaudy plastic reindeer on their roof, a life-size glow-in-the-dark nativity scene in the front yard and a stuffed Mr. and Mrs. Claus on the front porch. These people burn more kilowatts in December than most large industrial nations use in one decade. The really scary thing is that people actually drive

out to admire these works of holiday horror.

Why is it that . . . corporate executives continue to put the almighty dollar above the true spirit of the season? How often do we have to watch Santa Claus cruise around in a Buick Regal? The spirit of love has been displaced by the spirit of the pre-Christmas sale.

Who was the genius . . . at network programming who decided to replace Christmas classics with *Ernest Saves Christmas*? Whatever happened to *Heat Miser and Cold Miser*, the musical sons of Mother Nature? What can our children look forward to — "A Transformers' Christmas"? Can you imagine life without the Grinch and the Whos from *Whoville*? Exam breaks will never be the same again.

And yet . . . we heard them exclaim as they rose out of sight, *Merry Christmas to all, and to all a good grade.*