

The Daily Tar Heel

98th year of editorial freedom

KELLY THOMPSON, Editor
 THOMAS HEALY AND CAMERON TEW, Assistant Editor
 BRANDON POE, Copy Editor

GRANT HALVERSON, Photography Editor

Staff Writers: RANDY BASINGER, PAUL BOYD, GIGI BRANCH, LAURA BROWN, HEIDI FISHER, LORA GAY, JIM GREENHILL, GRANT HALVERSON, ANDRÉ HAUSER, DEVON HYDE, WENDY JOYCE, MARISSA MILLS, KATHERINE PERRY, BRIAN SPRINGER, JOHN VON CANNON, ERIC WAGNON, BEVERLEY WHITE AND NANCY WYKLE
 Photographer: DAWN DELVECCHIO
 Cartoonists: ALEX DEGRAND AND DAVID ESTOYE

Important decisions

School needs to take care of business

With a \$5 million donation on the line, it is difficult to tell if the administration is more concerned about getting the new School of Business built as quickly as possible or about resolving scheduling and transportation issues first. If the buildings and grounds committee decision last week is any indication, construction is the top priority at this University.

The committee, which is comprised of faculty and students, has been considering the Kenan site since April but had not voted on it because scheduling issues had not been resolved. At last week's meeting, committee members were told by Provost Dennis O'Connor and their own chairman that Chancellor Paul Hardin had already decided to take the Kenan site before the Board of Trustees, and they were asked to add their support. Two members voted for Kenan Heights, none voted against and five abstained.

The fact that the Kenan site would have been approved eventually is something that few people would dispute; the point is that most of the committee members felt uncomfortable approving the site without addressing its disadvantages first. The most disturbing part of this incident is that members of the administration revealed a communication gap which made it easier for faculty and student concerns to take a backseat to construction deadlines.

This lack of communication was simply incredible. To start with, Hardin denies that he had decided to take the Kenan site to the BOT, and says he was waiting for the committee's decision. One week after the

committee meeting, even he did not know the 2-0-5 count. Hardin also said the committee "typically report(s) to the BOT... (the BOT) would have trouble with my recommendation if the committee opposed it." This is quite a different story from committee Chairman John Sanders, who said in an interview with The Daily Tar Heel "Our responsibility is to try to represent the faculty interest in advising the Chancellor... Whether we advise him one way or another is of no interest to the Board of Trustees."

We may never know the politics of the committee decision and who knew what, when, but one thing is clear. Of course the University should move quickly to use the donation to its advantage, but doing so at the expense of faculty and student concerns about transportation, scheduling and even the fate of the undergraduate business major is simply not acceptable.

The buildings and grounds committee has made its decision. That cannot, and should not, be changed. But the administration must renew its commitment to including student and faculty input and to addressing their needs. This incident could be interpreted as a complete lack of respect for chancellor's committees, the role they are supposed to play (as liaisons, not rubber stamps) and the people they represent. Faculty and students can only hope this regrettable communication gap will be corrected and that the administration will work hard to regain our trust. —Kelly Thompson

Sticks and stones

Amid problems Bush goes after flag burning

She's a grand old flag, but how far will the U.S. government go to ensure people do not burn the flag or show what some leaders feel is disrespect for "Old Glory?" The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling Monday that the Federal Flag Protection Act of 1989 violates the free speech guarantee of the U.S. Constitution's First Amendment may make some leaders turn their backs on democracy and freedom for the sake of a symbol and supposed political beliefs.

The Constitution and Bill of Rights were conceptualized by American leaders like James Madison, George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to give the American people freedom they did not have under the sovereign rule of Great Britain. These men designed a document that would provide Americans with freedom to assemble, freedom of the press, and the most sacred of all freedoms; freedom of speech. And now 200 years after the ratification of the Constitution to protect these freedoms, some government leaders have decided to take it upon themselves to reduce the freedoms of the people they serve. When so many countries around the world are reforming their political beliefs and granting more freedom to their citizens, it is amazing that the country which has fought the most to grant its citizens freedoms may decide to cut the vein of freedom that flows from every American's heart.

President George Bush, along with several members of the Republican party, has said he will fight for a constitutional amendment even more fiercely since the Supreme Court has struck down the federal law and will even make a political issue out of it during the upcoming elections if necessary. Come on George, most of the court was appointed by you and former President Ronald Reagan. There must be something wrong if your own self-appointed judges find flaws in a law passed to curb freedom and democracy. You cannot rid yourself of a problem you find morally reprehensible by striking down the document that grants that freedom itself. It is hypocrisy.

The United States is in the midst of perilous economic and social problems that

have rarely been seen in the world. The country stands in front of the rest of the world trying to solve these problems and others like eliminating nuclear arms and ridding the world of diseases like AIDS. But all George and the boys can focus on is flag burning. There is something wrong when a flag is more important than a child dying of hunger or a family freezing because they may not have enough fuel to heat their home.

Bush says the amendment "is in the best interest of this country" and Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole, R-Kan., plans to request a vote on the issue June 14... Flag Day. Dole's symbolic gesture does a lot to show the country how minor the issue really is. The flag is a symbol of our nation, a great symbol. But that is all the flag is. Those who decide to desecrate, burn and deface the flag are despicable, but it is a right they enjoy under our Constitution. Moreover, these people's actions do no harm to the country for whom the flag waves. Many children have said "sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me." This is one of those namecalling times every child has had to face. As Americans we should tolerate the disgusting action of destroying the flag and maybe even show contempt and scorn for those who perform the dastardly deed. But there is absolutely no way these people deserve the privilege of seeing a constitutional amendment banning flag burning adorning such a great document.

It is highly unlikely that Bush or the leaders at Capitol Hill see the burning of the flag as a serious threat to national security. If they feel that burning a flag is such a serious matter let police arrest the culprits for what they are truly doing, littering. It is time our nations leaders drop such trivial matters and get on with the true business at hand. A balanced budget, a better education for children and better medical care for the poor would be a more welcome addition to the second half of 1990 than an amendment banning the burning of a piece of cloth. —Cameron Tew

Editorial Policy

The Daily Tar Heel's board opinion editorials are voted on by the board, which is composed of the co-editors, opinion editor, forum editor and three editorial writers. The opinions reflect the board's majority opinion. Signed editorials do not necessarily reflect the entire board's opinion.

The Daily Tar Heel has three regular staff columnists who write once a week. Their opinions also do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the board.



UNC-CH must keep great quality at a great price

Joe Andranaco
 Guest Columnist

The state is faced with a financial shortfall again this year. And because North Carolina is bound by its constitution to maintain a balanced budget, the politicians in Raleigh are scrambling to find as many band-aids as possible to put over their budget wounds. One of those proposed band-aids is a one-time tuition hike following on the heels of permanent 15 percent out-of-state and 20 percent in-state raises from last year.

But the University is already engulfed in a budget crisis, and has been for some time. The faculty and staff have had to find creative, but often insufficient, ways of running what Time magazine called in 1966, "The South's best university." Once the gem of North Carolina higher education and one of the pre-eminent universities in the nation, UNC now faces faltering ratings and prospective mediocrity. The high quality of faculty and the University's commitment to education and service will always keep UNC strong, but most indicators point to a decline from its top-ten rankings in the past.

While the faculty and staff are facing budget woes, rising costs and increasingly non-competitive salaries, students are having to pay more tuition without receiving an improvement in services. That's quite a change from 1982, when The Washington Post wrote about UNC-CH: "Public education is a creed and a passion in North Carolina. The people of the state make it a point of pride not only to run a university that is manifestly one of the finest in the country, but to keep its doors open to students who haven't much money."

The constitution of North Carolina calls for an education that is "free and practicable" as possible. The foresight of its framers is being perverted by the actions of a government which is using the tuition process to raise state revenues, therefore making students into cash cows. Many legislators claim that a tuition hike

is not going to deter students from attending the University, but the Office of Scholarships and Student Aid has turned down thousands of students for aid that is simply not available. While North Carolina is committed to public education, a tuition hike would only accentuate the problem of rising costs in higher education. In 1984, the Insider's Guide to the Colleges noted that "UNC is no longer only for the rich and Southern. It offers one of the finest and most enjoyable state educations available." Perhaps they spoke too soon.

Within the last decade, the median income of the parents of UNC students has increased dramatically. UNC has become a school where those who can afford the education enjoy the benefits of the Southern Part of Heaven and those who cannot afford it struggle to make ends meet — and often cannot. Ironically, at the same time legislators are calling for tuition hikes, state government is increasing the size of grants given to residents attending private colleges and universities in North Carolina. Some of these grants are not need-based, but rather across-the-board funds.

One of the more objectionable aspects of the tuition hike is that it is being used as a tax. Extra tuition revenues are being used to fund existing state services instead of improving University life. Why does tuition not directly go to UNC and why can it not keep money saved during the year (which currently reverts to the state's General Fund)? The University is willing to make some sacrifices; the General Assembly should maximize those efforts by giving UNC as much room to maneuver as possible. Perhaps one of the greatest sources of inflex-

ibility is that the onus of attention has shifted from the University of North Carolina to a conglomerate of universities networked across the state. Politicians no longer look to support UNC-CH, but rather look to address the needs of their constituent university campuses. By neglecting this University, the state is forgetting the tremendous service it has rendered to North Carolina, and continues to do so strongly today. While some of the other institutions in the system offer quality educations, none have the same type of unique programs that Chapel Hill does. Consolidating and streamlining the campus system would only ensure a higher quality of education for all those involved.

With the University's bicentennial approaching, the importance of its educational mission and service to the community, state and nation need to be reaffirmed and appreciated. Passing the bill promoting budget flexibility and making a commitment to UNC-CH as perhaps the single most important educational institution in the state are two things the General Assembly can do to strengthen the bond between the University and state community. This University has been at the vanguard of higher education, particularly public education, for nearly two centuries. An institution that has known unparalleled stature in the South is having to settle for favorable comparisons to its once distant contenders, such as Duke and UVA.

Thomas Wolfe wrote: "They'll think again of Chapel Hill and —/ Thinking — come back home." At this critical juncture, there are many who need to be thinking of Chapel Hill and the service it has rendered; we desperately need them to come back home.

The bleeding needs to be stopped — not banded.

Joe Andranaco is a 1990 graduate from Ocala, Florida.

READERS' FORUM

Education Foundation a positive force at UNC

Editor's note: This letter was sent to David McCollum in response to the letter he sent to Moyer Smith and Neal Harrell of the Educational Foundation.

Dear sir:

We recently received your letter of May 15, 1990, in response to our correspondence inquiring of your interest in joining the Educational Foundation. We would like to take this opportunity to correct your misinformed understanding of the purpose of the Educational Foundation and what it is and has been responsible for on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

First of all, as stated in our membership brochure which you obviously have not received, the Educational Foundation, Inc., was chartered Dec. 7, 1938, to provide assistance to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for the following: to offer financial aid to worthy young men and women seeking an EDUCATION at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. That is why it was appropriately named, **The Educational Foundation.**

The Foundation is just that. It is not a booster club and does not operate under the same policies as other athletic support groups with which you may be familiar. The Foundation has not and never will "buy out contracts of coaches." The contract which you referred to in your letter was terminated by the chancellor's office and the athletic department. They then requested that the Foundation fund the settlement because, as a state university, UNC could not do so.

Second, the Foundation is not the responsible for the "trees that were torn down on campus" for the Alumni Center. That is a project of the General Alumni

Association, which is not the same organization as the Education Foundation.

Third, the Foundation has, and will continue to support the University in non-athletic matters whenever the need arises, and it has the means to do so. You mentioned that the libraries on campus have been hit hard by the budget crunch and were wondering "just how much of the money was contributed by the Foundation to the resolution of this problem." Please find enclosed, a number of articles, which you must have failed to read as you browsed through your DTH, which will answer that question. The amount that was contributed was determined based on need, not just an arbitrary figure arrived at by the Foundation's Executive Committee.

As is mentioned in the attached articles, the Foundation has in fact contributed to the University on numerous occasions beyond what was mentioned on the previous page, including:

- a \$100,000 contribution toward the construction of the Craig Parking Deck now being built on South Campus (and an additional commitment of \$1.9 million)
- a \$50,000 contribution to Wilson Library which was used to purchase a rare book collection
- a \$50,000 contribution towards the 1989 Senior Class gift provided the momentum for a \$500,000 professorship
- a contribution of approximately \$5,000 each year to the Senior Class and the Carolina Athletic Association in support of their respective operational needs (and to think you may have benefited from those funds.)
- a \$50,000 contribution to the University's Parking Fund for the 1989-90 fiscal year.
- funds necessary to send the debate team to California for a national tournament (which, incidentally, they won).

The Foundation, as we mentioned earlier, was established to provide funds for worthy student-athletes seeking an education at UNC. It is not the responsibility of the Foundation to provide funds to other parts of the University, but it has chosen to do so in situations when it has been able. In fact, 75 percent of the Foundation's top donors contribute more to the University's academic programs than to the Foundation.

We must assume that you have never attended, and never plan to attend, an athletic event at Carolina because if you were to do so, you would see the Foundation's funds at work. The next time you say "Go, Heels!" you will be showing your support of Carolina Athletics which is what the foundation is all about. Without the support of the Foundation's members, we think it is safe to say that UNC's athletic programs would not have enjoyed as much of the success as they have over the years.

Last, we have removed your name from our membership records at your request (it was put on by request of a representative of the Senior Class or C.A.A. who apparently confirmed that you would like to join) and will not "waste your time with our literature again."

MOYER SMITH
 Executive Vice-President

NEAL HARRELL
 Director of Membership Services

Tuition increase disturbing to students

To the editor:
 We as students have another potential tuition increase with which we must cope. This increase may be realized in the form of a one-time surcharge that is needed to soften our state's current budget

woes or as a permanent addition to our tuition. I am not comfortable with either increase and I am sure others share my sentiments. Just last year the legislators in Raleigh raised our tuition and a second increase in as many years will be financially taxing for many students and their families.

It is important for us as students to be aware of such increases and the need for their implementation. Tuesday night, June 19, Rep. J.W. Crawford, D-District 22, will speak at the Student Union about the state's current financial status and the resulting tuition increase. As subcommittee of the Subcommittee on Education of the House Appropriations Committee, he offers valuable insight into the tuition increases and why they are needed. A representative of the University will also speak to present the University's position on the potential tuition increases. As students, our presence at the forum will demonstrate our concern with the matter.

I hope to see many of my fellow students at the Union Tuesday night.

RON SWIFT
 Graduate
 Chemistry

Letter policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. We will attempt to print as many letters to the editor as space permits. When writing letters, 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.
- If you have a title relevant to the topic of the letter, let us know.