

The Daily Tar Heel

Thansis Cambanis EDITOR
Amy Piniak MANAGING EDITOR
Peter Roybal MANAGING EDITOR

Jeanne Fugate EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR
Bronwen Clark UNIVERSITY EDITOR
Nancy Fonti UNIVERSITY EDITOR
Wendy Goodman CITY EDITOR
Robyn Tomlin Hackley STATE & NATIONAL EDITOR
James Lewis SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS EDITOR
Robbi Pickeral SPORTS EDITOR
Marshall Benbow FEATURES EDITOR
Melissa Steele FEATURES EDITOR
Dean Hair ARTS/DIVERSIONS EDITOR
Chanté LaCon COPY DESK EDITOR
Courtney Piver COPY DESK EDITOR
Kristin Rohan DESIGN EDITOR
Candi Lang PHOTOGRAPHY EDITOR
Chris Kirkman GRAPHICS EDITOR
Michael Webb EDITORIAL CARTOON EDITOR
Justin Williams STAFF DEVELOPMENT

World Wide Web Electronic Edition
http://www.unc.edu/dth



Established 1893
103 Years of Editorial Freedom

BOARD EDITORIALS

Women, Front and Center

■ A campus women's center marks an important step toward recognizing the legitimate role of women at UNC and educating students about gender issues.

Even though women are in the majority here at UNC, their concerns are often relegated to minority status. A campus women's center is an effective, encouraging and important step toward recognizing the importance of women's issues on our campus and helping students to confront them now and in the future.

A women's center would allow critical information for both men and women to be available in a central location. Many issues, from the high-publicity problem of rape to sexual harassment, sexism in the classroom, campus safety, sexual orientation, eating disorders and curriculum reform are all part of women's University experiences. They can be addressed more effectively from a centrally coordinated location staffed with knowledgeable people.

Recent flyers have decry the poor numbers of women on the UNC faculty. If those numbers are to increase, the University will have to make efforts to create a supportive environment. The crisis over the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity memo has revealed deep fractures in our community and an inability even to talk about the questions

raised. A women's center places these issues squarely on the agenda and provides a starting point for debate.

A poll taken in the fall showed widespread support for a women's center. Recent successes in women's studies also indicate enthusiasm for these topics, with classes filled to overflowing. The task force also pointed to UNC as the only university of this size that did not already have a center or plans for one.

Concerns of University women are not already addressed by the Hillsborough Street women's center, which targets the concerns of the entire Chapel Hill community and not issues specific to an academic community.

While a women's center cannot erase the gender disparities that exist on campus and in the world, a center is a vital first step in confronting an obvious problem and attempting to make progress toward finding a solution. Certainly it is consistent with the University's mission of preparing students well for the world, a world in which men and women must work together for solutions and fulfillment in every aspect of life.

Walk the Walk

Another year of student government officially begins today as officers and representatives are inaugurated into campus leadership positions. Student Body President-Elect Aaron Nelson should use this as an opportunity to jump-start his administration and to begin leading the student body that elected him.

Nelson should skip the posturing that occurs yearly on inauguration day and has plagued his words since election day. Only by speaking with the students' voices can Nelson fulfill his campaign rhetoric.

Nelson spent the first six weeks of the semester gaining the support of the student body. After overwhelmingly winning their support on February 13, Nelson spent the next six weeks eroding the trust of the students. Many people have objected to his treatment of the Carolina Review theft and to his appointments. Nelson should leave the mistakes of the last six weeks at the door of Suite C and regain that trust.

Today's ceremony should be representative

of the ideals Nelson espoused throughout the campaign. Nelson has worked hard in the past to bring people together, and today he will have a genuine opportunity to begin to do that again.

On election night, Nelson said, "We have a mandate from the students." This mandate is conditional. Nelson and his staff should diligently work to break down the hierarchies separating his team from students, not build them up.

In one of Student Body President Calvin Cunningham's final acts, he paved the way for Nelson to receive a generous stipend. The \$2400 stipend will come directly from students' pockets. This stipend does not legitimize the office of the student body president, it only makes Nelson more accountable to his constituents.

Nelson will set the tone for all the officers being inaugurated this afternoon, and it is up to him to ensure student government remains firmly for the students.

Best of luck to all those student leaders being inaugurated today.

It Makes Cents

Dole's campaign may soon be running on the sound bite, "Let them eat cake." Senator Dole and the Republican majority in Congress have blocked a vote on raising the minimum wage, going against the welfare of the American people. The increase from \$4.25 to \$5.15 over two years should have been implemented long ago.

The minimum wage today does not provide people with economic security. Currently, a full-time worker paid \$4.25 an hour earns \$8,800 annually before deductions. The poverty-level annual income for a family of two is \$10,030. Considering inflation, today's minimum wage is actually 31 cents below where it was in 1979.

Most Americans are getting poorer, working more time for less money and having a harder time finding a job in a market where corporate profits are soaring. Congress has increased its own salary by one-third in the five years since the last minimum-wage increase. Chief executives' pay rose by 31 percent last year alone, putting their median pay at \$5 million — while they continue to pay workers as little as possible.

Even though 72 percent of Americans support a minimum-wage increase, Bob Dole arrogantly contends that minimum wages hurt the worker. A Princeton University study showed that after a minimum-wage increase of 80 cents in New Jersey, 331 fast-food restaurants did not lower employment levels. Nobel Prize-winning economist Robert Solow agreed moderate increases in the minimum wage had very little impact.

Technological advancements are making many jobs obsolete and have already eliminated millions of positions. A forward-looking government would provide a safety net for workers who simply could not find jobs. A higher minimum wage is only one step necessary to protect workers from exploitation. Other proactive measures include employee-owned businesses, profit sharing and living wages to break the stranglehold a minority of wealthy entities have on the economy.

Workers should have a stake in their business, see the fruits of their labor and be paid a wage that allows them to support their families and keep them from poverty.

You Can't Fight Hate Speech With Weak Speech

We — 30 people strong — gathered on Friday afternoon to speak about speech, in what had to be one of the most intellectually masturbatory events of the season.

Local leaders sat shoulder to shoulder at the Sonja H. Stone Black Cultural Center in a roundtable discussion with a mystery guest, one I had least expected to find amidst this group.

The ugly specter of censorship showed up. Self-censorship.

Participants in The Daily Tar Heel's roundtable discussion on hate speech and hate crimes seemed unwilling to speak freely. Maybe it was the lingering languor of a Friday afternoon. Maybe it was the end of a hard week. Or maybe it was the terms in which the questions were couched.

But it wasn't from want of trying on the part of those who organized the discussion.

The DTH sought to bring together divergent viewpoints in one room to raise concerns people have been mumbling under their breaths and in the rumor mills.

Yet, when put face to face, something happened — people froze up and weren't half so free with their speech.

At one point in the discussion, Student Body President-Elect Aaron Nelson exhorted, "I absolutely do not think we should restrict speech."

We didn't *have* to restrict any speech. Each and every person somehow restricted themselves.

Maybe it was the atmosphere. The BCC was packed. About 30 chairs formed a circle in the middle of the room, and nonparticipants (including a whole passel of DTH-ers) crouched in the corners. The air hung heavy with tension — Carolina Review Publisher Chariton Allen sat beside Nelson in an uneasy truce, and everyone glared at the huddled mass of DTH representatives.

Yet, the moderator, BCC Director Gerald Horne, controlled the atmosphere and forum with ease. He inserted "provocative questions," which he disclaimed neatly were "not necessarily (his) own."

The participants each listened intently, and the level of respect exemplified what the larger community should be implementing.

Graduate Student Laura Streifeld suggested at the forum that "the most important thing is to try to promote understanding," as everyone was

attempting to do at the incredibly convivial discussion.

Perhaps, however, there was too much niceness going on.

Many things were said, but just as many issues, concerns and — most importantly — emotions were skipped. For the first 45 minutes, people discussed the weighty theoretical implications of hate speech and hate crime.

Instead of bringing up specific names, instances and accusations, everyone seemed almost scared to break the ice — to utter the words "Carolina Review" or "DTH Editorial Page." And so we talked about community and legal definitions of hate crime — valuable definitions, but straying from the anger that inspired this forum.

And in some ways, this "politeness" hindered the positive outcome. Instead of Hillel Director Daria Diner immediately discussing his disagreement with the DTH's decision to run an allegedly offensive editorial cartoon, he waited until only 30 minutes remained.

Diner recognized this: "I'm very glad we're going to have this theoretical debate, but I want to know what is going to happen," he said.

What concerns us as a community is not necessarily the whys and wherefores of an action, but how best to accommodate the freedoms of speech and from harassment — to ensure a feeling of community without stifling free expression.

We don't really give a damn about the legal precedents behind being able to burn a flag or yell out obscenities or make a controversial statement; we just want to be able to do what we want to do and not be offended when others do what they want to do.

Instead of Carolina Review Editor Ashley Garner issuing a public explanation for the controversial cover depicting Nelson with devil horns within the first 15 minutes, she, too, waited until the very end of the discussion — as did the DTH



JEANNE FUGATE
EDITORIAL PAGE
EDITOR

representative, Justin Williams.

I wonder if, after all, this campus — or at least those sitting at the roundtable — is more concerned with nice speech than hate speech. It felt as if some genteel ideal of gentlemanly disagreement held us back from getting to the heart of what was wrong, the heart no one wanted to put into words.

The absence of any administrator at the forum further detracted from the legitimacy of the proceedings.

By not lending his voice to this discussion, Chancellor Michael Hooker sent an even louder message to the community that the administration didn't think the topic was worthy enough to devote time to. It was all well and good for students and community leaders to lend their voices, but the administration had better things to do, such as go straight from the Faculty Council meeting, which ended at 5:20 p.m., to important (no doubt highly profitable) dinner engagements.

Our chancellor and his staff have extremely hectic schedules. If his secretary had not RSVPed for some administrative representative, it might not have been such a slap in the face. Hooker should have at least sent a written statement in absentia to add another integral layer to the discussion.

Although each of us in that room probably wanted some nice, pat conclusion — a quick release of tension and anger — I think we all left a little bit dissatisfied. Those who were most angry or the most upset did not get the chance to speak their peace. Those who might have been able to apologize didn't really get a good chance.

So what does this tell us? That we should have — as one participant, Beth Glenn, mockingly suggested — "stood in the Pit and called (each other) names"? Or maybe we could go scrawl peace signs and puffy hearts in 60,000 library books at the Undergraduate Library.

Chariton Allen suggested that in his ideal world, "hate speech would be counteracted by more speech."

We certainly have listened to more speech, but it doesn't seem like it has counteracted anything.

Jeanne Fugate is a senior English and creative writing major from Ocala, Fla.



How to Run for U.S. President in Three Easy Steps

Now that the also-rans of this year's Republican primary contest have dropped out and Bob Dole is established as the monolithic, aged front-runner, most pundits talk of the November election in terms of a two-man race — Clinton vs. Dole. Even if you count Ross Perot, who's recently been threatening to toss his Yosemite Sam-sized hat into the ring, and Pat Buchanan with his dwindling band of peasants with pitchforks, you only have four serious candidates for the Oval Office.

But with seven months to go before the November election, I think it's time now to look at some of the less-than-serious candidates, and there are plenty of them out there.

Some 248 people have officially declared their candidacy for president, according to the Federal Election Commission. By November there will likely be more than 300, far outstripping even the last presidential election, which boasted 273 candidates. A factor leading to this surprisingly high number is it doesn't cost anything to register. You simply have to fill out two forms, a statement of candidacy and a statement of organization. And if you're feeling pressed for time, you can just fill out one.

A quick glance at this list of self-declared candidates is like a trip through the sideshow of the election circus, with every manner of oddball, religious fanatic and earnest political novice entering the race for president, most of them facing astronomical odds of being elected president of anything more than a fan club.

Jack Mabardy of Framingham, Mass., is a Republican contender of whom you may not have heard. Mabardy thinks the American economy is in a shambles, and his statement gives an ominous hint of his tough-love approach to fiscal growth. He writes, "I have several programs that will devastate America to enhance the economy." Mabardy also opposes abortion, favors life sentences for anyone who abuses or tortures animals, favors speed limits and is calling for, interestingly enough, "UFOs in local shopping malls."

Earnest Lee Easton (party unknown) of South Bend, Ind., is another. Easton is campaigning on a strong pro-veteran stance and includes

among the planks of his platform: "the recruitment of more Candy Strippers as volunteers for veteran hospitals and other veteran installations where veterans are confined."

Charles R. Doty, founder and pastor/general of the little-known Universal Church of God, is one of my favorites.

His statement is filled with terse, vaguely abbreviated solutions to all the problems present and past administrations have found so intractable. Terrorism? "Have plan that, I think, will work." Poverty? "Top priority." Missing Children? "Top priority item with me." And Doty's best, most openhearted and conciliatory gesture: Israel? "Will bless."

The list of candidates goes on and on. There's George Washington America and David Crockett Williams. There's a Canadian professor, a Washington, D.C., man whose address is listed as "homeless"; and a southern California woman named Shear'ree. No last name. Just Shear'ree. Some are old hands. Billy Joe Clegg ("Clegg won't pull your leg") is making his seventh consecutive run at the presidency.

The Constitution sets out requirements for presidential candidates; they are elemental and non-exclusive. You must be a natural-born citizen, at least 35 years old, who has lived at least 14 years in the country. The FEC doesn't officially require you to file unless you raise or spend more than \$5,000, but most people without any intention of raising even \$5 send in the forms anyway. It's part of the fun — anyone who wants can put on their résumé that they once ran for president.

Getting your name on the ballots of individual states is another question. The laws vary. To be listed as an possible candidate in North Carolina in November, the Board of Elections requires a petition with the signatures of at least



JEFF GARIGLIANO
IRONIC
DETACHMENT

two percent of the state's nearly four million registered voters. Most states have similar arrangements aimed at keeping the field narrowed to only the serious candidates, since it costs money to print ballots. But I'd say most of the 248 candidates now running aren't worrying about collecting signatures.

In 1984, a Wyoming man named Al Hamburg ran his dog, Woofier D. Coyote, for president and his bull snake, Sandra Snakey, for Congress. This year Hamburg — who was convicted in 1990 of two counts of forgery involving, believe it or not, campaign signatures — is managing a presidential campaign for Wyoming Wolf, who's listed as a Republican but is not a real wolf or even an animate object but rather a protest against a Wyoming policy on wolves near Yellowstone National Park.

Often the candidates, lacking all uncton and political savvy, speak with refreshing candor. What a blessed relief — after hearing Clinton in the last election blather on about how he felt our pain or watching Dole say with a straight face that he really has the interests of poor Americans at heart — to listen to Daniel Zwilling concede good-naturedly, "I'd like to say I have well-defined, clear policies... but that is not the case."

Sifting through the list, I half expected to stumble across Calvin Cunningham's name. After all, he already has a lot of ambition, likes to wear suits and speaks in sufficiently elliptical sound bites to qualify for larger office. But while Cunningham wasn't listed, I did find three North Carolinians, two of whom could not be found using directory assistance. The third, Thomas Wayne Allen, could.

A 37-year-old from Raleigh, Allen said he made two failed bids for Raleigh city council before taking the logical next step. This is his first run for president.

He's raised about \$500, mostly from family and friends, and when asked what he thought the greatest hurdle was now standing between him and the Oval Office, he said optimistically, "I don't think I have a hurdle."

Jeff Garigliano is a graduate student in journalism from Bayport, N.Y.

