

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DE ROCCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor
CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor
MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor
BILL RIEDY, News Editor

JOHN CONWAY, City Editor
KAREN FISHER, Features Editor
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Define your terms

A recently passed amendment to the UNC Student Constitution prohibits Student Government from funding "religious" or "political" groups. And at first glance, several campus organizations would appear to fall under the heading of political or religious: the Association for Women Students, the Carolina Gay Association, the N.C. Student Legislature and the Black Student Movement. But there's a problem: No one's defined "religious" and "political." The result is that most campus organizations could fall under the political or religious heading — the Campus Governing Council itself, and even *The Daily Tar Heel*.

Gaping holes in the amendment have been highlighted by a recent challenge to the funding of the BSM Gospel Choir, a challenge which proves there still exists the need to define political and religious, perhaps by providing examples of such, to clarify which organizations deserve funding. Through its ruling on the choir's funding, the Student Supreme Court will establish much-needed precedent on the political/religious question. However, it's up to the CGC to propose a constitutional amendment defining the terms. Owing to its complexity, perhaps no definition would ever be airtight; but it surely would be less permeable than having none at all. In the Gospel Choir's case, two CGC members argue that the choir should not be funded because it is a religious organization; because the majority of the music it performs is gospel, they say, the choir has a religious orientation. An official complaint has been presented to the Student Supreme Court for a final decision on the matter.

It was owing to the Student Constitution amendment's double-talk that such a complaint was inevitable. Without a succinct, clear set of guidelines, sporadic and individual interpretations of what is political or religious will continue, and subsequent CGC allocations will be forever open to challenge.

In this instance it seems, however, that the BSM Gospel Choir deserves the \$1,700 it received. The choir is not a religious group, but a group of religious people. To join you must only be able to sing; being a Christian is not a requirement. And not only is the group open to the entire student body, but it adds to the cultural diversity of UNC as well. The choir should not be denied funding because it does not discriminate on the basis of political or religious beliefs.

A constitution and its amendments always will be subject to interpretation; interpretation occasionally tainted by prejudice. Without an accepted definition of political and religious, the definition of terms often becomes closely tied to whether an individual wants to fund the group. At present, it seems the Student Supreme Court should uphold the CGC's allocation of funds to the Gospel Choir. But more importantly, the CGC should invest its energies in the production of constitutional amendments which define the terms "political" and "religious," establishing a precedent for future, fair allocations to campus organizations.

Down with crime

People in education haven't been surprised by fewer students in their classrooms because of the maturation of post-World War II baby-boom children. But criminologists didn't expect the aging of the generation to affect the crime rate. A recent FBI Crime Index linking crime to population size, however, proves that the number of crimes committed may depend on the number of adolescents, ages 14 to 21, as they are responsible for about half of all street crimes. This report should serve as a warning to law officials during future population upswings.

FBI statistics released last week showed a 4 percent decline in violent crime during the past two years — the first decrease since 1977, and a welcome change from all-time highs reported in 1980 and 1981. Murder and robbery each fell 7 percent, rape dropped by 5 percent — the only increase was reported in aggravated assault, which was up by 1 percent. Property crimes have also dropped substantially according to the Index.

The mass of adolescents in the 1960s — the baby-boom generation — has grown up now, thus there is a lower population of adolescents around to commit street crimes. And now that the baby-boom babies have passed through their adolescent years, forecasters, including criminologist James Fox of Northeastern University, predict smaller prison population, the need for fewer "beat" policemen and a reduced apprehension about street crime.

Credit for the decline can't be given to a low rate of unemployment — there isn't one. Joblessness was up in 1982 when the decline began, but it was low in the '60s when the crime rate was high.

Law officials should take heed of the FBI findings and be prepared for an increase in crime when the population expands again. And watch out in 1990, Fox says, because crime is expected to be on the upsurge again. At that time, baby-boom children's children will be in their prime.

The Bottom Line

Don't be surprised if you see Michael Jackson dancing to one of his own hit songs in Purdy's one weekend night. But don't be fooled either.

Jackson, it seems, has that rare quality of popping up where and when you least expect him. At a Grand Master Flash concert in Manhattan last month, fans and critics were surprised and delighted as Jackson danced onto the stage and performed some of his recent music.

No one would have asked any questions or displayed any doubts had it not been for the insistence by showbiz bigwigs Diana Ross and Marvin Gaye that Jackson had spent that same evening with them at a celebration of Motown Records' 25th anniversary in California. Which meant one of two things: either everyone's favorite off-the-wall musician is bisexual, or his clone made one of the conflicting appearances.

The latter proved to be the case. It seems that the Big Apple got the big con-job. The man who fooled all those eastern coast urbanites was Laine Lasser, an experienced Jackson impersonator from North Carolina who usually confines his talent to the area around Chapel Hill, his hometown. And Lasser seldom tries to pass himself off as the real thing.

But after the taste of mistaken superstardom Lasser received in New York last month, his palate could become a bit gluttonous. Unless Jackson himself

tells Lasser to beat it, double-sightings of Billie Jean's alleged lover may become as widespread as Jackson's vibrant music.

A garden of pleasure

In the past few years, publishers have told us why *Real Men Don't Eat (or Cook) Quiche*, why *Real Women Don't Pump Gas*, and what constitutes the preppy look or the valley girl approach.

But now The Cucumber Group has taken a step further and published *Why Cucumbers Are Better Than Men* (M. Evans and Company, New York, 1983).

According to The Cucumber Group, cukes are better because they don't make you cry, they won't tell you how to vote, they won't tell other cucumbers you're a virgin (they won't care if you're a virgin), they aren't into chains and leather, and they won't tell you they "aren't the marrying kind."

Cucumbers are never cranky in the morning, they won't call you by the wrong name, they won't send you to the drugstore, they aren't allergic to your cat, they don't have mid-life crises, they don't expect you to be faithful, and they won't leave you for a cheerleader or an ex-nun, or so the book says.

You can have your cucumber, your name, your credit and your career — all at the same time, according to the group. And cucumbers don't care if you make more money than they do.

But most importantly, a cucumber will never leave you for another woman, another man ... or another cucumber.

And that's the bottom line.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A step backward in race relations

To the editor:

Charles I. Eller's column "Abolish Affirmative Action" (*DTH*, April 20) represents a very narrow-minded attitude.

Eller proposes that Affirmative Action be abolished in the United States because it discriminates against whites and gives minorities job and admission preferences. Eller admits that blacks have "been mistreated in the past."

Does he think 15 years of Affirmative Action will rectify 300 years of gross injustices, perpetrated against a race of people in this country? It seems that Eller wants blacks to forget about the fact that

they have been physically abused and discriminated against solely because they are different from whites.

Eller supported his argument with the Affirmative Action cases in Boston and last week's mayoral election in Chicago. He implied that it was federal government and "liberal-minded groups such as the media" which help blacks gain and keep city government jobs.

I agree that veteran white firemen were treated unfairly, but to suggest the city of Boston fire the younger, black firemen who have less experience would have only maintained a predominantly white fire

department. A solution to the problem might have been to reduce each employee's working hours.

Eller's biggest distortion in his column was his assertion that the media aided in the defeat of Bernard Epton in the Chicago mayoral election. A more accurate account is that Epton's campaign workers engineered 90 percent of the racial hostility in the election. The media only reported what was happening. They did not create the news. Why didn't Eller blame Epton's defeat on his own racial campaign and attitudes?

Eller needs to seriously think about his

position. Abolishing Affirmative Action is a step backward in race relations in the United States. Blacks and other minorities just want the same chance as any white person to achieve potential in life. If they are denied these rights, they have more 1960s-type demonstrations in the streets.

I don't care if whites, even the most racist ones, band together as long as they don't discriminate against blacks and other minorities.

John Hinton
Chapel Hill

No alternative offered

To the editor:

I just finished reading Charles Eller's self-serving piece on Affirmative Action ("Abolish Affirmative Action," *DTH*, April 21). While he will not deny that blacks have been "mistreated" (read enslaved, exploited and disenfranchised) he offers no alternative to Affirmative Action for correcting the imbalances existing within our society. When blacks were denied their rights as citizens and human beings in the past, people like Charles Eller did not champion hiring based on attributes, they didn't have to, all the jobs and opportunities were the birthright of white males. The issue he fails to address is how black people will acquire the attributes necessary to compete for quality jobs when the educational opportunities available to them are

generally inferior. Affirmative Action, while far from perfect, seeks to break the cycle of discrimination that has persisted in our society since it's inception.

In regard to the Chicago election, does Charles Eller interpret the massive defection from the Democratic party there as simply candidate choice based upon political issues? That the Democrats there decided that a millionaire lawyer better represented their interests than Mayor Washington? Eller should listen to news analysis by people obviously better informed than he (i.e. the national news services) and keep his blind spots and reactionary theories for his "White Power" meetings.

David Toorchen
Carrboro

Misstatement of law

To the editor:

This is in response to your editorial regarding abortion ("A modest proposal," *DTH*, April 21). At the outset I would like to say that the purpose of this letter is not to express an opinion about abortion, pro or con. I also do not dispute your medical statistics and the inference that they raise a state interest in maintaining the legality of abortions for the protection of the health of women.

However, your statement that the "central issue" in the abortion controversy is "whether a woman has the right to control her own body" is a misstatement of the law. This right to control one's own body is called the right of personal autonomy. The Supreme Court has held (by a 7-2 vote) that if this right exists at all, it is subject to regulation for even minimal state interests (*Kelly v. Johnson*, 1976).

The fact that the fetus is even arguably a separate life would raise a sufficient state interest in the protection of that possible life so as to deem the banning of abortions constitutional. In other words, if the right to an abortion were based on a right of personal autonomy, as you state, then the right to an abortion would not

be constitutionally protected. In fact, the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade*, 1973 (the case in which the abortion right was established) expressly rejected the notion that personal autonomy is the basis of the right to an abortion.

The right to an abortion is founded on a right of privacy, which is regulable only by a showing of a compelling state interest (as opposed to a minimal state interest as discussed above). In *Roe v. Wade* the Court held that there was no compelling state interest in protecting the fetus, especially in the first trimester, because it is not legally a person. So the central issue in the abortion question, in the legal context, is one of the legal personhood of the fetus.

Those proposing the human life amendment are not seeking the redefinition of the legal personhood of the fetus to "muddle the issue" regarding the right to an abortion, as you put it. Whether you agree with them or not, they are meeting the legal issue head-on. They did their legal homework. In writing your editorial, you didn't.

Martin Reidinger
Law School



On the edge of the U.S.

By LINDA ROBERTSON

BERKELEY, Calif. — This town has a reputation. Therein lies its soul and much of its magnetism. Students for a Democratic Society, the Free Speech Movement and *The Barb* have faded away, but many here still cling to Berkeley like remora fish, some aware, some unaware, but all carrying on despite the fact that the beast has changed.

Although things were pretty shaky in the '60s and early '70s, the center is definitely holding in northern California these days. They even serve Perrier in the Haight-Ashbury district. On a Sunday afternoon a few bums sleep on benches in the Panhandle, but there are no bonified hippies around. Color-coordinated joggers inhabit Golden Gate Park. Jerry Garcia is nowhere to be found. Just two years after 1967's Human Be-In, Jack Kerouac died in Florida, when the excesses of drugs and alcohol caught up with him. Is that all it was — one big trip, one short spasm?

At a party in San Jose a recent MBA graduate talks about business in Silicon Valley. "I just offered a double-e (electrical engineering) grad a salary of 30K. He turned it down to go with a new, small company for 25. Stupid move. If you're smart you can play the Valley and hop from start-up to start-up. But it's risky. Go for the established companies and the better money." He owns a BMW, a personal computer, and an aquarium. On the other side of the glass a large pink fish gnaws on the body of a smaller gray one. "They killed him about an hour ago," the MBA grad says.

Friday at a noon rally in Sprout Plaza on campus a group protests the use of animals in laboratory experiments. "How would you like to spend your life in a dirty cage?" one speaker asks. Nobody answers. An evangelist by Sather Gate has attracted more listeners. Two rows of activists' tables make Chapel Hill seem apathetic in comparison, but there is an arbitrariness about the scene, and the organizations only cater to very select interests.

Stony Burke rages about the U.S. government for your entertainment and passes his hat. The Bubble Lady blows translucent spheres of light. The Polka Dot Man spaces out, and a Cal student talks about Tahoe. "There will be snow until July 4," he says. "Think how many weekends that is." In the background a woman strums her guitar and sings about the lobotomization of monkeys.

Maybe the nuclear disarmament movement will fill the void Vietnam has left. Spread out on a table on Telegraph Ave. are pamphlets, posters and bumper stickers supporting the freeze. "How much are these buttons?" a customer asks. "Seventy-five," answers a man with a look of practiced earnestness. She fishes in her pocket for change. "But anything will do," he tells her. After all, this is a cause, not a sidewalk sale. She pins a button to her backpack. Now it looks symmetrical; there are three on each strap.

Sellers of handmade jewelry and pottery line the street. On one corner, next to a beat-up van, are three artifacts who hung out near Haight Street "until the drugs dried up." They all have long, disheveled hair, rings on every finger, leathery skin. One man, at least 35, plays a guitar. Another, with dirt embedded in the wrinkles of his feet, plays bongo drums. The woman with them spins slowly, clutching a cape and extending her arms like wings. They seem happily oblivious, surviving in a time warp.

At Blondie's Pizza, the cashier has teased his platinum hair over one eye, which is dark with mascara. Joni Mitchell is singing on the radio: *He went to California, hearing that everything's warmer there. So you write him a letter and say 'Her eyes are blue; he sends you a poem and she's lost to you. Little Green; he's a non-conformer. The cashier switches the station to WQAK, which has adopted an all-new-wave, music-for-the-80s format.*

A sophomore talks about his school. "Last year I had trouble finding my place. I thought people would be really different here. The professors don't care about you personally. Students are pretty competitive and into themselves. I was really bummed about my grades — I didn't think they would matter so much. This year I'm liv-

No explanation

To the editor:

First, I would like to thank all of the people who circulated petitions in support of David Garrow and, more important, thank the over 2,500 students who signed the petitions. Second, I would like to address some points raised by Professor Joel Schwartz's letter to the editor (*DTH*, April 22).

Schwartz says a lack of support for undergraduate teaching by the political science department is not one of the issues involved in Garrow's case. It very well might not be one of the issues in his mind, but it is a major issue as far as the students are concerned. I have heard repeatedly the great concern for teaching at UNC and in the political science department in particular. I do not doubt the sincerity of those who have expressed this concern, but only a few non-students have seemed to realize just how difficult it is to take such assurances 100 percent seriously when a fine teacher such as Garrow is not reappointed. On this point, my position, and the position of the 2,500 students who signed petitions in support of Garrow, is very simple. Students, the political science faculty and the administration are very concerned with having good undergraduate teachers. David Garrow is an excellent teacher. He should be rehired.

Professor Schwartz underlines another point we have been trying to make all along, that a legitimate-sounding reason for not reappointing Garrow has yet to appear. Everyone agrees teaching is very important. Very well. Joel Schwartz is a good teacher. He was reappointed. David Garrow is also a good teacher. He was not reappointed. Why not?

According to the Tenure Document, research is also an important factor in deciding whether someone should be reappointed. Schwartz, by his own admission, has "a very minimal record in publication," yet he was rehired. Garrow has published two fairly well acclaimed books during his short stay at UNC, yet he was not reappointed. Why not?

The political science department owes the students an explanation of what is really going on in Garrow's case, if not now, then when the whole affair is over and they can speak without worrying about breaking personnel regulations. I am afraid that because Garrow's case will probably stretch into the summer, we will never get such an explanation.

Lindsay Taylor
Everett

ing with some really —" he searches for the right word — "really neat people. We go camping a lot. Getting away occasionally is key."

U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick recently spoke on the campus that spawned the Free Speech Movement 19 years ago. But when protestors heckled her off the stage, activism curdled into mere rudeness. A few days later, the student senate decided against apologizing to Kirkpatrick.

Numerous Bay Area publications carry on the anti-establishment tradition. The *Appeal to Reason* has just come out with its "Scuttle the Ship of State Issue." Front page headlines pull no punches: Dump Diane (San Francisco mayor Feinstein); Send Ronnie the Rat Back to Central Casting; Sink the Queen and Free Ireland. There is also a story on LSD Entrapment. The Uhuru House, national organizing office of the African People's Socialist Party, publishes the *Burning Spear* magazine, which urges support of the fight against "slumlord" Asher Levine sponsored by the Burning Spear Solidarity Brigade.

There will always be plenty of vitality here. Visitors searching for the ideological pyramids of a lost era will not find any because the place is much more than a quaint window on the past. Not everyone tries, with disarming self-consciousness, to be different. Not all the radicalism is hollow. But in 1983 many students pick up the *East Bay Guardian* just to skim the kinky personals.

Berkeley is still on the edge of the United States. That is more of a simple geographical reference now. One notes with a peculiar sense of regret that it is only three hours earlier here than on the east coast. No university is immune to the generational trends and political shifts of its students. But there is the faint hope that UCB might remain an outpost.

On a highway, standing in one of the last torrential rains of the season, a bearded hitchhiker holds a cardboard sign: BERKELEY. He is at least 10 years too late.

Linda Robertson is a senior English and journalism major from Miami, Fla.