

Opinion

Views on the CIA protesters' Honor Court trial

Protesters endure wrist-slap for good cause

The verdict of guilty of "willfully interfering in the conduct of the University" for the CIA protesters has created quite a stir in the Southern Part of Heaven. Did the Undergraduate Honor Court overstep its bounds in handing down a ruling that could potentially hinder the protesters' chances of finding a job, getting into graduate school or leading a normal life in the real world? No. Should the protesters have considered the consequences of their actions more seriously before they chose to demonstrate in the office of University Career Planning and Placement Services? Yes.

The protesters were not disciplined excessively for their actions. If anything, their punishment was a slap on the wrist. The honor court did what it was created to do: it enforced the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance in a responsible manner.

Most of the time, honor court trials go on unnoticed. Students cheat or lie every day and end up in honor court for these violations. But for most of us well-behaved students who stay out of trouble's way, honor court is a vague notion we might remember hearing about during Carolina TOPS. Occasionally, however, certain among our numbers will overstep the bounds which allow us to live together harmoniously. Under such extreme circumstances, the honor court steps to the forefront of our attention, and we become aware of the significant role it plays in the University community.

This happened in the trial of the CIA Action Committee members. With this case, the honor court had its moment to shine, although the circumstances in which it had to operate were far from normal.

The court usually functions behind

Laura Pearlman
Associate Editor

closed doors; participating in a hearing before 150 people in a lecture room had to be disconcerting. The windows on the door to the front of the room were papered over, and students were allowed to enter only through the back door. The audience was asked to follow a few simple rules while observing the trial. Scott Boatwright, who presided over the trial, stopped the proceeding at the first slight rumble of disapproval and informed the audience that he would not tolerate comments that could intimidate witnesses. Being in the public eye did not hinder the court's operations; the court members should be commended for their composure.

The student justices judged a precedent-setting case with professionalism and maturity, and they took advantage of the opportunity to show the student body just how far a protest can go before the campus code condones it no longer.

The danger in this precedent is hardly apparent. The anti-CIA protesters took their demonstration out of the proper forum (the Pit) and moved it to a place of business, a place where students go for counseling, a place where University activities are carried out. For these digressions, the honor court performed its duties to the students of this University and censured the behavior of the five undergraduate demonstrators. Graduate student Dale McKinley will be tried at a later date by the Graduate Honor Court.

Nobody is saying the protesters can't demonstrate again. What they

are saying is that the students, faculty and administration won't tolerate a demonstration that interferes with the functioning of the University and in doing so interferes with students' rights. If the Action Committee members had been permitted to get away with such disruptive activity without reprimand from the University, they would do it again, perhaps trying a more dramatic and even more inappropriate display. With a black mark on their records, the committee members might think twice before they disrupt the runnings of a University office again.

The protesters are welcome to make a statement in the Pit any time they wish. If anything, this censure would be good for the CIA Action Committee. If its members fear that people won't pay attention to a protest confined to a certain area of campus, they should be inspired to plan more creative, thought-provoking demonstrations. People should attend and interact in a protest because they are concerned about the topic, not because they are cornered in a place of business where they have no choice but to bumble into the protesters and their props.

The honor court made the right choice by not imposing a more severe sanction, such as probation or even expulsion. Had this happened, the activists would have lost their opportunity to educate the student body in any capacity.

The protesters and all students should consider this whole ordeal food for thought. They know now what kind of demonstrations will not be tolerated, and they can better plan their efforts at education.

Laura Pearlman is a junior English major from Asheville.

Setting a bad precedent for student activism

Matt Bivens
Associate Editor

On Thursday night, Manning 209 was a different lecture hall. Almost 150 people attentively faced forward — no one stared into space, struggled with a crossword puzzle or whispered to friends.

Sitting around a rectangular table up front were five students charged with violating the campus code during an April 15 anti-CIA protest at the University's Career Planning and Placement offices. With them were five Undergraduate Honor Court justices, plus an investigator and a defense counsel.

After a four-hour trial and about three hours of deliberation, the court returned its verdict: not guilty of trespassing but guilty of willful obstruction of University business. The five defendants received the lightest punishment possible, censure. A notice will be placed in the defendants' records that they were disciplined, and they will receive an official letter of reprimand. According to the Instrument of Student Judicial Governance, heavier penalties are in store for them if future incidents occur.

The verdict was unfortunate. By censuring the protesters, the honor court set a dangerous precedent.

The protesters knew they risked criminal charges when they first planned their demonstration — after all, peaceful protest does not imply compliance or obedience. Hence the term, civil disobedience. But risking their status as students was a possibility they probably didn't consider. Who would have expected agents of the University, presumably an institution of open debate, to quash a peaceful student demonstration?

Now, if the protesters are charged again under the code, heavier penalties hang over their heads. This means

why they concentrated only on this one event.

But, in the minds of many other students, the protesters were on trial for much more. They were on trial for being jerks. For yelling about mining Nicaraguan harbors. For building ugly tiger cages. For chasing away recruiters, and even for occupying shanties and chaining themselves to South Building in 1986 to demand divestment. For making people angry.

If you're angry at the protesters, ask yourself why. If you're angry because they advocating denying a CIA recruiter his free speech rights, good for you. You have a truly valid point. But that should not have been an issue at this trial. It was a separate event.

If you're angry because you disagree with their views and think the CIA is a fine organization, chalk up another plus to you. That still has nothing to do with the trial, but you're entitled to your opinion; just make sure you're informed. The anti-CIA protesters made many good points; can you refute them? have you checked any of their facts in the library?

If you're angry because the protesters are obnoxious, the shanties are ugly and you want to drop your resume without hearing about assassination manuals, then give yourself a big, fat, apathetic minus. And ask yourself again: are you glad the protesters were censured because, on April 15, you believe they willfully obstructed University activities? Or are you glad because the protesters make you uncomfortable, and now someone has finally shut them up?

Matt Bivens is a junior journalism major from Olney, Md.

McKELLY Chicago Tribune

NO CLEAR WINNER EMERGED FROM THE DEBATE, TED...



Faculty pay hike worth consideration

Hudson/Spirtas
Staff Writers

Why would a professor leave a comfortable position at a prestigious school like UNC-CH? There are many possible reasons, but the most worrisome is a matter of cold, hard cash. Low faculty salaries at UNC-CH are causing a "brain drain," a stream of scholars leaving for higher-paying institutions and taking the University's national reputation with them.

UNC-CH has moved into the front ranks of American universities, public and private. It now competes with schools like Harvard and the University of Michigan for students, teachers and acclaim.

However, UNC-CH is handicapped in this battle because it pays its faculty much less than these schools. In a survey by U.S. News and World Report, American college presidents ranked UNC-CH the 11th best school in the nation. But when it comes to faculty salaries, the University stands next to last among the top 20 schools.

The average salary for a professor at UNC, including benefits, is \$49,300, according to the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors. The same professor would make \$65,800 at the University of California at Berkeley. Top public schools like the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin and Virginia also offer higher salaries than UNC.

UNC-CH cannot afford to lose the top-flight faculty it has harvested because of myopic tight-fistedness, and staying competitive in the fight for talented Ph.D.s has become even more important now that graduate enrollments are dropping. The faculty deserve and need higher salaries, and money must be found to do it.

The idea of increasing the cost of education bothers many students and parents. But money that helps to retain valuable scholars is well worth the investment. Of course, careful consideration should be used in establishing the criteria for the pay increases.

It is entirely possible that the University can offer a pay hike without raising the cost of higher education; that is up to the N.C. General Assembly, which will have final say on raising salaries, tuition or any other parts of the budget. And even if tuition rises, the University could still be a bargain unmatched among the nation's top schools.

Some skeptics complain that defecting scholars are just fame-mongers who would rather research and publish than teach. But the "stars" are not the only professors leaving Chapel Hill — they are just the ones who draw media attention and highlight the problem. A profes-

sor does not have to be a giant in his field to realize that \$57,400 at Duke is more than \$49,300 at UNC-CH.

Others explain their reluctance to pay professors more with the argument that building Chapel Hill into one of the top schools in the nation will lead to the exclusion of many of North Carolina's own students. But having an excellent flagship school does not mean that North Carolina has to ignore its youth. We have a system of 16 fine state schools to provide for these students. As UNC-CH builds its reputation, some of these students may be turned away from Chapel Hill, but there will still be a place for them. The benefits the state reaps from UNC-CH's five-star image far outweigh the drawbacks.

Others argue that the state would benefit more overall from money injected into the private sector. What these people fail to realize is that the future belongs to the kind of marriage of government, businesses and universities that has been so successful in the Triangle. Painting businesses and universities as perpetual competitors is an outdated point of view.

North Carolina is a poor state, but that is no excuse for cheating our employees. UNC-CH's national reputation helps the state in many ways — the Triangle would not be the vibrant community it is today were it not for UNC-CH and N.C. State University.

UNC-CH's reputation also brings jobs and national stature to the state. The appearance of two Republican and seven Democratic presidential contenders at the Educational Forum last year is just one example of this national prominence.

The University has a long-standing tradition of excellence, but without proper care and financial backing, this tradition will fade into distant memory. The University must offer salaries that are comparable to those offered at the nation's other best schools. If we fail to recognize this, UNC-CH will slide from the pinnacle it has reached into a valley of mediocrity.

Kyle Hudson is a sophomore history major from Greenville and Michael Spirtas is a sophomore political science major from Washington, D.C.

We're living proof that voting is non-partisan

As chairmen of the Young Democrats and College Republicans, we are jointly writing this column to encourage all students to please register to vote by October 10 and get involved in this year's crucial elections.

Many Americans do not realize that the right to vote is not a guaranteed right, but one we have given ourselves.

We do not have to remind you of the countless lives that our forefathers gave so that we could have freedom and the fruits it provides. For many

Goodwin/Taylor
Guest Writers

the struggle continues. We may have won our freedom and the right to vote, but people the world over have not. Presently they are fighting and giving their lives for a freedom that too many of us do not even honor.

If American lives were given for this right (as they were), the least any American should do is to take the

time to vote. It's very easy: the first step is registering. You can do that in the Pit and other prominent campus locations, as well as at the Chapel Hill Municipal Building (the Post Office) and the Chapel Hill Public Library — both on Franklin Street. You may register as a first-time voter there, or transfer your registration from other precincts, counties or states. Take with you a proof of identity and residence, such as a driver's license. And remember, Oct. 10 is the last day to register to vote in this year's election.

Besides, if two people like us that disagree can get together, then you know the issues of registering to vote and student involvement in the elections are indeed important.

Go George! No, wait a minute. Go Mike! Whoops, we're at it again!

Wayne Goodwin, president of the UNC Young Democrats, is a senior political science major from Hamlet. Bill Taylor, chairman of the UNC College Republicans, is a senior political science major from Trenton.

Grazing in a pasture of jellybeans and hairdye

David Bone
Guest Writer

The approaching November presidential elections along with President Ronald Reagan's recent "farewell" speech to the United Nations have led my thoughts away from studying to the idea of Reagan as an ex-president. Just what will Reagan do after he steps down as president of the United States?

After a well-deserved vacation of a couple of months, I am sure the ex-president will get bored. After having the toughest job in the world, other occupations should certainly pale in comparison; but, as with other living ex-presidents, Reagan will surely continue to make significant contributions to society.

Following the lead of many post-World War II presidents, Reagan will probably set up his own presidential library, complete with notes, official letters, pictures and books from his two terms. Although Reagan's staff

is there for the ex-leader of the free world to do?

Maybe he will return to his career of acting. I know the American public, and indeed the entire world, is waiting for more "Bonzo Goes to Washington" movies. He could even get George Bush to play Bonzo. Imagine the script possibilities. Maybe Reagan could turn it into a regular TV show, probably a sitcom.

Even better, he could replace George C. Scott in the now-defunct FOX network show, "Mr. President." Reagan could draw from real situations from his terms for story ideas. What a great way to record the Reagan years for posterity!

Or Reagan could become a product endorser. Think of what he could do for the hair dye and jelly bean industries alone. Imagine a backdrop of the American flag waving in the wind and Reagan saying: "Miss

Claire! if it's good enough for the ex-President of the United States, it's good enough for you." He could become the next Ed McMahon.

Of course, Nancy and he could always team up with their astrologer, Joan Quigley, in Hollywood. I will even offer the perfect name for their enterprise: "The Stars' Guides to the Stars." Eventually, they would probably have their own talk show, perhaps rivaling even Oprah.

Who knows which road Reagan will choose to travel during his post-presidential years? The possibilities are endless. I, for one, cannot wait to find out which direction he chooses, and I would relish the chance to support him in any of these future endeavors.

David Bone is a sophomore political science and history major from Wilmington.