

The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, Managing Editor

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, Editorial Page Editor
JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor
TAMMY BLACKARD, State and National Editor
TOM PARKS, Business Editor
DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor
MELANIE BLACK, Design Editor

JULIA COON, News Editor
JENNY CLONINGER, University Editor
CHARLES BRITAIN, City Editor
CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor
KELLY THOMPSON, Omnibus Editor
KIM AVETTA, Design Editor

DAVID SUROWIECKI, Photography Editor

Managing our money Hardin's proposals a solid first step

Paul Hardin, in one of his first major initiatives as chancellor, finally proposed to the Board of Trustees last week a series of proposals that would give the university system more autonomy and fiscal responsibility. The proposals have been floating around for quite some time, but the long-term nature of the problems the universities are having makes it tempting to shove them aside. But, as Hardin said, the university needs to continue to support higher faculty pay and consider tuition increases to keep the system top-rate, along with requesting further financial independence.

Since his report, however, Hardin has been criticized by UNC system President C.D. Spangler for his push to raise tuition and by Board of Governors' Chairman Robert "Roddy" Jones for his attempt to convince legislators to let state campuses keep tuition revenues. Jones said that if the state allowed that, lawmakers would probably cut the campuses' total appropriations so that the campuses would not really get more money.

Unfortunately, none of the university officials who have spoken up so far seem able to reach a happy medium. It was important that Hardin get the discussions rolling, but his proposals are a bit optimistic, while Jones and Spangler seem hesitant to take the major steps that will eventually improve our university system.

Hardin's suggestion that campuses be allowed to set their own tuition is not only unlikely but unfeasible and unfair. Understandably, Hardin has felt locked in and unable to take many new initiatives be-

board opinion

cause of the state control, but to expect the system to do without some sort of central control over tuition simply won't work.

However, Hardin's call for tuition increases is feasible, and the campuses should be given more control over such increases. The legislature may be unwilling to give up all the money that students pay, but campuses should ask for at least any revenue from future increases — giving both the state and the universities some control. Along the same lines, the system would work better if Jones' call for the BOG to be granted authority over line-item transfers is approved. But his proposal needs to be thoroughly studied — while it may be good to take that control away from legislators, the BOG may not be the best place to put that control.

All of these proposals will, of course, demand a great deal of time and study. In the meantime, however, one proposal from Hardin must be implemented: higher pay for faculty. His support of faculty in his speech to the trustees was heartening; it should be acted upon immediately. None of the other proposals will mean anything if we can't convince faculty that we want them here and are willing to pay them a salary that recognizes their importance to the country's future.

Hardin's proposals were a good first step, but they were only the beginning. The BOG and trustees need to study his suggestions and prepare for a protracted lobbying effort that emphasizes a balance of power among the state, the various boards and the campuses. As it is, all the suggestions seem slightly out of whack.

"Baron" jousts Duke University taken by show of wealth

Guess who I am? Daddy owns a chain of cafes in Long Island and has a seat on the New York Stock Exchange, and my lovely Mummy is the treasurer of the neighborhood Garden Club. I chose to attend Duke University since my great-grandfather on my father's side, both of my grandfathers, six of my uncles, two of whom are twice removed, and at least 12 of my cousins are outstanding alumni of the university. Thank you. Who am I? Well, my name is Kennedy, or is it Rockefeller or maybe I used the last name of Carnegie... now what last name did I put on that application?

Our prestigious neighboring university — the one with the time-worn walkways (erected in 1924 but looking like it originated in 1624) and that unique mixture of Gothic and Georgian architecture — got itself in a little trouble this week. One of its most highly revered students, The Baron Maurice J.L. de Rothschild, son of the French financial success Baron Guy de Rothschild, was just discovered after two years of attendance to be a fraud, not truly related to the European banker and not truly a legacy to his multi-million dollar fortune.

How could something this scandalous happen at the Ivy League school of the South? While universities across the country are suffering from accusations that they bent admissions standards for athletes, could Duke be using special admission standards for the especially wealthy, or is it more than a coincidence that the average Duke student's family rakes in

more income than families at any other university? Although Duke's tuition is a costly \$12,800, the consideration of money from the admissions office view should be nominal.

However, the incident with the Baron is not the first time Duke has been deceived — or maybe blinded — by false financial backgrounds. Four years ago, David Bloom graduated from Duke, using his new college education on Wall Street to swindle investors out of millions. Unfortunately, Duke, which had been promised a sizable donation, was left empty-handed, while Bloom's hands were placed in handcuffs.

Duke appears to be awed by the smell of large sums of money, perhaps feeling trapped by its relative youth. Because the university does not have those integral ties to old money like its competition at Harvard and Yale, it apparently tries to restore that missing component by accepting to the university the nouveau riche. While perhaps this will one day transform into "old money," like when the sidewalks really are time and weather-worn, Duke University cannot be overwhelmed by this money issue.

For the time being, it should be kind of fun to play make-believe at Duke. Attending Duke among all those amazing combinations of brilliance and wealth would make a person want to be somebody special. Maybe the cousin of Prince Charles or the adopted child of the Hearst family or maybe ... —Jennifer Wing

The incident with the baron is not the first time Duke has been deceived -- or maybe blinded -- by money.

How to CONFUSE A CAMPUS LIBERAL

LESSON 1: PUT A FRAME AROUND A PLAYBOY COVER AND CALL IT ART.



IT'S DEGRADING TO WOMEN! IT'S SICK AND DANGEROUS!... NO, WAIT! IT'S ART! I WANT IT IN MY LIVING ROOM! I'LL PAY \$10,000... NO! I DIDN'T SAY THAT!...

PLEASE, TAKE IT AWAY. MY HEAD HURTS.

(PETE CORSON) = WITH APOLOGIES TO THE ART WORLD



Readers' Forum

Sexism a reality on UNC campus

To the editor:
I am tired of the appalling and destructive portrayal of women on this campus. Two days ago I sat through an entire class behind one of the "12 reasons why beer is better than women" T-shirts. For an hour and 15 minutes, I could do nothing but internalize its degraded message. In that same class my chemistry professor explained a principle of repelling forces with the example that "you guys would flee from a fat date in the same way." The DTH's irresponsible decision to print a full-page, color insert advertising Playboy (Sept. 8) has only reinforced the theme that women are (in Playboy's words) "Entertainment for Men".

In reference to Michael Berard's letter to the editor ("Top ten" T-shirt won't hurt Code," Sept. 6), I refuse to accept any of these statements as humor. Sexism is real. The presence of date rape and sexual violence on this campus is a severe concern. Women and men's bodies are not objects. I refuse to accept the packaged image of women on this campus. I am repeatedly bombarded with the message that the Carolina woman should be attractive, luring and willing. I refuse to accept.

The DTH has effectively endorsed and expanded on this destructive image by running the advertisements for Playboy. I am not in favor of censorship. I oppose Jesse Helms' efforts to define and restrict what is acceptable art. However, I perceive an important distinction with the Playboy ad. The DTH states in its own advertising policies that "The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to reject advertising which it considers objectionable. Advertisements that discriminate on the basis of race, creed or sex will not be accepted." In light of the recent Playboy advertisement, this statement states a blatant lie. For a \$900 profit the editors of the DTH endorsed an offensive publication and committed a slur against all the women on this campus. I refuse to accept.

LISA ABBOTT
Sophomore
Biology

Playboy insert had no place in DTH

To the editor:
Like many other UNC students, I was appalled to find a Playboy

insert in the Sept. 8 issue of the DTH. It was surprising to see sexist advertisement in a college newspaper with a female editor.

Undoubtedly, most of the DTH staff would hate to write for a paper that propagates the physical, visual and psychological exploitation of females. Without question, most students are opposed to letting sexism help pay for their campus publication. Obviously, the insert had no place in the DTH.

Of course, we all cherish basic liberties like the freedom of the press. We also would not like to see our right to unlimited consumerism curtailed. If somebody wants to read Playboy, for democracy's sake let them. But there is a fine line between using our rights and violating the dignity of another person. By advertising sexism in a partly-funded student newspaper, the DTH has crossed that line. Let's hope that this was a singular incident. The Daily Tar Heel should offer an apology to the students at Carolina.

JURGEN BUCHENAU
Graduate
Latin American History

Exercise right to reject degrading ad

To the editor:
Of course Playboy magazine has the right to advertise. And of course the Daily Tar Heel has the right to accept such ads. But the Daily Tar Heel also has the right to refuse them.

Assuming, with good reason, that the Daily Tar Heel would surely refuse to accept a full-page color insert from a magazine degrading and insulting to blacks, Jews or other minority groups, one wonders why the Daily Tar Heel did not exercise its discretion and refuse Playboy's ad on Sept. 8.

Isn't it peculiar, and sad, that many people still don't place women's sensitivities on the same footing with other historically oppressed groups?

SETH COHEN
Graduate
Law

Playboy ad makes a tasteless breakfast

To the editor:
I don't usually read Playboy before breakfast. But a glossy insert fell out of

my DTH the other day (Sept. 8) — an ad featuring the cover of October's issue. So I took a look at what kind of messages the DTH is helping this magazine send to the men I work and socialize with daily.

"Entertainment for men" is Playboy's subtitle. Does this mean that women, like the one posing on the cover, are entertainment for men? Or maybe the caption refers to the entire magazine, implying that the "award-winning fiction. Stimulating style. In-depth interviews" are of no interest to women.

A red banner proclaiming "ON SALE NOW" covers the model's breasts and thighs, which are bared on the actual issue. What is on sale — a magazine, or women's bodies and sexual favors?

Note that the magazine has interviews with "fascinating people," and pictures of "the most beautiful women in the world." So a person is someone you talk to and a woman is someone you take pictures of?

And what about the most beautiful women in the world? The four women in the ad are all white. Three of them are blond and blue-eyed. They are all heavily made-up and posed with lips parted in expressions of naivete and vulnerability. Is Playboy suggesting that this WASP stereotype of babydoll passivity is what women should strive for and men should admire?

These messages disturb me. I especially don't like the suggestion that men "start a long-term relationship with Playboy," as if these banal, two-dimensional images were comparable to the emotional complexities and rewards of real human sexual intimacy.

I am disappointed that the DTH, the majority of whose target readership is female, ran this ad. I believe that our student newspaper should not promote a magazine that invests in the perpetuation of sexism.

The DTH editors should reconsider their decision in accepting the ad. An apology to the community is in order. As a gesture of good will, the DTH should donate the proceeds of the ad to an organization that combats sexism and works for understanding between the genders. The Orange County Women's Center, the Rape Crisis Center, the Battered Women's Coalition or the capus SAFE escort service are some that come to mind.

I am not calling for censorship of any kind. Rather, I am expressing my own personal sense of hurt and outrage. I ask that anyone

who is likewise offended by such materials to speak out, to say to their promoters: Your message is hurtful and unacceptable. Please don't send it to me with my morning coffee.

RISTIN COOKS
Senior
Interdisciplinary studies

If disrespect must exist, make it equal

To the editor:
Friday morning on our way to class, we opened our trusty Tar Heel and to our surprise and disgust we were confronted with an ad for Playboy magazine. How could the DTH be so tasteless as to not include Playgirl? Remember, this university is more than 60 percent female. If you are going to promote disrespect toward women, you should also promote disrespect toward men. Why not make all things equal?

We've also wondered how the Undergraduate Library can justify housing Playboy magazine. We even called and asked. The circulation department seems to believe it is a good source for articles and interviews. This may be true. However, we believe that college students can find better sources for information. When asked why they did not house Playgirl as they do Playboy, the Undergrad did not seem to know if Playgirl contained credible literary articles. Why not? They sure seemed to find Playboy's articles up to their literary standards.

Personally, we don't feel that the DTH or the Undergrad should support either magazine. But if they are going to promote one magazine, they should promote both equally. Women's needs must be met, too!

TRACI HOPKINS
Senior
Public health

ANN MARGARET HOOVER
Senior
Elementary education

Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. When writing letters to the editor, 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.
- Most letters run from one to two pages, but longer letters may be run as guest columns.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: James Burroughs and Jennifer Wing.

Assistant Editors: Jessica Yates, arts; Jessica Lanning, city; Myrna Miller, features; Staci Cox, managing; Anne Isenhour and Steve Wilson, news; Lisa Reichle and Richard Smith, Omnibus; Andrew Podolsky, Jay Reed and Jamie Rosenberg, sports; Karen Dunn, state and national; Will Spears and Amy Wajda, university.

Writers: Craig Allen, Kari Barlow, Crystal Benstein, Sarah Cagle, Brenda Campbell, Terri Canada, James Coblin, Blake Dickinson, Mark Folk, Julie Gammill, Jada Harris, Joey Hill, Susan Holdselaw, Jason Kelly, Lloyd Lagos, Tracy Lawson, Rhea Logan, Jeff Luttrell, Alan Martin, Kimberly Maxwell, Helle Nielsen, Glenn O'Neal, Simone Pam, Gus Pappas, Tom Parks, Janette Pippin, Karl Pfister, Mike Sutton, Laura Taylor, Emilie Van Poucke, Stephanie von Isenburg, Sandy Watt, Sherry Waters, Chuck Williams, Nancy Wykle and Faith Wynn.

Sports: Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, Jason Bates, John Bland, Christina Frohock, Scott Gold, Doug Hoogervorst, David Kupstas, Bethany Litton, Bobby McCroskey, Natalie Sekicky and Eric Wagoner.

Arts and Features: Cheryl Allen, Lisa Antonucci, Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Ashley Campbell, Diana Florence, Carrie McLaren, Elizabeth Murray, Leigh Prossley, Hagamhika Sifrisena and Kim Stallings.

Photography: Evan Eile, Steven Exum, Regina Holder, Tracey Langhorne and Kathy Michel.

Copy Editors: B Buckberry, Joy Golden, Angela Hill, Susan Holdselaw and Clare Weickert.

Editorial Assistant: Mark Chilton.

Design Assistants: Kim Avetta and Melanie Black.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Pete Corson, David Estoye and Mike Sutton.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Leslie Humphrey, classified ad manager; Kirsten Burkart, assistant classified ad manager; Amanda Tilley, advertising manager; Sabrina Goodson, business manager; Allison Ashworth, assistant business manager; Lora Gay, Kristi Greenon, Beth Harding, Lavonne Leinster, Tracy Proctor, Kevin Repowitz, Alicia Satterwhite, Pam Thompson and Jill Whitley, display advertising representatives; Kim Bias, creative director; Pam Strickland, marketing director; Sherrie Davis, Ingrid Jones, Shannon Kelly and Tammy Newton, sales assistants; Jeff Carlson, office manager.

Subscriptions: Ken Murphy, manager.

Distribution: RDS Carriers.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, managers; Anita Bentley, assistant manager; Stephanie Locklear, assistant.

Printing: The Village Companies.

Religious groups lack true spirit

Last week I attended a Campus Crusade for Christ meeting. I am not a Christian, nor did I have any desire to be converted as such. I simply thought it would be interesting to observe the practice of a religion with which I was not entirely familiar. I went in with an open mind and hoped for a thoughtful, enlightening experience. I was deeply disappointed.

The guest speaker was a pastor who spoke extensively about his views on religion. He proclaimed that Christianity was singularly the path to salvation and anyone who didn't follow it was damned to hell. He renounced Buddha, Mohammed and Taoism in one breath. He warned the students to be wary of professors and friends who would encourage them to be more tolerant and understanding of others' beliefs. The response from the students was frightening, almost cult-like.

The Christian church has, since its conception, proclaimed itself to be superior to all other religions. A church need not, however,

Shilpi Somaya

Guest Writer

claim exclusivity in order to have a strong and faithful following, unless, of course, it has some doubt as to whether it is strong enough to survive otherwise.

By warning students to ignore the opinions of professors and peers, the pastor is encouraging a dangerous attitude of close-mindedness and ignorance. On a university campus such as ours, where education is supposed to be the focus, I would hope for something a bit more.

Although the pastor undoubtedly has the First Amendment right to speak about whatever he believes in, community leaders should realize their unwritten ethical obligations when those beliefs are used manipulatively or translated into missionary work. Although mis-

sionaries may, in their own minds, believe that they have been ordered by their god to convert others, responses from China, India and other countries in the early 20th century clearly prove that the rest of the world prefers to live without their interference.

I am not asking for acknowledgement of other beliefs from the pastor or groups such as Campus Crusade. Most world religions were founded centuries before Christianity and have never, nor will they ever in the future, need the approval of anyone to be considered valid, and in fact, followed by a majority of the world population.

Rather, I would hope that in today's world, where health, environmental and political problems are not limited to, nor can they possibly be solved by, any one nation, race or religion, campus groups would act in the true spirit of the beliefs they are trying to promote.

Shilpi Somaya is a sophomore economics and international studies major from Toronto, Canada.