

The Daily Tar Heel

98th year of editorial freedom

JENNIFER WING, Editor

STEPHANIE JOHNSTON, University Editor
CULLEN D. FERGUSON, Editorial Page Editor
MARK ANDERSON, Sports Editor
CHRISTINA NIFONG, Features Editor
NATALIE SEKICKY, News Editor
GRANT HALVERSON, Photography Editor
JEFF WORKMAN, Layout Editor
ALEX DE GRAND, Cartoon Editor

MATTHEW EISLEY, University Editor
PETER F. WALLSTEN, City Editor
WENDY BOUNDS, State and National Editor
DEVON HYDE, Omnibus Editor
JOANN RODAK, News Editor
KATHY MICHEL, Photography Editor
CHRISTY CONROY, Layout Editor
JOHANNA HENDERSON, Managing Editor

Increase could save system

Every student has felt the repercussions of severe budget cuts made by the General Assembly. UNC's library system is quickly losing its national prestige, competing universities have lured faculty members away with lucrative offers and graduate students are finding it increasingly difficult to afford an education on paltry teaching-assistant salaries. Amid this financial difficulty, Gov. James G. Martin's proposal to give the UNC system autonomy over tuition rates may be the one solution to save the university system from complete ruin. Although concerns that increasing tuition may prevent some students from applying to certain universities are valid, the predicted \$28 million generated from such an increase would better serve the system.

should examine how the individual universities are trying to respond to minority concerns. By focusing on multi-cultural studies, promoting the African-American curriculum to department status, searching for more minority professors and making progress on a cultural center, these critics may realize that diversity does not necessarily come via low tuition but rather through sensitivity to minority concerns.

Giving individual boards of trustees (BOTs) the power to adjust tuition rates would assure that the needs of each school are met. Under Martin's plan, each BOT can evaluate the financial problems at its respective university. By having this control, the BOT at UNC could respond directly to the University's financial woes.

Critics fear Martin's plan will create financial barriers for students who wish to attend universities such as UNC and N.C. State. The Board of Governors (BOG) and UNC-system President C.D. Spangler have suggested that the proposal will eliminate diversity within the universities by attracting mainly white, wealthy applicants. But the proposal addresses these concerns by requiring that 25 percent of revenue generated from tuition increases be given to financial aid. Furthermore, the belief held by Spangler and the BOG that low tuition contributes to diversity indicates a definite lack of knowledge about how to recruit and retain minority students.

But the UNC system *should* remain cautious about the proposal. The General Assembly may feel justified in substituting the revenue generated from tuition increases for the funding it gives system schools. However, the withdrawal of funds would place the system back into financial difficulties, and the loosened economic control could lead to the privatization of the universities. The UNC system's purpose is to provide a state-funded education at a reasonable price. If the BOTs will maintain reasonable prices, the General Assembly should promise to continue its funding and even to restore pre-budget-cut levels.

North Carolina is staring at a possible \$900 million to \$1.4 billion budget gap. Based on this huge deficit, Gov. Martin has proposed what may be the only salvation for a rapidly declining university system. President Spangler says it's in the system's best interest to keep tuition low, but if the system continues to decline as it has in past years, nobody will care how little it costs to attend a lousy university.

Jingoism backs some war support

The flag-waving fervor accompanying the Gulf War has revealed a basic misunderstanding of the English language.

According to Webster's New World Dictionary:

■ Jingoism is the "chauvinistic advocacy of an aggressive, warlike policy."
■ Patriotism, on the other hand, is the love and zealous support of one's country.

An argument being waged about the war is whether or not it is possible to support U.S. troops without supporting the war itself. But the underlying assumption of this argument is that, in order to be considered patriotic, one must support at least one aspect of the war: the troops.

This is not to say that all supporters of the war are jingoists, but the swelling patriotism of the last month is overtly aggressive, including a disturbing rejuvenation of the phrase "Love it or leave it."

An example of this aggressive patriotism was played out recently, when Italian basketball player Marko Lokar, a member of the Seton Hall squad, was booed by his fans because he refused to wear the American flag on his uniform. The discouraged player, who did not support the war, quit the team. An ugly reality of the incident is that many of the fans who booed Lokar were probably xenophobes who cheered his athletic prowess despite the likelihood they would

not associate with him socially. Others of those fans would most likely trumpet the ideal of freedom of expression. But aggressive patriotism is stronger than idealism, more powerful than racism.

And the problem is being institutionally reinforced, from miniature flags distributed to fans at the Super Bowl and in the Dean E. Smith Center to college sports teams wearing flags. Hollywood is jumping on the bandwagon, producing patriotic videos and television extravaganzas. There is no active campaign maligning people who do not wear flags or stick patriotic bumper stickers on their cars, but the pressure is on to fall in line, to express patriotic opinions.

Dissent is healthy in a republic striving for democracy. Many of the leaders of the peace movement during World War II now admit they were wrong, that the war on Hitler's Third Reich was a necessary evil. But their opinions were still important and their purpose was completely patriotic: to prevent the needless loss of American lives.

War inspires heated emotions, but moral and logical considerations are also involved. Each of us has the right to formulate an opinion according to our own beliefs, but we all have the responsibility to listen, as well. The well thought-out opinion and the willingness to listen are far more patriotic than prominently displayed symbols.



READERS' FORUM

Letter's writer knows nothing about racism

To the editor:
Excuse me, Mr. Moss ("Vandalism, incidents wrongly labeled racism," Feb. 21), but what the hell do you know about racism or the ways that it manifests itself in society? These acts of "good business practice" and "vandalism" are blatant acts of deep-seated racism. If theft is a problem at Rite Aid, then why not move all of the hair-care products to the front of the store? Why single out the products of the African-Americans? A Malcolm X poster has as much right to hang undamaged as a David Duke poster would. Can you not see that these acts single out the African-American as the object of their discrimination? In so doing, they become acts of racism.

The Daily Tar Heel is a part of the media, and the media vows to present the truth. It is not "A Current Affair," and nothing is being sensationalized. It is the ignorant students, such as yourself, that keep the disease of racism spreading on our campus. By refusing to admit that there is a problem, you support racism through pacifism.

The African-American students have come together through the Black Student Movement. There is strength in numbers, and together we stand taller and prouder. Are you faulting us for this? No one hinders the white students from following suit and organizing.

Lastly, Mr. Moss, if they moved a product called "Shampoo for Whites," I would protest. Why? Because that would be discrimination, and discrimination of any people is wrong. By protesting for you, I would better myself. And by bettering myself, I would have more to offer this world. So, Mr. Moss, maybe you need to wake up. These "simple and meaningless" events might scare the hell out of you.

SHURONIA J. FLOOD
Freshman
Political Science

Article assumes war supporters are ignorant

To the editor:
I noted Greg Gangi's condescending little article ("Government does not deserve blind faith from citizens") in the Feb. 18 Daily Tar Heel with some interest.

How easy it is to fall into the trap of assuming that anyone who disagrees with our views is uninformed, stupid or suffering from some mental aberration! I assure Mr. Gangi that supporters of President George Bush and the present war are not the blind, ignorant people he so sanctimoniously has pronounced them to be, nor are the Greens the font of all knowledge on the planet.

Of course, blind support for the president or any leader is wrong. I have spent many hours on picket lines during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations opposed to their policies, but support for the president when he is doing 100 percent what you want is not blind allegiance.

Mr. Gangi may indeed know more about the Middle East than I (I've only been there once and only delivered my first lecture to a college class on the subject in 1973); Mr. Gangi may indeed be more moral than I (although I try to live a good life); Mr. Gangi may indeed be more intelligent than I (I only have one Ph.D.); but, I assure you that I and most others who support the military option against Iraq do

spend a "few minutes each day to stay abreast of local and world news" and do understand the "issues that underlie the crisis" and most definitely have not "arrogated moral judgment to the president."

Those opposed to the military action should have been silenced by the facts: even with more than five months of the embargo, Saddam still has the military might to wage war (the sanctions would have been borne by the people, not the military, of Iraq); Iraq invaded and annexed Kuwait because Iraq's gross national product has declined some 20 percent in the last three years, and Saddam could not afford to repay the loans he took out in order to fight Iran; the so-called "Palestinian" issue had nothing to do with the invasion (how the "Palestinians" were to gain by Saddam taking Kuwait is unclear even to them); and many who know Saddam best (the Saudis, Turks, and Kuwaitis who have supported or bankrolled him for years, as well as the Israelis and Iranians who have hated him for years) all agree that Saddam is a threat to the Middle East and the world.

It seems that to disagree with Mr. Gangi is to be a "misguided" patriot. An interesting concept.

R. EVERETT LANGFORD
Graduate
School of Public Health

Cartoon misrepresents Irish Republican Army

To the editor:
I am writing in response to the cartoon entitled "Irish Scud" printed in the Feb. 2 edition of the Daily Tar Heel. To get directly to the point, even to suggest a comparison between the Irish Republican Army and the Iraqi army is a paramount example of insensitivity and ignorance. The ignorance is to some degree understandable, considering that the British army's occupation of Ulster (Northern Ireland) has been and continues to be backed by the most successful propaganda effort in modern history. The insensitivity, however, is not so easily dismissed.

While it is generally accepted that British policy in Ireland has historically been extremely harsh, it is not so well known that the Irish have been subjected to the same sort of racism in the "British" Isles as African-Americans have in the United States. The same derogatory comments have been applied to each in their respective areas, and a remarkable parallelism is evident. Both have been inaccurately portrayed by oppressors as being ape-like, unintelligent, ill-mannered, etc., and the depiction of the Irishman in "Irish Scud" exemplifies this attitude.

Moreover, it is to me beyond comprehension that anyone could compare the armies of Saddam Hussein to the IRA. Consider one fundamental difference: the Irish have had their country invaded and conquered by a foreign army, and they have spent the past few centuries, without the help or concern of the world, trying to regain their independence. On the other hand, the Iraqis have done the invading and occupying of a foreign nation. Thus, even if you don't agree with the use of violence by the Irish, the comparison of their response to Hussein's unprovoked missile attacks on Israel and Saudi Arabia is still insidiously ignorant. To quote the English musician Billy Bragg: "we war in Ireland (is) the war we send our soldiers to fight in and then

wonder why our cities get bombed." English cities are bombed and will continue to be bombed until their army leaves Ulster, just as Iraqi cities will be bombed until their army leaves Kuwait.

To explain the English/Irish conflict would be a task well beyond the scope of this letter; it would require going all the way back to the Celtic past of the islands and the cultural strife that developed through the ages to the political face that the conflict takes on today. I can only urge the readers of this letter to educate themselves with Irish, and not only British, appraisals of the situation.

However, I especially urge the editor of the DTH to educate herself about this issue, for "Irish Scud" is yet another example of the ignorance that surrounds world opinion on this problem, and I feel it is the editor's responsibility to present unbiased and accurate information that is not childishly insulting. I'm not attacking the editor's right to her opinion, but I do ask that before another such cartoon or article is printed, she spend a few hours in the library investigating the issue.

BRYAN CARELLA
Sophomore
English/Medieval Studies

PAUL SHEEHAN
Sophomore
Applied Sciences

Senior class library gift deserves commendation

To the editor:
I would like to recognize the unusual achievement of the senior class in reaching its pledge goal. Having selected the library as the recipient of its class gift, the members of the class have done an outstanding job in terms of publicizing the campaign, pledging the necessary support and assuring their class a role in the library's future.

I want particularly to mention the leadership of Andrew Herman and Bobby Dabal, who have devoted long hours in conscientious attention to this project. That produced the success in the campaign. I know with this leadership that enhancing the gift and the class's endowment will be a continuing enterprise, but clearly, such a noteworthy achievement requires the community's recognition.

It is a mark of distinction for the class of 1991 that they have both selected the library for their gift and have successfully met their pledge goal—two milestones that are virtually unprecedented and unduplicated among senior classes across the country.

JAMES F. GOVAN
University Librarian

R.A.s cheated by \$400 meal plan rescission

To the editor:
As a newly-selected resident assistant, I would like to express my response to the rescission of \$400 from my expected job compensation.

In the letter I was sent to notify me of my job offer, it was indeed implied that there had been a change in the marketed job compensation. But the true explanation and clarity of the matter did not come until The Daily Tar Heel article ("\$400 meal plan credit rescinded for new resident assistants") Feb. 21. I empathize with the present budget situation, and I understand the University's necessary cutbacks.

However, I do believe the housing department should have stated straightforwardly in our notification letter that the cutback had occurred.

Many students like myself are trying to earn sufficient funds for schooling, and \$400 is a substantial amount of money to lose. We deserve the simple respect and courtesy of being properly informed of the entire situation. The letter simply swept it under the rug. The futile attempt made in the letter was to leave the \$400 meal-card credit off the list of job compensation for new RAs. This was grossly inadequate and does not qualify as a responsible communication.

I will not begin to even comment on the value judgment of having the new and old RAs receiving unequal pay for equal work.

JO ANNA GODWIN
Junior
Psychology

Campus elections catered to bureaucracy

To the editor:
The campus elections were a farce. There were no candidates for my congressional district, so I mounted a last-ditch write-in campaign. I know that at least eight people voted for me, but results showed that there was a tie among five candidates who each received one vote. I asked the elections board what happened and was informed that perhaps the three bubbles at the top of the ballot weren't filled in correctly, and thus the ballots were rejected by the computer.

Although I find it very unlikely that all eight people erred, I see some logic in this policy. The explanation for why the votes couldn't be counted by hand, however, was "that was the only way we can be sure people vote for what they should be voting for." This has terrifying implications. I was told that I couldn't be shown the ballot because "that would obscure the electoral process," as if it weren't already. I inquired as to how I could be sure that someone just didn't want me on Student Congress and kept me from being elected because they had access to the process. My inquiry was rebuffed: "Well, sometimes you just have to trust the system."

Nonsense! No system is to be absolutely trusted. I campaigned, however briefly, on the idea of keeping non-bureaucrats' check on the student government. I have not called for a recount, but I pledge to the student body to fulfill all my campaign promises and keep a check on the bureaucracy.

DAVID GHIRARDELLI
Junior
Geography

Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. We attempt to print as many letters to the editor as space permits. When writing letters, please follow these guidelines:

- If you want your letter published, please sign and date it. No more than two signatures please.
- All letters must be typed and double-spaced.
- Please include such vital statistics as your year in school, major, phone number and hometown.
- If you have a title that is relevant to your letter's subject, please include it.
- Place letters in the box outside the DTH office in the Student Union annex.

The Daily Tar Heel

Business and advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Bob Bates, advertising director; Leslie Humphrey, classified ad manager. Business staff: Allison Ashworth, manager; Kimberly Metz, assistant manager; Gina Bernardino, office assistant; Michelle Gray, Annie Hood and Becky Marquette, receptionists; Ken Murphy, subscriptions; Chrissy Davis, promotions manager. Classified advertising: Angela Spivey, assistant manager; Laura Richards and Thi Vu, assistants; Brandon Poe, production. Display advertising: Lavonne Leistner, advertising manager; Heather Bannister, Chris Berry, Kelly Bohart, Chad Boswell, Carrie Grady, Ashleigh Heath, Carole Hedgepeth, Vicki Isley, Trish Parrott and Dawn Rogers, account representatives; Kim Blass, creative director; Milton Artie, Laurie Davis, Maribeth Layton, Brooks Spradling and Stacy Turkel, sales assistants; Deborah Bumgarner, proofreader. Advertising production: Bill Leslie, manager; Anita Bentley, Chad Campbell, Greg Miller and Lorrie Patz, production assistants. Assistant editors: Mondy Lamb, arts coordinator; Jennifer Dickens, city; Kenny Monteith, graphics; Amy Seeley, news; Layton Croft, Mondy Lamb, Omnibus; Jim Holm and Sarah King, photo; Neil Amato, Stewart Chisam and Warren Hynes, sports; Dacia Toll, state and national; Steve Pollit, university. Newscasters: Kevin Brennan and Amy Dew. Editorial writers: James Burroughs, Stacy Cox, Jen Pilla and Nancy Wykle. University: Marcie Bailey, Elizabeth Byrd, Birch DeVault, April Draughn, Soya Ellison, Ashley Fogle, Adam Ford, Brian Golson, Burke Koonce, Matthew Mielke, Gillian Murphy, Jennifer Mueller, Cathy Oberle, Shannon O'Grady, Heather Phillips, Bonnie Rochnan, JoAnn Rodak, Karen Schwartz, Billy Stockard, Sarah Sulter, Carrie Wells, Laura Williams and Natasha Witherspoon. City: Jennifer Brett, Kris Donahue, Laura-Leigh Gardner, Chris Goodson, Cheryl A. Herndon, Nancy Johnson, Julie Malveaux, Amber Nimocks, Nicole Peradotto, Nicole Perez, Erik Rogers and Dawn Spiggle. State and National: Jennifer Davis, Karen Dietrich, Steve Doyle, David Etchison, Doug Hatch, Andre Hauser, West Lockhart, Eric Lusk, Pete Simpkinson, Kyle York Spencer and Dacia Toll. Arts: Isabel Barbuk, Kiti Buckley, Tere Clippard, Grant Halverson, Anna Michaud, Kirk Medlin, Greg Miller and Jeff Trussell. Features: Eric Bolash, Tiffany Cook, Karen Crutchfield, M.C. Dagenhart, Pia Doersam, Matthew Hoyt, Mara Lee, Ginger Meek, Mary Moore Parham, Ari Rapport, Colleen Roddie, Kay Stallworth and Dawn Spiggle. Sports: Kenny Abner, Jason Bates, A.J. Brown, Robert Brown, Eric David, Jay Exum, Doug Hoogervorst, Matt Johnson, David Kupstas, John Manuel, Amy McCaffrey, Bobby McCroskey, Doug McCurry, David Monroe and Bryan Strickland. Photography: David Minton, editor emeritus; Evan Eile and Joe Muhl, senior photographers; Kevin Burgess, Jonathan Grubbs, Brian Jones, Cheryl Kane, Keith Nelson, Linus Parker, Debbie Stengel and Susan Tebbens. Layout: Melanie Black, Shawn Fuller, Christy Hall and Robin Lentz. Copy Editors: Mitch Bibby, Stephanie Brodsky, Laura Clark, Hardy Floyd, Lorrin Freeman, Angela Hill, Aimee Hobbs, Sarah Kirkman, Mitch Kokal, Jennifer Kurlens, Lisa Lindsay, Amy McCarter, Susan Pearsall, Natalie Pool, Terri Potter, Chris Shuping, Angela Spivey, Kenyatta Upchurch, Emilia Van Pauske, Clare Weichert, Steve Wilson and Mike Workman. Cartoonists: Deana Deese, Chris DePre, David Estoye, Chris Kelly, Jeff Maxim, Jake McNally and Mike Suttton. Editorial Production: Stacy Wynn, manager; Kristen Jones and Greg Thacker, assistants. Distribution: RDS Carriers. Printing: Village Printing. The Daily Tar Heel is published by the DTH Publishing Corp., a non-profit North Carolina corporation, Monday-Friday, according to the University calendar. Callers with questions about billing or display advertising should dial 962-1163 between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. Classified ads can be reached at 962-0252. Editorial questions should be directed to 962-0245/0246. Office: Suite 104 Carolina Union U.S. Mail address: P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-3257 Campus mail address: CB# 5210 box 49, Carolina Union