

# The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor    JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor    JOHN CONWAY, City Editor  
CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor    KAREN FISHER, Features Editor  
MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor    JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
BILL RIEDY, News Editor    CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

## All the world's a stage . . .

We, the editors of *The Daily Tar Heel*, have always felt obliged to endorse those candidates whom we feel are best qualified in elections pertinent to life at UNC. So well-received and influential were our past endorsements (Cobey for U.S. Congress, Reckford for student body President . . .), we thought Academy voters in Hollywood surely would be waiting for word on the *DTH's* opinions before casting this year's Oscar ballots.

So, here they are — the *DTH's* picks for Monday's competition, Hollywood's annual night of glamour and goosebumps.

• **Best Picture** — *Gandhi*. Director Richard Attenborough's dream of 20 years finally realized itself in the form of the year's grandest, and most poignant, motion picture. As portrayed by Ben Kingsley, a legendary figure came to vivid life.

• **Best Actor** — Dustin Hoffman, *Tootsie*. Dustin in drag proved to be hilarious, moving and, ultimately, an insightful glance at sex roles in our society.

• **Best Actress** — Meryl Streep, *Sophie's Choice*. Streep is one of those actresses who will wind up in this category year after year. But this is the year for Streep's first Best Actress Oscar. Streep drew upon the most meticulous of speech patterns and mannerisms to create an unforgettable heroine.

• **Best Supporting Actor** — Louis Gossett Jr., *An Officer and a Gentleman*. Gossett's tough drill sergeant was one of the year's most unforgettable screen characters, and the chemistry between Gossett and star Richard Gere was nothing shy of perfection.

• **Best Supporting Actress** — Jessica Lange, *Tootsie*. No one in 1982 broke as many hearts as Lange did, and she brought to *Tootsie* the warmth and sensitivity which helped to make it one of the most lovable motion pictures of the year.

• **Best Director** — Steven Spielberg, *E.T.* Spielberg's adorable alien was the year's best-loved star and no director in recent memory has elicited such memorable performances from a cast of child actors.

Now, the word has been issued. Thousands of baffled Academy voters will rush to the *DTH* drop box outside of Groman's Chinese Theatre to find some direction to their all-important ballot casting. And if the *DTH's* endorsements are as successful as they have always been, the winners will be *Missing*, Peter O'Toole, Julie Andrews . . .

## . . . the men, players

No one has declared for the 1984 state Senate race, but you wouldn't know it by judging Sen. Jesse Helms and Gov. Jim Hunt. Their political machines are in motion and their campaign funds are growing. They're putting on quite a show and fooling no one — except maybe themselves.

A Hunt-Helms battle is nothing new in North Carolina. In 1981, Hunt proposed a 3 percent gasoline tax increase in order to subsidize his dwindling state Highway Fund.

In return, Helms' unleashed his powerful political organization — the National Congressional Club — waging a media campaign against Hunt's increase.

Just one year later, Helms and his shadow Sen. John East switched votes at the last minute to help pass a bill which doubled the federal excise tax on cigarettes.

This time it was Hunt's political powerhouse that went to work. The Campaign Fund took out full page ads in newspapers across the state calling Helms and East the "Tobacco Tax Twins."

But apparently, even the worst of political enemies could become friends — if the cause was right. In April 1982, the two joined forces in an effort to save the Cape Hatteras lighthouse. Together, they kicked off a statewide fund-raiser, smiling broadly, while posing on the steps of the capitol for photographers.

Now, there's only a year to go and both men seem more worried about their own public image. Last month Helms introduced his version of a social security bill to the Senate. Then he immediately pulled it back out, perhaps after judging that it wouldn't be too popular. And Hunt has been spending his time making eloquent speeches on education and the need to crack down on drunk drivers.

It's the way of political machines, especially when the two most powerful political figures in the state are pitted against one another. And it won't end there. In fact, later this month, both Hunt and Helms will join forces to rally support for the opening of the sand-clogged Oregon Inlet on the N.C. coast. At that time, they'll probably smile a lot, shake hands and be best friends — at least for a day.

## The Bottom Line

### The fountain of life

If Chapel Hill is even half as glib as Philadelphia, close your eyes and pray for a pothole. And hope that you break your ankle when you find one.

A woman in the City of Brotherly Love did just that when she fell into a 3-inch-deep pothole. Then, she sued the city for negligence — and won \$600,000.

"The jurors must have had their heads in the sand," an official for the Philadelphia Solicitor's office said. A jury in Philadelphia Common Pleas Court ruled last week that the city was negligent in failing to repair the pothole and ordered Philadelphia to pay the award to Betty Rogers, 32. City officials say they will appeal the case.

Rogers broke her ankle in two places May 17, 1978, when she stepped off a curb into the sinister pothole. Her lawyers said her ankle never healed properly, and now she is prevented from even standing up.

One of Rogers' lawyers, Robert Davitch, said, "What I think is outrageous is that the city permitted that hole to remain there for six or seven years."

He said the hole was repaired in 1981 by the owner of a restaurant who "went out with a wheelbarrow and filled the hole with cement."

Two holes are better than one. Two holes also give you "a bigger mouth-full quicker."

According to Dennis Heyden, local product manager of the Halsey Taylor company, drinking from a water fountain which is equipped with a Two-Stream Bubbler is safer and more satisfying than drinking from a fountain that has only a single projector.

Most conventional water fountains have what appears to be a single stream of water that is projected up in the shape of a parabola. Yet, hidden beneath that stream is another stream that emerges from a small opening just behind the opening of the main stream — and you've got your Two-Stream Bubbler.

The Bubbler, as it is affectionately referred to, was invented in 1912 by a Mr. Halsey Taylor for submission to the secretary of the U.S. Army.

Rather than letting water that had touched one's mouth fall back on the projector, the Taylor design left the water to fall in a drain, consequently reducing the chance of germs being transmitted from one drinker to another from the projector.

And that's the safe, satisfying bottom line.

# First Amendment not for Christians only

By AMY NOVIT

In the March 28 issue of *The Daily Tar Heel*, a column by Tracey St. Pierre titled "The myth: separation of church and state" was printed. This column was surprisingly written by a journalism major; I say surprisingly because it was full of wild claims, vague references and quite a few contradictions. I felt I needed to respond.

St. Pierre begins by stating that the First Amendment does not contain the phrase "separation of church and state." Therefore, according to her, since the Constitution does not specifically use this phrase, it was not the intention of the First Amendment to separate the church from the government. And yet the Amendment clearly states that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ." Not only does the Constitution declare that the government may not make any laws concerning religion, it goes a step further and states that the government has no hand in matters of religion at all. It gives people the right to practice religion or not practice any religion, all without governmental interference. The First Amendment offers not only freedom by not pushing a religion prescribed by the government, but freedom by not prohibiting us to practice any religion that we choose. Clearly this is a separation of church and state. St. Pierre goes on to make the claim that the First Amendment was written to "protect the church, not the state." To suppose this is to twist the meaning of why the Constitution was written in the first place. The purpose of the First Amendment was to protect the religious freedom of each individual to worship how and if he wanted without the fear of governmental persecution. If this amendment protected the church in the bargain by somehow keeping the state from having jurisdiction over the church, then so much the better for those Americans who chose to worship in the Christian faith. But to declare that this is the reason that the First Amendment was written is a narrow-minded and certainly self-serving view. It seems to me that St. Pierre, not the Supreme Court, has created a "new and completely arbitrary interpretation of the First Amendment."

St. Pierre leaves many terms undefined, either because she assumes that what she is saying is common knowledge, or because she herself is unclear as to what she means. What does it mean to say, in connection with

a political system, that "if a moral system is not being legislated, then an immoral system is being legislated?" St. Pierre is saying that there is some kind of universal norm for morality that would define a political system as moral or immoral. But what is her definition of morality? There are all kinds of ethical theories that try to explain where morality comes from. Her definition of what is "right" or "good" seems to come from the Christian church. Does this mean that all non-Christians are immoral? Or that all political systems not based on the Christian religion are immoral? This statement is ambiguous and actually trivial to the rest of her argument, which is why it is such a mystery that she included it in the first place.

St. Pierre states that our country was founded as a Christian nation, and that "no system of law or government can be religiously or morally neutral." She seems to forget that America was established as a refuge for persecuted people of all lands, a place where they could live and worship as they pleased. Perhaps complete religious neutrality hasn't been established in our country. But by the very fact that the United States was founded as a democracy (a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people) and not a theocracy (a form of government in which God or a deity is recognized as the supreme ruler), it is evident that our nation is not and was never supposed to be identified as strictly Christian. St. Pierre says that the original North Carolina Constitution demands the belief in God, belief in Protestantism or belief in the divine authority of the Old or New Testaments as a prerequisite to holding any political office in our state. This is her proof of the Christian foundations of our nation. But the major word in this constitution is the word "or." Why does St. Pierre think this only applies to Christians, when Buddhists believe in God (but call him a different name) and Jews believe in the Old Testament? Clearly this original constitution covers many religions, a fact that St. Pierre chooses to ignore. Another important point is that this was the original constitution for North Carolina, which means that it has since been revised. If the original constitution no longer stands, it does more harm than good to St. Pierre's case to bring it to light.

After reading St. Pierre's column, I set out to reconstruct her argument. My philosophy teaching assistant helped me come up with this summary argument of St. Pierre's article:

**Premise No. 1:** If the government won't support the church, then religious freedom is jeopardized.

**Premise No. 2:** The government doesn't support the church.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, religious freedom is being threatened.

This argument is valid in form — that is, the argument proves the conclusion — but the content is not valid at all. St. Pierre declares that the second premise is true, and as an example, she cites that the taking down of the star from the top of the Planetarium is a way in which the state doesn't support the church. This premise is true. But the first premise is bizarre. St. Pierre seems to equate religion with Christianity, and freedom of religion with governmental support of the church. To say that by not supporting the church the government is threatening religious freedom misses the point of religious freedom entirely. St. Pierre states that "the Constitution was an instrument whereby existing religious values of the nation could be protected and perpetuated." But by saying before that the purpose of the First Amendment was to protect the church, one comes to the conclusion that she is saying that the Constitution (and therefore the First Amendment) was written in order to protect the existing Christian values. She is essentially saying that religious freedom means being allowed to worship Protestantism as she wishes, but she totally bypasses the plight of those who seek religious freedom not to worship Protestantism. No one is stopping St. Pierre from worshipping Christianity as she chooses; she may fill her room or house with non-secular objects and pray in her own fashion. But to put a Christian religious symbol on top of the planetarium, a secular establishment, is a violation of religious freedom if one defines it in the usual sense of freedom for everyone.

Finally, St. Pierre blows her entire argument to bits with her concluding sentences. She says, "I can't believe it's come to the point that a star can't be put on top of the planetarium. Religion or not, the star first appeared in the sky nearly 2,000 years ago when Jesus was born. It's a scientific fact." By shifting her argument from religious to scientific, St. Pierre discredits everything that she has said up to that point. If she really is concerned about science, she should have no objections to putting a model of the Big Dipper on top of the planetarium. It too is a scientific fact. To take away the religious meaning of the star is to deflate the argument. St. Pierre has lost sight of her point, and I believe I have, too.

Amy Novit is a freshman from Bloomington, Ind.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Lee shows musical integrity with Rundgren

To the editor:

Recently I have noticed something very strange going on around here. Students on campus have been asking each other, "Who is Todd Rundgren?" It makes me wonder how pervasive Todd's obscurity is here, and why he's obscure at all. Rundgren's is no new voice in rock. Recording since 1968 with the Nazz, Utopia and solo, he has gained fame and fortune as one of the truly creative wizards of contemporary music, "a true star." Todd may be one of those artists about whose songs people say, "That's Todd Rundgren? I love that song but I never knew it was him!" Songs like "Hello, It's Me," "I Saw the Light in Your Eyes," "It Wouldn't Have Made Any Difference," "We Gotta Get You a Woman" and, recently, "Swing to the Right" (with Utopia).

Todd has always attempted to expand the horizons of rock with new studio

techniques and by combining pop, soul and other genres of music to form his own distinctive sound. Rundgren is a bonafide, big-league rock 'n' roll star, and whether you've heard of him or not, you will sell yourself short by not at least listening to his music before you make up your mind not to go to this concert.

I find it amazing that Carolina Concert for Children Chairperson Ben Lee has contracted acts of the quality of Rundgren and U2 after years of second- and third-rate acts at outrageous prices. WXYC applauds his attempts to inject some musical integrity into this concert. U2 is one of the most exciting bands anywhere. I think it is unfortunate that on a major college campus, where rock music traditionally has its base, an act of the quality of Todd Rundgren is even questioned. But it is not too late to wake up.

Bill Burton  
WXYC station manager



### Pine Room greeting usually more like a threat

To the editor:

It has been getting on my nerves since the beginning of the year, yet I have said nothing thus far. However, I feel it is time to discuss the behavior and courtesy of the workers in the Pine Room.

There are three or four ladies who work there that I like very much because they

are always helpful and ready to serve with a great attitude. However, a majority of personnel act as if they are doing us a favor by serving us. They are rude, offensive and just plain impolite more often than not.

Sure, sometimes they ask, "Can I help you?" but it usually sounds like a threat

rather than a greeting. The constant bickering and arguing between workers is very annoying, and seeing as there are no places on campus to eat other than the "Slow Break" or the snack bars in Morrison and James, I feel like the University can and should do better for the outrageous prices they charge for third-rate

food, or whatever it is that they serve.

I feel like management is the problem. Last semester, under a man we called "Mr. Pine Room," the food quality was better and the attitudes of the workers were much less "gestapo-like."

The University and ARA cannot expect us to pay \$100 for a meal plan for service that is comparable to prison food. I hope ARA will either ax some employees or shape up some attitudes.

Phil Bridges  
Ehringhaus

### Favorite slogan

To the editor:

When I read Bill Marsh's letter ("Distinguished statesmen," *DTH*, March 31), I was reminded of one of my favorite T-shirt slogans: "Once I was disgusted — Now I'm just amused." It describes my reaction to his letter quite well. I simply cannot understand how a person can embrace the politics of Senators Helms and East with such enthusiasm. With low-level zeal, OK; with reservations, sure; with some regrets, understandable; but "a privilege to live in a state represented by two such distinguished statesmen as Helms and East?" I break out in laughter. Distinguished? Helms? East? I'm sorry, but I just cannot make the mental leap across a chasm that wide. I count myself among those who are embarrassed to have Helms and East for senators. In fact, so many of my friends and acquaintances consider Helms and East to be regrettable at best that I find myself asking "Who is voting for these men?" And so I read a letter like Marsh's with a smile and a nod, saying: "Ah yes. Here's one. Here's one. Sure enough."

Steven R. Brown  
Chapel Hill

### Blood brothers

To the editor:

We would like to thank the residents of Morrison Residence College for their help in a recent emergency. Recent snowfall caused the cancellation of several bloodmobiles across the state. Because the Red Cross could not maintain a safe supply of blood, Betsy Ferrell, the Red Cross field consultant, called Alpha Phi Omega, the service fraternity that coordinates all the campus bloodmobiles. APO then contacted Greg Hinson and Mark Brown of Morrison. In less than 24 hours the residents recruited the necessary donors and volunteers for the bloodmobile. Their prompt action allowed the Red Cross to continue supplying blood to the hospitals in this region. Thank you.

Betsy Ferrell  
Red Cross Field Consultant  
Ruth Lucas  
Campus Bloodmobile Coordinator

### Not much to say

To the editor:

Judging by the editorial page lately, it appears that *The Daily Tar Heel* will print anything. Therefore I've decided there's no better time to be vain and see my name in print.

I'm sorry I don't have anything of major importance to say. I would say that I have a job when I graduate, but I'm likely to be stoned to death by envious seniors. I would mention El Salvador, toxic waste or homosexual rights, but I've led a sheltered life — I don't believe they exist.

I know! I'll write about the apathy on

campus. No, no one cares about that. I should write about bricking all of the grass over, or chopping down all of the trees, or building more dorms or fewer libraries or making Comp 114 a requirement for graduation.

I think, instead, I'll just say nothing. I'll just leave school quietly and join the establishment peacefully. Maybe now the CIA will stop opening my mail.

Rusty Sebastian  
Chapel Hill

### Not laughing over comics

To the editor:

Congratulations on reaching a new all-time low in public service! It's nice to know that you prefer to feed your readers on two-bit advertising and features articles, but it's a travesty to leave out the comics on which most people dearly depend. Of what use is the paper anyway

unless you run something really vital to student interests? If this is your idea of "new journalism" please spare us from being the guinea pigs in your experiment and don't sell your soul for a fast buck.

Michael Norris  
Carrboro

## Bargain with guerrillas

By WINSTON GILCHRIST

As Congress considers providing additional military aid to the government of El Salvador, the debate over the importance of this tiny Central American nation to the United States and the appropriate American response to the crisis there grows increasingly intense.

No informed person can question that the United States has vital national interests in Central America. Lying on the southern flank of the United States and controlling the sea lanes to and from the Panama Canal, Central America has great strategic significance. The United States also has extensive economic interests in the area, including large corporate investments.

Although El Salvador occupies only a small portion of Central America, the internal strife presently taking place in that country seriously threatens broader American interests in the area. If forces inimical to the United States seize power in El Salvador, the Soviet Union will expand its influence in America's backyard, and other nations such as Honduras, Guatemala and even Mexico may well be threatened.

In seeking to increase military aid to El Salvador, President Reagan's administration hopes to help the Salvadoran Army crush the rebellious guerrillas. In seeking a military solution, however, the administration may well be damaging American interests. The failed U.S. attempt to resolve the Vietnam conflict with military power immediately comes to mind. Although Vietnam and El Salvador should not be paralleled

too closely, conditions in El Salvador do resemble those that existed in Vietnam in several important respects. As was true in Vietnam, forces support by the United States in El Salvador find themselves fighting a guerrilla war in difficult terrain with minimal support from the indigenous population. Such factors will make defeating the insurgents very difficult, even if the United States takes the drastic step of introducing American combat troops.

Given the problems associated with a military solution, negotiating with the insurgents seems to be a much more viable option for resolving the crisis. By bargaining with the guerrillas and by suggesting to any coalition government that negotiations may produce substantial economic and technical aid to induce cooperation with the United States, the administration could possibly secure a friendly government in El Salvador, reduce Soviet influence in Central America and protect American national interests.

Of course the Salvadoran rebels may be, as Reagan claims, hard-core Communists determined to forcibly seize power. If such is the case, Reagan faces the most difficult decision of his presidency: whether to prop up a weak Salvadoran regime, with American troops if necessary, or to allow El Salvador to fall into Communist hands. But we as a nation will cross that bridge if and when we come to it. For the present we may still hope that all parties will be willing to end the conflict in a reasonable and peaceful manner.

Winston Gilchrist is a sophomore history and political science major from Sanford.