

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROGHI, 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

Water menace

An old and trustworthy product on the N.C. industrial scene — biocides — has been relegated to placement on an already-long list of threats to the state's environment. That deserved demotion followed a report made last week by the state's Division of Environmental Management warning that biocides pose a significant chemical threat to life in the state's rivers and streams. Most of those affected tributaries supply North Carolina its drinking water.

Already the state must contend with environmental concerns such as pollution, acid rain, drought and paraquat. But the newly discovered dangers of biocides could catapult this issue to the head of the list.

"Biocides" is the nickname for toxic chemicals widely used to stop the growth of bacteria in textiles, cooling equipment and other products. The extremely toxic chemicals are licensed by the Environmental Protection Agency, but a state study found that about 30 percent of the products did not display a required warning label: "This product is toxic to fish. Treated effluent should not be discharged where it will drain into lakes, ponds, streams or public water." Unfortunately, that admonition did not stop the more than 86 percent of professed users who said they discharged the chemical into municipal or private wastewater treatment plants that flow into streams. The ones from which many of us drink.

If used properly, biocides never enter the environment and cause no harm to it. But the careless handling of biocides, however, mandates that steps be taken immediately to halt all illegal and unwise discharges of biocides into streams that towns and cities use for drinking water. Much of that burden rests with the companies themselves, some of whom have voluntarily cooperated with officials in attempts to pinpoint the source of toxic wastes. Two companies have already done so.

It remains to be seen, however, if other N.C. companies will voluntarily stop discharging the chemical into municipal or private treatment plants. If they do not, municipalities must find out what is being discharged into their sewer systems and, if biocides or other contaminants are discovered, track down the offenders. Then, criminal charges should be filed against the company and the illegal discharges halted.

Biocides, although they enter a packed field on intense competitors vying for the public's attention, could pose the most serious threat to continued abuse of the N.C. environment.

Hold on referendum

The Campus Governing Council Wednesday night attacked the perennial problem of dwindling student fees in the face of inflation and a severely curtailed general reserve. And so, like many of its predecessors since 1977 — when the fees were last raised — it authorized a special student referendum to decide whether to raise the fees. The call this year is for a \$3 per semester per student increase. But the council, in calling for a special referendum, has ignored recent history and is destined to fall miserably in its attempt to draw students to the polls.

Last year, a similar bill was passed, but despite excessive publicity from campus publications and other student organizations, only about 1,800 students gathered at the polls. At least 20 percent of the student body — or about 4,100 students — must vote in an election for it to be valid.

Student fees are the life blood of most student organizations. Yet these organizations, which each year ask for a bigger chunk of the funds available, will find themselves faced with \$20,000 less from which to draw. Last spring, the CGC allocated about \$290,000 to student organizations — \$65,000 of which came from the general reserve. The next council, however, will not have as much to allocate from the surplus because of a staggering \$70,000 loss on April's Carolina Concert for Children.

By calling for a referendum this semester, rather than waiting until the general election in February, when an adequate turnout of student voters is ensured, the council hopes to add about \$30,000 to the surplus fund. The extra funds could be saved for the next council, or they could be allocated to organizations for capital expenditures and subsequent appropriations.

But these well-meaning representatives are acting counter to their own interests by scheduling a special referendum that will never draw the required number of students.

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

U. S. Marines to use naval, air power

By FRANK BRUNI

A new chapter in U.S. military involvement in Lebanon seemed to commence when the Reagan administration announced Tuesday that the U.S. Marines in Lebanon are authorized to call on U.S. naval and air power in certain circumstances related to self-defense.

Upon their arrival in Beirut nearly a year ago, the Marines were authorized only to shoot in self-defense. Since then, the situation in Lebanon has deteriorated, as four Marines have been killed in fighting between the Lebanese army and Moslem Druse militiamen. Battles have also erupted five miles southeast of Beirut between leftist Druse and rightist Christian militias.

The new instructions from Washington allow Marine commanders to employ offshore naval and air power to aid both the Italian, French and British contingents of the multinational peacekeeping force and the Lebanese army itself. Although administration officials argue that the new orders represent a mere extension of the self-defense policy and relate only to circumstances in which U.S. Marines may be endangered, congressional leaders are concerned about an escalation of U.S. military involvement in war-torn Lebanon.

In Washington, Senate Democrats called on President Reagan Wednesday to acknowledge that the threat to U.S. Marines in Lebanon mandates that American military presence there be subject to congressional approval under the War Powers Act. That resolution requires that the president notify Congress when U.S. troops face combat situations. The troops must then be withdrawn within 90 days unless Congress authorizes their continued presence.

For now, however, the U.S. Marines remain in the Middle East. While the Reagan administration feels an obligation to stand by the fragile Lebanese

government it promised to support, it also fears more harm to U.S. Marines. The present stalling helps neither case.

Seeking retribution

The circumstances surrounding the Soviet's downing of KAL flight 007 have generated a virtual battle of political wills between the United States and the Soviet Union. While U.S. leaders have lambasted the Soviet Union with harsh rhetoric, the Kremlin has drawn attention to the questions about the plane's flight which remain unanswered.

Among other responses to the tragic incident, the United States Monday took the matter to the United Nations Security Council. Although the general feeling at the council was anti-Soviet, four of the 15 member nations abstained from voting on a resolution that would have deplored the Soviet's action. Poland was the only nation voting with the Soviet Union as it exercised its veto power over the resolution.

In Washington, the House voted unanimously Wednesday to condemn the Soviet Union for "one of the most infamous and reprehensible acts in history." The severity of such a statement is countered by the absence of any significant sanctions against the Soviet Union. The Senate, where conservatives hoped to press for sanctions against the Soviets, was scheduled to deliberate the bill yesterday.

Friday in the middle

State Attorney General Rufus L. Edmisten ended debate concerning public access to records of consulting work by UNC faculty members when he declared Tuesday that such records are indeed public documents.

Edmisten's assertion overruled a former staff decision. Edmisten's staff had advised UNC President William C. Friday late last month to halt public in-

By KEN MINGIS

It seemed like old times.

Sure, the hair looked a little thinner and the face a bit softer. The blue eyes were dimmer and the neck sagged noticeably. But the South Dakota voice, nasal twang and all, was just as strong. So, too, were the words, sounding oh-so-much like another campaign and another time.

American troops are dying in the Middle East. George McGovern wants to stop that. American troops are parading around in Central America. The former South Dakota senator wants to stop that, too.

So he's running for president. Again.

It's been 11 years since the soft-spoken McGovern lost the presidency by the largest margin ever. It was in a different day and age that the senator from South Dakota took his stands, made his pledges and ran his campaign. And on that long-ago election day, McGovern carried only the state of Massachusetts and the District of Columbia.

He hopes to do better this time. But if he doesn't, that's OK, because three years after he was defeated for re-election to the U.S. Senate, McGovern is back in the limelight, saying what he wants to say and hoping someone will pay attention. There's no campaign organization to speak of and all the big bucks have been funneled into the campaign coffers of Mondale, Glenn and associates. But at age 61, with even his wife Eleanor refusing to campaign for him, McGovern is going to take another shot at the presidency.

As he told a crowd of friends and supporters at George Washington University on Tuesday, "You have to do what you have to do. This is something I feel I must do."

So be it.

McGovern in '84 has little chance of winning even one primary, much less the Democratic nomination and the presidency. He seems to realize it, too. The slow, patient tone of voice in which he makes his speeches echoes a thoughtful man who sincerely cares about what he is saying. He wants the presidency because, as John Kennedy once said, "That is where the power is." But McGovern, unlike some of his fellow Democrats, doesn't need the White House, doesn't lust after it like a junkie seeking another fix

like most romantics, he just wants to change the world.

Even as he joined six other Democrats now seeking their party's presidential nomination, McGovern stood himself off to the political left. That's never-never land in these days of Reaganism and the New Right. McGovern doesn't simply oppose increases in military spending, he wants to cut the defense budget by 25 percent. He wants the United States out of Central America and the Middle East, favors arms control and wants to boost domestic spending to aid the large number of Americans still unemployed. Explaining his foreign-policy views, McGovern characteristically said, "It's better for old men to lose their tempers at the conference table than for young men to lose their lives on the battlefield."

It's McGovern rhetoric all the way. He doesn't care what some of the governments in Central America and



Like most romantics, he just wants to change the world.

Even as he joined six other Democrats now seeking their party's presidential nomination, McGovern stood himself off to the political left. That's never-never land in these days of Reaganism and the New Right. McGovern doesn't simply oppose increases in military spending, he wants to cut the defense budget by 25 percent. He wants the United States out of Central America and the Middle East, favors arms control and wants to boost domestic spending to aid the large number of Americans still unemployed. Explaining his foreign-policy views, McGovern characteristically said, "It's better for old men to lose their tempers at the conference table than for young men to lose their lives on the battlefield."

It's McGovern rhetoric all the way. He doesn't care what some of the governments in Central America and

the Middle East think. For him, it is wrong for American troops to be fighting and dying in far away wars with obscure and vague "peacekeeping" objectives. It was wrong in Vietnam in 1972, and it is still wrong today.

Not bad. There may be hope for the Democrats in 1984 yet. So far, none of those candidates from the party of Franklin Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson have done anything to establish themselves as independent thinkers. They're all too busy trying to build an identity in the public mind, something that will set them apart from their campaign compatriots. But now, with McGovern in the race, each of the Democratic hopefuls will probably have to develop a few specific ideas and proposals. A novel idea, yes, but it might make for a more enlightening discussion of just what the United States is supposed to be doing with itself.

For example, just how does Walter Mondale feel about the situation in Lebanon, and what would he do? Mrs. Mondale may know, but no one else does. McGovern, on the other hand, said, "We should bring about some stability (there) and then as quickly as we gracefully can, pull out. Are we on a path now where we're going to find ourselves committing 100,000 or 150,000 Marines?" Agree with him or not, you at least have a good idea of where he stands on the issue. It's that kind of specificity that the Democrats are going to need next year if they want to send Ronald Reagan packing his bags for California.

McGovern, when asked what effect his shoe-string candidacy would have on his party, pointed out that no Democrat has generated any real enthusiasm, any of that pulsating, throbbing movement for a candidate or a cause. No one has struck the nerve yet, so he's going to try. (Recent polls reflect that lack of enthusiasm for any of the Democrats. Much of the "support" they seem to enjoy is simply anti-Reagan sentiment. And in 1984, that won't cut the cake.)

For McGovern, pulling together support for his campaign won't be easy. It might, however, be fun. Realizing his chances are slim, the ex-senator can speak his peace free from the political necessity of pleasing all the people, all the special interest groups. This time around, McGovern need please only himself, need answer only to his own conscience.

Ken Mingis is a senior journalism and political science major from Raleigh.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Individuals' actions no reflection on team

To the editor:

Though I myself am not a lacrosse player, I take much offense to *DTH* staff writers Scott Wharton and Stuart Tonkinson's handling of the story ("Three lacrosse players arrested for assault," *DTH*, Sept. 12) of the alleged Sept. 9 assault of a woman by three UNC lacrosse players. The story is in no way objective, but only serves to show the reporters' prejudice against lacrosse players as a group and their attempt to propagate this view in the University community.

First, the three men who allegedly committed the assault were not at an officially sponsored University lacrosse match, nor were they acting in the name of the UNC lacrosse team. They were acting as individuals. The fact they were students, lacrosse players, townspeople or whatever, is information that should have been

treated as no more important than their ages or where they live. These facts are irrelevant to the real story that a crime was allegedly committed, that charges were filed and a court date set.

Second, UNC lacrosse coach Willie Scroggs is not the parent or guardian of any of the players he coaches, and while he may see fit eventually to discipline his players for misconduct, it is absurd for these reporters to imply that he should.

Third, it is even more ludicrous for *DTH* reporters to ask Scroggs if he would discipline them and report his response, especially before a court of law hears all the facts and passes a judgment. In doing this, Wharton and Tonkinson obviously assumed the trio's guilt, never bothering even to attempt to treat them as individuals. Who knows? Only one of the three, if any, may eventually be proven

guilty, while the other two may be innocent.

And if all of this bias and assumption of guilt wasn't bad enough, I find it reprehensible that the reporters took the opportunity to drag out an almost two-year-old, unrelated incident against completely different individuals who happened to be lacrosse players and attempt to use it to assert that all lacrosse players are trouble-makers. It makes me wonder whether these reporters and the *DTH* would in the future use two unrelated incidents both involving blacks, women, American Indians, the members of certain clubs, fraternities, sororities, orders, professions, majors or

whatever, and imply that these people are "all alike."

I am sure that the majority of *DTH* staffers would not appreciate the implication that by allowing this story to be printed that all *DTH* staffers hold bigoted views, or that the facts alone are not enough to make a story newsworthy, and that sensationalism is necessary to make those facts into readable news. But the *DTH* editors and staff, by allowing this story to be written and printed in this form, especially on the front page, make me wonder if my implication isn't true.

Mike Davis
Chapel Hill

Lax reporting unfair

To the editor:

We are writing in regard to the article "Three lacrosse players arrested for assault," (*DTH*, Sept. 12). We feel that there has been a great injustice done to the lacrosse team and its reputation.

The reference to the May 1981 incident involving a lacrosse player in Four Corners Restaurant was irrelevant due to the fact that it occurred more than two years ago. In addition, many other athletes have been involved in this kind of incident with no front-page article, if any mention at all. There were at least three incidents this summer involving UNC athletes without the public's knowledge.

Because of this, we feel that the image of the lacrosse team has been degraded. Further, the last quote by Art Chansky — "I will say that the lacrosse team's record speaks for itself, both on and off the field" — is totally absurd! As for on the field, with a record in the last three years of two NCAA championships and a 26-game winning streak (the third-longest in NCAA history), the team's record does speak for itself!

Debbie Major
Sandy Taylor
Carrboro

Card-throwing a bad deal

To the editor:

The continuation of a Carolina football tradition, the half-time card section, has been jeopardized by the card-throwing incident during last week's game. It is obvious that thrown cards, especially the new laminated ones, are dangerous to other fans seated in the card section. As the card section is in a period of transition, with new cards being in use and with new boxes on the way, spectator cooperation is essential. Also, to en-

sure the safety of future spectators, security personnel will be requested to remove anyone seen throwing the large cards.

The card section is operated for the entertainment of the fans, and we would appreciate your cooperation in keeping it a part of the half-time festivities.

Chip Medlin
President, Sigma Phi Epsilon

Little promise of relief

How does North Carolina spell relief? R-A-I-N.



"THERE IS NO IMMINENT DANGER TO THE MARINES IN LEBANON"

ty still remain in effect. Watering lawns, shrubbery and gardens has been banned except between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. on Saturdays, and the washing of cars or outdoor areas with OWASA-provided water has also been forbidden.

Carolina students should not be surprised to see posters in the halls and bathrooms of dormitories. The Residence Hall Association has joined in Orange County's efforts for conservation and is trying to evoke student concern. The situation is a serious, not to mention arid, one.

Filling the hole

The subject of an increase in the Student Activity Fee is by no means a new one, but a dwindling treasury surplus, largely the result of losses from last spring's Carolina Concert for Children, has given the issue new life and an added urgency.

The Campus Governing Council Wednesday night approved a student referendum on a proposal to raise the Student Activity Fee by \$1.50 per semester. To approve the fee increase, 20 percent of the student body must cast ballots in the referendum and two-thirds of the students must vote for the increase. Recognizing the obstacle of galvanizing 4,100 students into action, the CGC had hoped to hold the vote in conjunction with the Sept. 22 balloting for homecoming queen, but it now appears as though the election will be Oct. 2. A similar referendum last spring only managed to draw 1,800 voters, and there's no promise that this new bid for an increase will be any more successful. Student apathy concerning the issue is formidable if inexcusable. While a vote for the fee increase would cost each student little, a failure to vote could cost many organizations a great deal.

Frank Bruni, a sophomore political science major from Avon, Conn., is an editorial writer for The Daily Tar Heel.