

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

EDDIE WOOTEN, Managing Editor

CHARLES ELLMAKER, Associate Editor FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor

MICHAEL TOOLE, City Editor

KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor

KAREN FISHER, Features Editor

MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

MELISSA MOORE, News Editor

CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Please stop the rain

Last week, government officials announced that President Reagan's 1985 budget proposals would include increased funds for research on acid rain. Environmental groups complained that such an increase would mean little, for it would be academic in nature and do little to actually alleviate the problem or put restraints on the factories causing acid rain. Those supporting Reagan's position argue that the proposed research is a necessary prerequisite for the prudent allocation of future funds. While the urgency with which environmentalists view the problem and a need for its solution is certainly understandable, there are provisions both within the Reagan proposal and existing regulations on factories that seem to indicate the course Reagan is taking may be the best one.

In recent years, acid rain has escalated into one of this nation's most serious environmental threats. Studies have found the villain responsible for acid precipitation to be coal-fired power plants and factories that emit sulfur dioxide. Scientists have concluded that acid rain is not only killing freshwater life, especially in the Northeast and Canada, but may also be damaging forests and crops and presenting a threat to human health.

Recognizing the gravity of acid rain's believed effects, environment and health officials have been demanding that the government take action to reduce by at least 50 percent the sulfur emissions creating acid rain. These lobbies perceive the allocation of funds for "research" and the government's assertions that enough ambiguity still surrounds the problem of acid rain to merit further investigation as stalling tactics. Such a perspective seems overly pessimistic.

For instance, the \$55 million government officials say the president will request for research into acid rain marks a \$28 million increase over current funds allocated to the problem. Some of that \$55 million would be specifically designated to testing techniques for removing sulfur from smokestack emissions. Moreover, there do exist current rules requiring that sulfur emissions be limited in all new power plants. So at least until the best methods for cleaning up old plants are discovered, measures are being taken to ensure that the problem doesn't get too much worse in the immediate future.

Environmentalists and health officials are right on most accounts. Acid rain has indeed been unequivocally established as a hazard to the environment and, potentially, to human health. Something must be done about it. Yet immediate criticism of Reagan's budget proposals seems unjust. Cleaning up acid rain may prove to be a task requiring billions of federal dollars; it is a challenge that should be met from an informed position. Only if the president fails to launch a clean-up campaign subsequent to the proposed research will there be room — and plenty of it — for complaints.

An affordable thrill

When the Campus Governing Council meets tonight it will have the chance to continue a Chapel Hill tradition in a manner students can afford. At issue will be a Spring Concert and whether Student Government should again play a role in providing it. This year's proposed allocation, however, is but a small fraction of the money used by the CGC for past concerts and should be approved for its potential return — the student enjoyment of the student fees.

The idea of a spring concert has come full circle in Chapel Hill from the time it was first conceived as a sunny Saturday afternoon filled with beer and bands. Henderson Residence College lays claim to cultivating the Chapel Hill spring concert and to providing the basic concept that would later tempt thousands of dollars from the most stingy student government coffers. The modern-day concert began in 1979 when 18,000 students filled Kenan Stadium to hear Jimmy Buffett and since then has included performers ranging from the Beach Boys to the Producers.

But big-name bands meant big budgets and, in the long run, big budget problems. In 1980, because of conflicts with the CGC treasury laws, the concert's books took months to close. Two years later, the concert's funds were frozen because of late requisitions. Furthermore, the concerts seldom broke even, losing \$8,000 in 1980 and about \$60,000 last spring.

Perhaps it's with a sigh of relief, then, that the council this year receives a proposal for a modest \$1,500 allocation to HRC to provide what will probably be Chapel Hill's only spring concert. If handled correctly, the proposal should be treated as the new beginning for the concert concept, one that this time will not grow out of proportion. This year in the wake of last year's losses and without the shadow of another multi-thousand dollar show, students will be able to assess exactly how much more, if any, they want from an outdoor concert.

It's taken a long time to bring the concept of a Chapel Thrill back down to the budget realities. With approval tonight of the \$1,500 allocation, Student Government will take the first step in rebuilding the idea of a spring concert, in step with student wishes and in line with student funds.

The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant News Editor: Tracy Adams

Editorial Assistants: Bill Riedy and Gigi Sonner

Assistant Managing Editors: Joel Broadway, Amy Tanner and Heidi Zehnal

News Desk: Sallie Krawcheck, Sheryl Thomas and Clinton Weaver

News: Dick Anderson, Diana Bosniack, Richard Boyce, Keith Bradsher, Amy Branan, Lisa Brantley, Hope Buffington, Tom Conlon, Kathie Collins, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Lynn Davis, Dennis Dowdy, Chris Edwards, Kathy Farley, Steve Ferguson, Genie French, Heather Hay, Tracy Hilton, Andy Hodges, Jim Hoffman, Melissa Holland, Reggie Holley, Sue Kuhn, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelley, Janet Olson, Beth Ownley, Cindy Parker, Ben Perkowski, Sarah Raper, Cindi Ross, Liz Saylor, Katherine Schultz, Sharon Sheridan, Deborah Simpkins, Sally Smith, Mark Stinneford, Vance Trefethen, Chuck Wallington, Melanie Wells, Lynda Wolf, Rebekah Wright, Jim Yardley and Jim Zook. Wayne Thompson, assistant state and national editor.

Sports: Frank Kennedy, Michael Persinger and Kurt Rosenberg assistant sports editors. Glena Burress, Kimball Crossley, Pete Fields, John Hackney, Lonnie McCullough, Robyn Norwood, Julie Peters, Glenn Peterson, Lee Roberts, Mike Schoor, Scott Smith, Mike Waters, David Wells and Bob Young.

Features: Clarice Bickford, Lauren Brown, Tom Camacho, Toni Carter, Charles Gibbs, Tom Grey, Marymela Hall, Kathy Hopper, Charles Karnes, Jennifer Keller, Dianna Massie, Kathy Norcross, Amy Styers, Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: Ed Brackett, J. Bonasia, Steve Carr, Louis Corrigan, Ivy Hilliard, Ned Irvine, Jo Ellen Meekins, Steve Murray, Arlaine Rockey, David Sotolongo and Sheryl Thomas, assistant arts editor.

Photography: Larry Childress, Lori Heeman, Jeff Neuville, Susie Post and Lori Thomas. Zane Saunders, assistant photography editor.

Business: Anne Fulcher, business manager; Angela Booze and Tammy Martin, accounts receivable clerks; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; William Austin, assistant circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman and Julie Jones, classified advertising staff; Yvette Moxin, receptionist; Debbie McCurdy, secretary.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Laura Austin, Kevin Freidheim, Patricia Gorry, Terry Lee, Doug Robinson, Amy Schultz and Anneli Zeck, ad representatives.

An insider's view of South Africa

By BRENT CALLINICOS

I am writing in reply to the column "An atrocity named apartheid" (DTH, Jan. 25), written by Helene Calista Cooper. It is interesting to see just how much she knows about South Africa after having spent all of one vacation there. This, of course, in her opinion, apparently qualifies her as an authority on South African affairs, to such a degree that she refers to it as "The Union of South Africa," instead of "The Republic of South Africa." This is only a small error of 23 years.

Speaking from my limited experience (having been born and raised in South Africa for 17 years) I found quite a few exaggerations, if not untruths, in her article. She also seemed to be relying more on sensationalism than fact. For example, she says, "Bantus are relegated to diamond mines where their labor is hideously exploited." Surely it would have been less biased, and more truthful, to say: "Some Bantus work in diamond mines, for no more or less than the whites who hold the same jobs." Blacks are also not "relegated to homelands." These black areas asked the South African government to grant them independence. Since this has been done, the South African police are quite justified in sending illegal immigrants back across the border, much in the same way that the American police send illegal immigrants back across the Rio Grande. Surely there is a parallel here, except to those people so anti-South African that they refuse to recognize its existence.

Cooper also refers to the "majority of blacks (in South Africa), referred to as freedom fighters by some and terrorists by others." This is a lie. Most of

the terrorists are not from inside South Africa, but from the so-called "free" black countries that border South Africa. It is an insult to someone who knows something about South Africa to call these people "freedom fighters." They are funded and supplied by Russia and Cuba. What kind of "freedom" would South Africa be subjected to if they were to overthrow the government — a communist form?

Surely it is better to have the predominantly white government that South Africa presently has than a black communist one.

Talking about an insult to "human rights" — these "freedom fighters" do some very interesting things to black and white South Africans, both soldiers and civilians, that would have made Hitler proud. For example, some of them find it amusing to cook black villagers in clay baking ovens, if they won't help them in their struggle for "freedom." They also have a habit of setting bombs in strategically important places in South Africa, such as video arcades, high school rugby fields, and restaurants. I guess killing 12-year-olds playing Pac Man is all part of their liberation of South Africa. Had this type of thing been done here it would have been called terrorism. Is the fact that it was done in South Africa a reason to call it "fighting for freedom"? Apparently the author and many other Americans possess very visible double standards.

Cooper also referred to South Africa as a country ready to explode. It seems strange that someone said that about 1960. I wonder why no mushroom cloud

has been seen on the horizon for 24 years? Could it be that the blacks in South Africa are not as violently opposed to the government as Cooper tries to make out? Of course I'm not trying to dispute her obviously superior knowledge on the subject. I'm just trying to bend what she said back far enough for it to be true. She was also quite critical of America's support of South Africa. Perhaps it would be better to support one of South Africa's enemies, like Angola? It is, after all, filled with black "freedom fighters," as well as 30,000 Cuban soldiers, who are obviously trying to help them in their struggle for freedom; and not to further the aims of communism. Why would they do that?

There is also no need to look at the other countries of Africa as examples. Just because almost every other country in Africa that had been ruled by the whites and was taken over or given to blacks became despotic doesn't mean that South Africa would go the same way. Surely it is better to have the predominantly white government that South Africa presently has than a black communist one. Maybe Cooper should have done an article on her native homeland of Liberia, which has a very interesting form of "human rights," "democracy" and "succession rules." The present leader, *Sergeant Doe* (obviously well qualified for the job), gained control by executing the former cabinet and government leaders, after tying them to stakes on the beaches of Monrovia — a vivid example of Khomeini-style democracy. Is that the fate Cooper wishes for the South African leaders? In the future, please consider both sides of the story before writing a totally one-sided view.

Brent Callinicos is a freshman business major from Greensboro.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

FYI: What I did last fall

To the editor:

When I returned to campus for the spring semester and picked up the first copy of *The Daily Tar Heel*, I was dismayed to find the usual stories of "What I Did Over Christmas Break" where the writer usually gets stuck in some God-forsaken place (like the Bronx?), under some really terrible circumstances (like the snow?), but he or she barely makes it out and safely arrives back here to tell the tale. To me, that story, or any like it, is something to be related over a beer somewhere or with your tea in the afternoon, not on the editorial page of a university newspaper. I would like to share with you what I did last fall, which follows in somewhat the same pattern as those wonderful stories printed on the back of the newspaper we students eagerly await to read upon returning from break.

After last summer, I decided that I was going to take a semester out from school because I was disillusioned with the whole system, everything, including America and Americans. I went abroad to seek my fortune in Europe, hoping to find a better system and, maybe, figure out a little about myself. I traveled alone, by thumb and by train, through France and Spain, and by boat into Ireland and Morocco. Those who have traveled alone know it's not easy, especially for a woman. Eventually, I found a job picking grapes in southern France, and in the Loire valley near Cognac. My traveling took 10 weeks all together before I got tired and decided to return to America.

For those of you who tremble at the thought of getting caught on the freeway in the snow or getting stuck somewhere in some place you don't know, try some of these situations on for size. There you

are, trapped in a corner with people who speak a foreign language that you don't speak very well and they want your passport and God knows what else. You'd better do some fast talking, buddy, and in words they'll understand. Imagine just making it to the train station to see your train leave and you have to face the prospect of sleeping in the train station because you have no money and only a bit of whiskey to sustain you till dawn when the banks will open. Or how about getting in a car for a ride and the person behind the wheel wants to buy a pair of your underwear?

My trip, in itself, was very hard. It's probably the hardest thing I've ever done besides returning to school, which I am very glad I did. I learned many things about the world, people and myself. I learned to appreciate other cultures and languages. I now speak French much better. I learned that life is much harder than a lot of young people realize. I learned that keeping a cool head is one of the

keys to survival. But most of all, I learned to appreciate America and the people in it. I believe that we are the best and freest country, and Americans are friendly and good people. It is like Daniel Boorstin, author of Pulitzer prize-winning "The Americans; The Democratic Experience" and a librarian of Congress, states, "... the more I lived abroad, the more American I discovered I was."

So to all those out there who doubt themselves and are looking for a test: Travel alone in a foreign country. But a word of warning: It's really only for the strong hearted. To all those who shake with fear at the thought of putting their toes out in unfamiliar territory (New England?) and cling to their safety vessels (a car?) to get them through their terrible ordeals (a storm?): Why don't you try putting your foot into something totally foreign and learn how to survive on your own.

Kathleen M. White Carrboro

Support Springfest

To the editor:

This year, as in many years past, Henderson Residence College is sponsoring Springfest, an outdoor concert to be held on Connor beach in April. In past years, Springfest has attracted a few small bands from the area for a two-day event. Mike Beverly, program director, and the Springfest '84 committee want to bring it back to the quality concert it was in 1978 and 1979 when it attracted performers like Jimmy Buffett, Mike Cross and Brice Street. But any major campus event cannot be tackled alone. It needs support from all areas and student government if it is to be a success.

The Springfest '84 committee has contacts with bands like R.E.M., Squeeze (yes, they are back together) and various others. A concert of this size will work to

bring the whole campus together for a day of great music. And since it is possible that Springfest will be the only major concert on campus this spring, the Residence Hall Association has already come out with a \$500 donation to help in financing. In addition, Ehringhaus Residence College has made a \$200 contribution to help Springfest '84 get the bands we would like to see.

I would personally like to extend a challenge to the other areas to match our offer. Ehringhaus Residence College supports Springfest '84 and wants to see it be a concert that will have the whole campus ROCKIN'!

Shannon Friend, Governor Ehringhaus Residence College

On planning forums

To the editor:

In past years, the Residence Hall Association has entertained candidates for Student Body President, Residence Hall Association President, Carolina Athletic Association President and the *Daily Tar Heel* editor with the purpose of endorsing a candidate that best exemplifies the characteristics, goals and hopes of our organization. This year, however, RHA has decided to hold a forum and question the candidates, but not to endorse anyone. The reasons for this are quite valid.

RHA does not consider itself a political organization in a sense that we strive to

provide programs for our constituents. We feel that our duty is fulfilled by providing a forum in each residence area on campus. This allows every potential voter to hear and evaluate each candidate by his standards. As a result, you elect the person whom you feel will best represent your interests.

The Residence Hall Association encourages every person to attend a forum and demand that these candidates pay attention to the issues.

Mark Dalton, President Residence Hall Association

Get an education

To the editor:

Concerning the editorial "A Costly Symbol" in Tuesday's newspaper, there are several comments made that show very little consideration. I quote "a manned station in space would not so much stretch present technology as it would stretch the already overburdened federal budget." There are two things wrong with this statement: First is that a manned station would not require any new technology, the entire purpose of the station is to 'create' new technology that

cannot be created on the surface of the earth; Second is that even though this station may cost 8 billion, in the long run the technology that comes from this station would more than offset the initial investment. This space station would not only provide a boost for industry, it would also create many jobs. I am surprised that a journalist would attempt to write a commentary on a subject about which he obviously knows so very little.

J. Scott Edwards Grimes

Alienation, not apathy

By VANCE TREFETHEN

Another round of campus elections comes around and once again UNC students are castigated with labels like "apathetic" and "nobody cares." Jo Ellen Meekins said in a recent column, "I refuse to believe that 'nobody cares'" ("Elections are important," DTH, Jan. 26), and I wholeheartedly agree. But there must be some reason why UNC's student body refuses to vote or get enthused about campus elections. If not apathy, what is it?

Let me suggest that the problem with lack of student participation and involvement in student government lies not in the attitudes of the voters but in the attitudes of those political organizations and individuals seeking office. No one can deny that student government can be an important factor in shaping life on the UNC campus. Meekins said, "The winners of the upcoming elections have the potential to affect university policy and, thus, student life." And how does that come about? It happens because student government allocates over \$250,000 to the various campus organizations that are officially recognized by the University. Wouldn't it be logical and reasonable to expect the campus elections to discuss and debate the use of that money (beyond the question of whether or not one or two student fee increases should be passed for specific purposes)?

Why is it, then, that campus political organizations and political hopefuls debate things like social and political upheavals in Cuba, Russia, Brazil

in South Africa, and nuclear power? When was the last time the CGC sent troops or arms to support left-wing terror or right-wing repression in Central America? How much of our student fee money is going to support the racist policies of the South African government? Do you see what I'm getting at?

Central America, South Africa and dozens of other national and international issues deserve our attention and concern. But as much as I deplore racism, poverty, and repression, my votes for Student Body President and CGC representative will not be influenced in the least by what they think about American foreign policy. I'm going to vote on the basis of how they want to spend my student fees.

It may well be that there are organizations on this campus that shouldn't be funded any longer. It may also be that there are some that need more funding. There may be new groups that are trying to organize and need student fees to carry out activities that may be beneficial to all of us. We simply never find out because the candidates spend very little time talking specifically about what they're going to do with the \$250,000 that distinguishes them from the other candidates, or what specific organizations should get more, less, or no funding.

Call the student body "disillusioned," "disappointed," or "alienated," but please don't call us apathetic. When campus politics starts addressing the issues that concern students, I have a feeling that alienation will disappear.

Vance Trefethen, a sophomore economics major from Bangor, Maine, is a staff writer for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

