# The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

IILL GERBER, Editor DEIRDRE FALLON, Managing Editor SALLY PEARSALL, News Editor JEAN LUTES, University Editor DONNA LEINWAND, State and National Editor JEANNIE FARIS, City Editor JAMES SUROWIECKI, Sports Editor FELISA NEURINGER, Business Editor

JULIE BRASWELL, Features Editor

ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor

CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor

CHARLOTTE CANNON, Photography Editor

Editor's note: This is the fourth part in a weekly series. Paul Brandes is a professor of speech communication.

Daily Tar Heel: What do you think the

chancellor's role should be? Paul Brandes: He's got to be a leader. We haven't had a chancellor for a leader since Frank Porter Graham. The students want to study leadership and they want to become leaders. A leader looks over the hill. Our chancellors have looked behind it. We haven't had a new program, a new school, an exciting new curriculum; we haven't had an exciting new challenge to our students since I came here in 1966. What the chancellor's got to provide for the school is a role model of leadership and for the faculty a role model of leadership in scholarship.

We haven't had scholars as chancellors ... (recently because UNC-system President William) Friday appointed caretakers. They were fine men. They've all been very nice to me, personally, but they were caretakers. Are we going to get another caretaker?

DTH: What qualities do you think the chancellor should have?

Brandes: In the first place, he's got to like students and be outgoing with them. He's got to be seen. He's not supposed to be a fund-raiser. We can hire vice chancellors to be fund-raisers. He's supposed to be at student functions; he's supposed to be where he can associate with the student body. He's got to make them (the students) feel as if he's a part of this university. He's also got to let the faculty feel that he is a leader in scholarship. The Association of Retired Professors said the chancellor has got to be a scholar. You can be a scholar and be an outgoing person

Who's Next?

UNC needs more than a caretaker

Readers' Forum

The Chancellor Interviews

we have plenty of them. But what we're likely to get is another guy who plays the game and everybody on the inside wants to keep his job. So they've always had chancellors who were appointed from the inside so everybody gets to stay in his little corner and nobody upsets the apple cart. He ought to be an outgoing model of visible leadership.

DTH: How much impact can the chancellor have on shaping the direction the University takes?

Brandes: How much impact can Nancy Reagan have on the United States? A great deal. How much does she have? Almost none. This drug program's just a front. He (the chancellor) has all the potential that he could possibly have. But . . . (the past four chancellors) have not taken the role. Friday knew they wouldn't. He didn't want them to.

DTH: What direction should the University take?

Brandes: We don't have our own people as faculty members, but whom do we hire for our administrators? They're all inside boys. They can all continue to slap each other on the back. That's very unhealthy. They don't have any new ideas because they haven't been anywhere else. We certainly ought to start creating some course work which deals with the peace problem in the United States. We let a school like the University of California at Santa Barbara have a special course at which Vietnam veterans are invited to lecture the students. We have an oppor-

tunity to do that sort of creative teaching.

They put this new curriculum in, but it wasn't a new curriculum at all. All they did was take away from the students what had been won in the revolution. English got its required courses back, history got its required courses back. They put it under a disguise that it's going to be something different. All it was was that the old powers moved back in because the students let them do it and the faculty let them do

We've done little in developing interdisciplinary curriculums. When I first came in that was all the thing. Now we don't want an inter-disciplinary curriculum. What we want is to keep the traditional departments. But the world is no longer traditional. We need a new broom. People who've been in the administration ought to get out of the administration.

The world is changing, and we're not. I think the faculty and the students are. Maybe I'm biased, but in our own department we're just hiring a new person ... we wouldn't think of hiring one of our own graduates.

DTH: What do you see as the new chancellor's immediate priorities?

Brandes: The first thing he ought to do is get to know the faculty and the students, be visible, open up some channels to new ideas. He's got to turn the whole fruit basket upside down. If a football coach is hired by a school, what does he do? They all don't have to come from the outside, but he certainly ought to pick some people with some new ideas.

Paul Brandes was interviewed by editorial writer Jim Greenhill.

THERE! THAT SHOULD

BALANCE THINGS NICELY, AND EASE SOME OF THAT ANXIETY OF YOURS.

### How to buy college admission

Ostensibly, the Scholastic Aptitude Test is one way of distinguishing the academic

#### board opinion

potential between college applicants, but the proliferation of SAT study courses has diminished whatever value the test once had.

The only true indicator of an applicant's scholastic potential is his high school record. An outstanding SAT score is either an indicator of innate intelligence, or of parents who willingly paid for Junior to attend a study course.

Academicians routinely criticize the test. Numerous studies indicate that the SAT may have a racial and socioeconomic bias. While this assertion is debatable, students who attend a review course will outperform students of equal ability who do not take the course. But only one prerequisite exists for taking a course — the money to pay for it.

Before study courses became popular, a student's test score was indicative of his general knowledge. But a student who uses the information that a Kaplan-like course crams into him is merely regurgitating soon-to-beforgotten trivia.

While most of the courses are for the SAT, graduate and professional

school hopefuls study for the GRE, LSAT, GMAT, MCAT and every "T" imaginable. High school students prepare for advanced placement tests. As more and more students cram for them, they become mere trivial pursuits, no longer tests of academic achievement and potential.

Officials from the College Board, which produces the SAT, claim the study courses only marginally improve a student's score. The company claims no one can study for the test. But the Educational Testing Service, which administers the SAT, is entering the lucrative test-prepping market.

In the great American tradition, the Stanley Kaplan Educational Centers, the Princeton Review and similar companies are answering the demand for a product. High school students are among the most paranoid and anxious of teen-agers until the college of their choice accepts them. As more students apply to elite institutions, more students will look to Kaplan-like courses to improve their SAT scores.

As a measure of academic potential, the test is severely flawed. When the only students who can prepare for the SAT are those who can afford to take a review course, colleges such as UNC should be wary of placing too much importance on it.

## There's no place like it

Something was wrong at the Clemson game on Saturday.

Instead of drifting in at halftime, most people were in their seats by the opening kickoff. Instead of wandering around the stadium, looking for friends and adjusting their sunglasses, most people stayed in their seats and actually watched the game. Instead of talking to their dates and sipping fortified Sprite, most people stood on their seats and spilled their precious beverage in excitement.

No wonder UNC lost. The team gave up the homefield advantage by playing in a stadium they didn't recognize. Insiders heard Mark Maye mutter, "I don't think we're in Kenan

anymore, Toto."

UNC fans have been criticized for being apathetic and unspirited. Compared to the insanity in Duke's Cameron Indoor Stadium or Clemson's Death Valley, the Smith Center and Kenan Stadium usually resemble tombs more than athletic arenas. On Saturday, UNC fans arrived at the game with something to prove.

Maybe it was the live television coverage. Maybe it was the excitement of the national spirit contest. Maybe it was the realization that yes, orange is ugly. For whatever reason, the frenzied noisemaking in the student section was reminiscent of basketball back in Carmichael games Auditorium.

The noise was so loud that the

referees actually had to warn the crowd to cease fire, so the Clemson players could hear their signals. Referees warning a Carolina football crowd to make less noise? It had all the makings of a really good "Twilight Zone" episode. One flushed fan screamed the sentiments of many, "Oooooh, does the noisy-woisy hurt your little earywearies?"

Not all the spirit was constructive. There were some evil-doers lurking in the card section. Flying boomerangs of colored cardboard swooped down on the crowd, spilling drinks and nearly decapitating innocent fans. This was not a good thing.

Nor was some people's inability to wrestle with Jim Beam, Jack Daniels and their relations. In the hands of a person who has overdosed on spirit juice, a pompon can be a deadly weapon, whipping back into the faces of irritated spectators. The lesson: Don't drink and cheer.

Aside from these indiscretions, the enthusiasm of the crowd was terrific. Fans watching the game on television at home could hear every nuance of "Peel your banana and, unh, take a bite." UNC fans should prove their spirit was not just a fluke by bringing the same level of bacchanalic revelry to the Duke game on Nov. 21. Then, Mark Maye and company will know where they're playing — at home. — **Brian McCuskey** 

### Non-smokers want it all

To the editor:

I am writing in response to Mark Powell's Nov. 9 letter, "Reduce the number of smoking lounges." Powell suggests that it is illogical to have a full 50 percent of the general lounges in Davis Library set aside for smokers when only 29.8 percent of the population smokes. He also seems to have a paranoid vision that the University is unjustifiably catering to smokers since, as he says, "The most scenic view on campus (is) monopolized by smokers.'

What Powell either neglected or forgot to recognize in his argument is that Davis Library has over 422,000 square feet of floor space. Of this, there are six smoking lounges of approximately 500 square feet each. So, in effect, there are only about 3,000 square feet of designated smoking areas as opposed to 419,000 square feet of the library reserved for nonsmokers. Thus, it is easy to see that the smoking lounges constitute less than 0.8 percent of the total library floor space.

I am not trying to claim that since 29.8 percent of the American population smokes, smokers should be permitted to smoke in a directly proportional amount of Davis Library. On the contrary, I am quite content with my share of the presently designated 0.8 percent. All that I ask of Powell is that he recognize that there is room enough for smokers and non-smokers alike in Davis, and that there is no justifiable or logical reason to reduce the present number of smoking lounges.

And as to the assertion that smokers have a more scenic view of the campus, there is an obvious option that Powell might want to pursue. I am sure that no one would object if the lounges on alternate floors were switched so that there is

an equal proportion of smoking and non-smoking lounges on either side of the building. JOHN NAGEL

is for dopes

Freshman Philosophy Marijuana

To the editor:

In the past week, a Supreme Court nominee and two presidential candidates have revealed that they used marijuana in their more youthful years. Jill Gerber's editorial of Nov. 9, "The choice of a generation," correctly suggested that this flaw should not by itself disqualify anyone from holding public office. However, it should be noted that though many consider "recreational use" of the drug to be "no worse on a moral scale than going 65 mph in a 55 zone," use of the drug should not be condoned by any standards.

Perhaps no moral judgments should be passed concerning the use of marijuana, but whether or not its use is sinful, there is (contrary to popular belief) some danger in smoking

pot. I'm sure that there are few people on this campus who have not heard of the extreme consequences of blindness and paralysis that can result from extended use of marijuana, but of course, the occasional user is not likely to suffer such terrible consequences.

However, even the occasional user can never be quite sure of what is in the pot he smokes, unless he grows it himself. Therefore, I would venture to suggest that the risk an occasional user takes is slightly greater than the risk taken by "the businessman who fixes a scotch and soda after work every day."

As far as presidential candidates Albert Gore Jr. and Bruce Babbitt are concerned, I agree completely that they should not be disqualified from the 1988 race based solely on their past indiscretions. Marijuana was used extensively in Vietnam, where Gore confessed to having used it, and its use over there may well have helped some soldiers maintain their sanity. And whether or not one condones marijuana use, Gerber is absolutely correct that no candidate should apologize for use of the drug; after all,

mistakes are the best vehicle for learning. Now, Judge Douglas Gins-

burg was sort of a special case.

He was a victim of many

circumstances, foremost of which was the Reagan administration's firm stance against drug use. The administration could not very well support a nominee who had used drugs, especially in his professional years, without reversing all the efforts it has made to eliminate drugs from the schools. Thus, even though he should not be judged in this issue alone, there

be judged.

It is certainly true that as more members of the baby boom generation come into power, the use of marijuana will come to be much more easily overlooked, and more pertinent issues will determine an official's fate. Its use will ultimately decline in the future because the dangers that go with it will be realized, not because certain people consider it morally objectionable.

is little else on which he can

DAVID McCOLLUM Sophomore Chemistry

### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Eric Fullagar, Jim Greenhill, Brian McCuskey and Jon Rust. Editorial Assistants: Julia Coon and Sharon Kebschull

Assistant Managing Editors: Cara Bonnett, Melissa Daniels, Peter Lineberry, Joe McCall and Mandy Spence. News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Lydian Bernhardt, Matt Bivens, Brenda Campbell, Staci Cox, Sandy Dimsdale, Carrie Dove, Mark Folk, Alissa Grice, Lindsay Hayes, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Susan Kauffman, Sharon Kebschull, Hunter Lambeth, Will Lingo, Barbara Linn, Mitra Lotfi, Lynne McClintock, Brian McCollum, Justin McGuire, Stephanie Marshall, Laurie Martin, Myrna Miller, Smithson Mills, Lee Ann Necessary, Rebecca Nesbit, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Amy Powell, Charla Price, Becky Riddick, Andrea Shaw, Sheila Simmons, Mandy Spence, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Nicki Weisensee, Amy Winslow and Lisa Wynne. Angela Joines and Helle Nielsen, wire editors. Laurie Duncan, assistant state and national editor. Brian Long, assistant business editor. Leigh Ann

McDonald, assistant city editor. Kimberly Edens and Kristen Gardner, assistant university editors. Sports: Mike Berardino, Patton McDowell and Chris Spencer, assistant sports editors. Robert D'Arruda, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Brendan Mathews, Jim Muse, Andy Podolsky, and Langston Wertz. Features: Hannah Drum, Carole Ferguson, Laura Jenkins, Corin Ortlam, Lynn Phillips, Leigh Pressley, Karen Stegman,

Arts: James Burrus, Scott Cowen, Stephanie Dean, Kim Donehower, David Hester, Julie Olson, Beth Rhea, Kelly Rhodes, Alston Russell and Richard Smith.

Photography: Tony Deifell, Gretchen Hock, David Minton, Julie Stovall and Brian Whittier. Copy Editors: Karen Bell, Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Laurie Duncan, Bert Hackney,

Lisa Lorentz, Sherry Miller, Rachel Stiffler and Kaarin Tisue, assistant news editor. Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Bill Cokas and Greg Humphreys. Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Peggy Smith, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager: Michael Benfield, Lisa Chorebanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhaney, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwrick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovensky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary

Distribution Tucker Stevens, manager. Delivery Leon Morton, manager; Billy Owens, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon,

production assistants. Printing: The Chapel Hill Newspaper

## CGLA is not only a social organization

I am writing in response to Tanya Person's Nov. 4 letter, "BSM is not another CGLA." I am appalled by her insensitivity. Particularly unnerving is that Person misrepresented the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association, and I feel it necessary to clear up a few of the letter's errors.

She referred to the CGLA as "a social group trying to make a point." I will concede that some of our activities are social. However, the vast majority of them are not, and therefore we do not consider ourselves a social organization. We hold monthly board meetings, as well as general membership meetings, both of which deal with business. We maintain an office in the Student Union where we coordinate our activities; keep a small resource library; serve as a liaison/referral service for members of the University community, lesbian and gay students and organizations; and collect and distribute AIDS informational materials.

Person posed two questions: "What kind of services does the CGLA provide that it needs as much money as the BSM?" and

"Do CGLA services (if there are any) benefit the general student body?"

First, we do not need as much money to operate as the Black Student Movement - nor have we ever asked for such an amount. All that information is public. I invite Person, and anyone else, to research it at leisure, but please don't spread

misinformation. A small amount of research would have answered her second question. The CGLA publicizes all of its important events in the DTH personals and/or Campus Calendar, we also use posters and fliers to advertise our functions. To mention some of our services: We send speakers (upon request) to classrooms to discuss lesbian/gay issues with students, and we talk with about 2,000 students each year in this way; we publish a newsletter, Lambda; we sponsor Lesbian and Gay Awareness Week in the spring, when we host speakers, panel discussions and show educational films; and we participate in Human Rights Week and AIDS Awareness Week. We also try to serve as a support group for gay and lesbian

These services are geared to provide educational opportunities about lesbians and gays, and issues particular to our community. We recognize that gays and lesbians make up a persecuted minority group on the campus and in this society. This is exemplified by anti-homosexual violence and attitudes. We use education to combat the oppression and hatred that is leveled against us. Is education not what benefits a university community?

Person also said that those students circulating the petititon in an attempt to defund the CGLA have a right to their opinions, and CGLA supporters should not criticize them. I would like to point out that these homophobic individuals, of their own volition, initiated activities hostile to CGLA and to lesbians and gays.

We have never in any way caused harm or posed any threat — unless one considers the stimulation of one's mind or the freedom of others a danger.

> DON SUGGS Junior English/Psychology