

The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

JILL GERBER, Editor
 AMY HAMILTON, Managing Editor
 SALLY PEARSALL, News Editor
 KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor
 KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor
 LAURIE DUNCAN, State and National Editor
 LEIGH ANN McDONALD, City Editor
 MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor
 FELISA NEURINGER, Business Editor
 HANNAH DRUM, Features Editor
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor
 CHARLOTTE CANNON, Photography Editor
 CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor

King's message outlasts holiday

About 200 marchers made their way down Franklin Street Monday, pledging

board opinion

to carry on racial unity in remembrance of the Rev. Martin Luther King. It is the visible action of a handful that presents a picture of Chapel Hill as a mecca of tolerance in a state notoriously resistant to change.

But this picture is distorted. Last June, a small band of Ku Klux Klan members marched down the same street, their white robes and pointed hats striking proof that archaic racial attitudes still exist in North Carolina.

Students who come to UNC from the areas of the state that foster segregation find themselves for the first time living with a member of another race or attending classes with a mixed racial make-up. The opportunities to interact with members of another race seem limitless.

Yet students choose to segregate themselves through housing and social activities. Racism at UNC may not be exhibited as overtly as in a KKK march, but it still exists. The only difference is that the perpetrators have become faceless:

■ Black sorority pledges singing outside Morrison Residence Hall last semester were showered with racial

slurs from dorm residents.
 ■ In October, an MBA student told business school authorities about racial slurs put in her memo file by her colleagues.

■ In December, two students in Joyner Residence Hall found the letters "KKK" scratched into their door.

Although many students have been participating in the Martin Luther King activities this week, others maintain the attitudes that fuel these incidents. While the racially aware become more so, the perpetrators of offensive acts remain ignorant.

The solution is for those wearing the square black and white pins labeling them "Martin Luther Kingers" to apply their ideology toward a tangible means of promoting racial awareness. A good example of this comes from a new group, RACIAL, which has proposed a forum between white and black Greek system members to discuss racial differences.

This week's celebrations may have left students feeling that race relations have come a long way on campus. But if racism is to be extinguished at UNC, King revelers cannot become so steeped in ideology that they lose sight of racism's subtler forms. Rather, they should show their commitment to his dream by wearing a badge of racial tolerance long after the holiday is over.

An insincere form of flattery

Soon after the rain begins, you duck into a SoHo art gallery to wait out the thundershower. At first glance, it seems the gallery is full of masterpieces by Pablo Picasso. Stunned, you move into the room for a closer look.

Something is wrong. Your perceptive eyes take in the slightly skewed lines, the too-flat colors, the two-dimensionality of the images. Art 32 has prepared you well to denounce these as forgeries. Furthermore, the signature on each is "Bidlo."

A man approaches you. "You find these interesting?" "Amusing," you say, "but they're not very good reproductions." "Ah, but they are mine, and distinctly mine." "Perhaps. How much for this one?" A distorted copy of Picasso's distorted portrait of Gertrude Stein.

He shrugs. "For you, \$15,000." You hope it stops raining soon.

The above is not a bad farce. Mike Bidlo, a New York artist, is exhibiting a series of Picasso reproductions entitled "Picasso's Women, 1901-71" at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York City.

Artists have always mimicked other artists' work as an exercise in technical skill, and there is demand for good, affordable reproductions of the masters.

Bidlo's copies are not perfect reproductions, nor does he intend them to be perfect. Or affordable. The faked

Picassos sell for \$3,000 to \$20,000 apiece.

His crime is not the copies themselves — as long as there are original paintings, there will be reproductions. The crime is his attempt to justify his work as ground-breaking art. "It's about progress in art," he said. "It's my own original contribution."

Passing off flawed reproductions as original artistic pieces is not progress in art. Altered reproductions can raise important questions about the nature of art, such as Marcel Duchamp's famous copy of the Mona Lisa — with a mustache. Bidlo's reproductions show no such originality or deliberate alteration — they are merely flawed.

More disturbing is the use of outrageous price tags to create the appearance of artistic validity. Talent, originality and the passage of time dictates the financial value of a work. Bidlo is working backward, using the inflated fees to create the illusion of his artistic importance.

Art is the original expression of thought and feeling through an artistic medium. Mere mimicry, while exhibiting technical prowess, is not enough to deserve the label "Art."

Bidlo claims he is "extending the boundaries of what's accepted as art." In this case, "extending the boundaries" is a deceptive euphemism for lowering the standards of contemporary art. — Brian McCuskey

Readers' Forum

Sometimes a syllabus is not enough

Louis Corrigan
 Staff Columnist

It was the first meeting of a Soviet literature class and, after some casually disjointed opening remarks, the professor confidently asserted his belief that the literature would stand on its own and provide us with many pleasurable rewards. Since the reading list included classic works by Nobel laureates, I could hardly disagree with his assessment. So I promptly dropped the class.

To my mind, this professor had abnegated his role. Indeed, he had either nothing to profess or no desire to profess what he knew. Learning involves more than the mere consumption of information to be communicated by dots on a computer sheet. Learning at its fullest requires a synthesis that can only develop when different perspectives have been examined, argued and judged. As a rule, such perspectives do not automatically appear in a student's mind even after a thorough reading of the texts. The generation of perspective and its sidekick, discussion, stand as the instructor's responsibility.

Just as a student's paper would fall short of expectations if it merely summarized a novel's plot and characters, so too does a professor's lecture fall short if it simply outlines the course reading. To warm our innards, spark our thoughts and reinforce our faith in a living god, each will wildly benefit from a thesis.

A thesis is an ideational prejudice, a perspective, a lens through which we see anew both the course and, possibly, ourselves. It is insight that, like the chemical compounds being applied to Michelangelo's frescoes in the Sistine Chapel, strips away the varnishes of age and even traditional interpretation so that we find color and light where previously there was only animal fat.

Many lower-level courses, especially those in science, mathematics, and foreign languages, concentrate more on learning crucial facts, formulas and functional approaches. Survey classes necessarily

follow a more historical/developmental line that inherently offers its own set of perspectives. Thus, in a class on macro-economic theory, we encounter the austere wisdom of the classical economists, the revolutionary revisionism of John Maynard Keynes, and, later, various answers to the shortcomings of Keynesianism.

Such survey classes serve as the bedrock of the University's system of required perspectives. The faculty boards that decide such matters believe, correctly, that through our exposure to Aristotle's "Nicomachean Ethics," a bit of scientific method in chem lab, and the post-colonial difficulties confronting African nations, we will be not Renaissance men and women, but at least better and maybe happier people with fuller, more mature visions of ourselves and the world than otherwise is likely.

The value found in this large scheme of perspectives is, however, sadly absent from many individual courses, especially in subjects with aesthetic content. In the best cases, the professor knows and enjoys the course material so much that the class becomes an exercise (through the examination of technical devices) in saying Wow! When we come across a wonderful line of poetry, a beautiful painting, or a great idea, we ooh and aah, i.e., say Wow! Though we students who have no intention of entering academia may be satisfied that saying Wow! is enough, a Wow! does not carry a classroom debate very far. A soliloquy of summary laced with a string of Wows! does not a thesis make.

One of the finest classes I have taken at UNC was a class on Shakespeare. We were to read 11 plays, including most of the better comedies and tragedies: your

basic survey of a major writer. Since everyone in the class possessed some familiarity with and love for Shakespeare, the class seemed ripe for a great orgy of oohing and aahing. Yet the professor, informed by Marxist theory but possessing deeply humanistic impulses, started us off with a social dissection of "King Lear."

We were not to read it as a play — we would do that later — so much as a social document revealing certain class conflicts raging during the Elizabethan period. In this context, Edmund's assertion of his right to be treated equally ("Now, gods, stand up for bastards.") comes across as less of a stock villain's justification and more of a legitimate claim for legitimacy that Shakespeare himself could not fully answer in this play, owing in part to his own position in society. With this social approach forever in our minds, we could still say Wow! — this professor is a master at the starry-eyed sigh of appreciation — but also, we could understand the plays as we never could have on our own.

Marxist, feminist and psychoanalytic perspectives are merely three of numerous widely debated critical approaches that have diverted attention from formalistic issues of style, technical innovation, and a work's derivation from an aesthetic tradition in favor of an emphasis on intellectual issues. And surely, once knowledge of formalistic matters is secure, such issues mark the beginning of serious debate and synthesis.

Which is not to say that students will or should accept any such perspectives or their concomitant world views. Human beings have a wonderful ability to resist new ideas. But resistance leads to evaluation and re-evaluation, the necessary ingredients of any education. It is certainly a significant experience when an undergraduate course can result in that.

Louis Corrigan is an Evening College student from Atlanta, Ga.

Think before you act

To the editor:
 It was particularly distressing to see the name of a UNC law professor heading a list of faculty condoning the actions of the anti-CIA protesters arrested last October ("Anti-CIA protesters deserve your support," Jan. 13). One can only hope that law students are not taught that it is proper to use physical force to prevent individuals from peacefully associating with representatives of a U.S. government agency.

Yet perhaps the most ominous aspect of the professors' letter is the way it reflects the mentality of Mario Savio and the student professors of the '60s: Act now, think later. The authors praise the students who blocked access to the CIA recruiters on campus, citing the realization of "the Chapel Hill community" that "action needs to be taken" to curb CIA activities overseas. Conspicuously absent, though, is any notion of what that action ought to be. Should the CIA be abolished entirely? Can it be reformed, and if so, in what ways? Would some other kind of entity better protect the rights of the citizens of the United States? The authors are silent, telling us only that "something must be done." The irony here is that this sort of blind reaction to a perceived injustice is exactly opposite to



New Ideas II: The Re-Plugging of Monkey Business.

the thoughtful, broad perspective a university education is supposed to provide.

Certainly UNC students, like all Americans, should keep a watchful eye on their government. But this hardly excuses the forceful occupation of university property which is owned by North Carolina taxpayers and operated for fee-paying students. Surely no one can advocate the cause of individual rights abroad by denying them at home.

PETER KLEIN
 Senior
 Economics

Stop back page book reports

To the editor:
 I guess the reason no one else has said anything about the Jan. 14, "Non Sequitur" on Ernest Hemingway yet is because no one else reads it.

This column could be taught in journalism classes as "How to Get People to Not to Read Your Articles 101." The author, a strong candidate for the Pulitzer Prize in alienating his audience, couldn't sound more pompous. He assumes everyone on campus knows everything about Hemingway and he

never gives any background or explanation on the novels to which he refers.

Many times last semester, the column (which obviously has other authors) was very humorous and enjoyable to read. If "Non Sequitur" at least dealt with something different once in a while, it would help. It should be more humorous and not a series of book reports. I would think the school newspaper would want its writers to write for the students and not for their personal gratification.

WILL HAIGHT
 Sophomore
 Biology/Economics

Take Hart, do as Simon says in '88

Steven Epstein
 Guest Writer

Welcome back, Gary! Your decision to get back in the race for the Democratic nomination was a truly good one.

First and foremost, your reentry brings to a focal point important issues that have hitherto been lost amid the confusion of the Democratic race. Those issues are, of course, honesty and integrity, two characteristics that Americans curiously enough find appealing in their presidents. Although it is true we should not make chastity or fidelity the centerpiece of a presidential campaign, the assumption that the honesty and integrity of a candidate should not factor heavily on the voter's preference — an assumption which you must be relying upon — is ridiculous. The lessons of Oliver North, Ivan Boesky, Michael Deaver and the like have painfully taught us that power and dishonesty are a very dangerous mix. Above all else, Americans want to elect a president in 1988 who personally evinces honesty and integrity and who spreads those wholesome qualities throughout an entire administration and an entire nation. On this score, can we do better than Gary Hart? You bet we can.

While Gary was dashing from city to city in 1984 extolling his virtues and "educating" the American people, one of the present Democratic contenders, U.S. Sen. Paul Simon, was taking the time to think about and address the provocative and all-too-often incompatible subjects of politics and morality. Simon devoted the

ninth of his 11 books, entitled "The Glass House," to the inevitable struggles he has had to face in casting thousands of votes during his years in the Illinois General Assembly and U.S. Congress. Among other things, Simon used this book as a forum to lash out at the modes of political leadership that accept public opinion as a god, that bow to the whims of political action committees and large special interest groups, and that appeal to people on the basis of fear and selfishness, rather than upon their finer instincts.

Gary's reentry into the race is good for the campaign also because of the renewed emphasis it has placed on ideas. He defended his reentry on the grounds that the other six candidates had failed to address his "new ideas." But military reform and "enlightened engagement," the two self-professed centerpieces of his "new" campaign, are dead issues. The Goldwater-Nunn Military Reform Act of 1986 accomplished most of the details on which his military reform proposals are based, and the very successful diplomacy between the United States and the Soviet Union, which has already led to three summits and the first-ever treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons, makes one question how desper-

ately this world needs his vision of enlightened engagement. Rather than worrying about these "new ideas," the American people want bold leadership to attack the genuine problems of today, such as: 1) major deficiencies in educational curricula, massive shortages of qualified teachers, and the unavailability of a college education for all Americans, 2) a political unwillingness to make real jobs available to the millions of people who are unemployed and to address the overall inefficiencies in the nation's welfare program, 3) the unavailability of long-term medical care for millions of elderly Americans who cannot afford medical insurance and who are not reached in their nursing homes and hospitals by Medicare, and 4) the whopping trade and federal budget deficits which fuel the fire of the previous three problems. Simon has placed these four subjects at the center of his hard-fought campaign — a campaign that is most notable for its lack of controversy, scandal and deceit.

Simon has not won 26 election contests by accident. His 35 years of politics on all levels of government have demonstrated his ability to move on the pressing problems of the day, and to move on them with honesty and integrity. So, Gary, thanks, but no thanks.

Steven Epstein, a first-year law student from Carrboro, is president of UNC Students for Simon.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Matt Bivens, Sharon Kechschull, Brian McCuskey and Jon Rust.

Editorial Assistants: Gary Greene, David Lagos and Laura Pearlman.

Layout: Cara Bonnett, Peter Lineberry, Joe McCall and Mandy Spence.

News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Laura Bennett, Lydian Bernhardt, Brenda Campbell, Jenny Cloninger, Staci Cox, Laura DiGiano, Carrie Dove, Lindsay Hayes, Kyle Hudson, Michael Jackson, Helen Jones, Susan Kaufman, Will Lingo, Barbara Linn, Lynne McClintock, Brian McCollum, Stephanie Marshall, Myrna Miller, Smithson Mills, Rebecca Nesbit, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Amy Powell, Beth Rhea, Becky Riddick, Guinevere Ross, Mandy Spence, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Jackie Williams and Amy Winslow. Mark Folk and Justin McGuire, senior writers. Angela Joines and Helle Nielsen, wire editors. Brian Long, assistant business editor.

Sports: Chris Spencer, assistant sports editor. James Surowiecki, senior writer. Robert D'Arruda, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Brendan Matthews, Patton McDowell, Jim Muse, Keith Parsons, Andy Podolsky and Langston Wertz.

Features: Laura Jenkins, Corin Ortlan, Leigh Pressley, Karen Stegman, Kathy Wilson and Julie Woods.

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

Photography: Christie Blom, Tony Deiffel, Janet Jarman, David Minton, Elizabeth Morrah and Julie Stovall.

Copy Editors: Karen Bell and Kaarin Tissue, assistant news editors. Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Bert Hackney, Lisa Lorentz and Sherry Miller.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Bill Cook and Greg Humphreys.

Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg and David Starnes.

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 Choreanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovinsky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary.

Distribution: Tucker Stevens, manager.

Delivery: David Econopoulou, 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.