

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

LEILA DUNBAR, Associate Editor ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor

CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor

MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor

BILL RIEDY, News Editor

JOHN CONWAY, City Editor

KAREN FISHER, Features Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Sewergate saga

The recent firing of Environmental Protection Agency official Rita Lavelle has proven what many environmentalists and politicians have suspected for a long time: major clean-ups are needed in the EPA.

Problems there have grown into the perfect scandal: erased computer tapes, missing money and a president who refuses to release anything but edited information. Reporters fondly call it "Sewergate." There's even a Deep Throat of sorts: Hugh Kaufman, EPA hazardous waste investigator, has provided congressional committees with copies of EPA records.

So far, Congress has subpoenaed about 787,000 pieces of paper, the majority concerning "Superfund," a \$1.6 billion program that enables the government to clean up toxic waste dumps and make polluters pay. Just recently, EPA auditors accused the agency of mismanaging these funds, reporting they could not verify where more than \$50 million was spent.

Congressional leaders are worried about the \$50 million. But they're more worried about the reluctance of EPA officials and the Reagan administration to release agency reports. At first EPA administrator Anne Gorsuch Burford refused, on Reagan's orders, saying the papers were too "sensitive" for Congress.

Shortly afterward, two electric paper shredders appeared at the EPA offices where the "sensitive" papers were held. EPA officials tried to explain the shredders were to dispose of badly copied documents. But Congress didn't buy it. A compromise was finally reached on Friday, giving Congress edited versions of the documents.

Throughout the scandal, Reagan has stood behind Burford, saying her two-year record at the EPA has been spotless. Wyoming Republican Senator Alan K. Simpson added that the accusations have been nothing short of hysterical ramblings. "Most of Burford's critics are simply so pinched and shriven with bias and partisanship that they would flunk a saliva test," he wrote in *The Washington Post*.

However, if all the accusations prove false, Burford's record still has been anything but spotless. Congress now suspects that she frequently made "sweetheart deals" with polluters. They cite for example the time she met with representatives of the New Mexico's Thriftway Company who were seeking waivers from laws limiting the lead in gasoline. Burford drew the Senate aide escorting the group aside and told him she couldn't tell the representatives to break the law. But she hoped they got the message.

It's clear that any hysteria surrounding the EPA scandal serves only to emphasize problems within the agency. Reagan now should rid the EPA of its bureaucratic infighting by appointing a competent administrator. Only then can environmental policy again be administered effectively.

On my honor . . .

Two weeks ago, a student stole the questions to a Speech 61 examination from a teaching assistant's office. When Professor Robert Cox informed the class that the test had been stolen, the students were shocked and angry. Cox offered to give the exam, possibly giving the cheater an unfair advantage, but the 250 students in the class agreed that a new test should be administered. Instead, the students spent the hour discussing the merits of an honor system.

The incident exhibited the worst and the best of student honor; the worst, because one student thought so little of his classmates that he would steal an exam; the best in that the others could see the importance of the honor code by becoming a part of the honor process itself.

The honor code is more than the pledge everyone signs at the bottom of an exam. It is a heritage that every student takes part in when he enrolls at the University.

The honor code is not just an idealistic standard. It is there to protect students. High school teachers tell students that cheaters only hurt themselves, by finding they are unprepared for college.

But cheating in college hurts other students as well. At a university, students compete for grades they will be judged by in the job market.

The students in Cox's Speech 61 class should be commended for upholding the ideals of the honor code. By agreeing to go through the strains of preparing for another exam, they did not allow the offender to profit from the violation. Through this unfortunate incident, perhaps more students will begin to appreciate and respect the honor code laid down for their protection.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Desk: Frank Bruini, Charles Ellmaker and Jeff Hiday, writers; Jonathan Talcott, staff columnist

Assistant Managing Editors: Lisbeth Levine, Melissa Moore, Kelly Simmons and Eddie Wooten

Assistant News Editor: Stuart Tonkinson

Special Projects: Mark Ancona and Keith Bradsher

News: Cheryl Anderson, Pete Austin, Joseph Berryhill, Ashley Blackwelder, J. Bonasia, Hope Buffington, Paul Cocks, Tom Conlon, Ashley Dimmette, Katherine Farley, Pete Felkner, Bonnie Foust, Sherri Goodson, Julie Haack, Ivy Hillard, Bob Kimpleton, Kim Kleman, Rita Kostecke, Stuart Long, Gary Meek, Karen Moore, Kim Morrison, Rosemary Osborn, Heidi Owen, David Poole, Pamela Pressley, Sarah Raper, Mike O'Reilly, Lynsey Rollins, Cindi Ross, Lori Schantz, Sharon Sheridan, Don Solomon, Mark Stinnerford, Susan Sullivan, Keith Taylor, Lynda Thompson, Stuart Tonkinson, Evan Trulove, Lea Watson, Mickey Weaver, Scott Wharton and Jim Yardley. Liz Lucas, assistant University editor.

Sports: Frank Kennedy and Kurt Rosenberg, assistant sports editors. Paul Gardner, Dragan Mihailovich, Kathy Norcross, Robyn Norwood, Michael Persinger, John Pietri, Lew Price, S.L. Price, Al Steele and Tracy Young.

Features: Toni Carter, Michelle Christenbury, Tom Comacho, Cindy Haga, Kathy Hopper, Debbi Sykes, Mike Truell, Randy Walker, Clinton Weaver and Edith Wooten.

Arts: David Schmidt, assistant arts editor; John Altschuler, Steve Carr, Jim Clardy, Todd Davis, David McHugh, Jo Ellen Meekins, Mont Rogers, Karen Rosen, Gigi Sonner and D.F. Wilson.

Graphic Arts: Jamie Francis, Jeff Neuville, Zane Saunders, Scott Sharpe, Al Steele and Lori Thomas photographers.

Business: Rejeanne V. Caron, business manager; Linda A. Cooper, secretary/receptionist; Lisa Morrell and Anne Sink, bookkeepers; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; Julie Jones and Angie Wolfe, classifies.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Dee Dee Butler, Sharon Duckworth, Keith Lee, Terry Lee, Jeff McElhaney, Doug Robinson, Deana Setzer and Marla Zablock ad representatives.

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

Breaking up the factions

By SCOTT GRANOWSKI

"Like attracts like" is a basic law of human social activity. However, we recognize that this attraction is the source of much prejudice, fanaticism, unhealthy dependence, cowardice and lopsided development. Every culture has recognized this and taken steps to prevent enclaves of factions forming by encouraging a sense of community, a sense in which we are all responsible as "citizens of community." But we are different; we, as a university community, encourage factions and enclaves. It may be that "no man is an island," but he and his cohorts are.

To assess this University, we need only to look at its stated primary purpose; the University is mainly, although not exclusively, a research institution. This orientation profoundly affects every member of the University by demanding a focused concentration which leads to narrow-minded factions.

In our academic faculty members, we find the models of our university life. Let us trace the steps of their formation. They each have a desire to retain their positions. Also, they need recognition which is based on new insights. New insights must necessarily be "original contributions" to the corpus of human knowledge. These contributions are hindered by the breadth of knowledge (for lack of time). The community encourages and demands a breadth of knowledge and a vision of the interrelatedness of all knowledge. Therefore, they avoid the strenuous challenges of the true community and revert to factions: groups of "like attracting like." The point can be made more forcefully by a few questions. Is there any faculty club set up for broad communication? Do your teachers even know of, much less know, one another? With a system which begets factions, can the appearance of racism and chauvinism be surprising?

At most major universities, there is a traditional split; administrators think that academicians do not know the real world and academicians think that administrators border on a lower form of life. Separation builds prejudice. And we encourage it. When was the last time you saw a teacher and an administrator talking? Where can they talk? How can they even meet? It is clear that our university does not consider these two aspects of the facul-

ty — academic and administrative — as organic parts of the whole.

Graduate students are easily recognizable; they are the students who are either alone or with people who dress, look and act similar to themselves. Usually you will only have to listen to their conversation for a few minutes to know their area of study. Graduate students are quickly learning that research takes place independently of true community. Discussions in the Carolina Coffee Shop on the state of world affairs do not obtain higher degrees.

Unlike grad students, undergraduates have a semblance of community life. Often, you can sit all day eavesdropping and not learn what their majors are. This is fortunate because the purpose of an undergraduate education is intellectual socialization and for this reason the collegiate system was developed. But this brilliant idea — that of gathering together undergraduates, graduates and faculty members of diverse natures into a living community so as to develop as full and well-rounded individuals — is not popular here. It is both contrary to the goal of the University and the immediate goals of the undergraduates. We have social organizations, dormitories, clubs and sports for our sense of community and yet we never rise above factionalism.

Social organizations are community-oriented; they encourage communication between and within the sexes. Yet what type of communication is emphasized? Ask members of SWAD — a clear demonstration of what is meant by "social" — or ask people who have tried to set up eating clubs, hoping to institute a wider sense of community. Both groups have discovered that our social organizations do not encourage or foster a broader vision of life, but rather encourage us to fit in by learning how to get along in groups: "the insider's guide."

Dormitories, deceptively labeled residence halls, have successfully fulfilled the significance of their names — from *dormire*, to sleep. Beyond serving primarily as a place to sleep, they have social funds for kegs, mixers, televisions, etc. But how many dormitories invited faculty members in for discussions? How many are really gathered together from different walks of life? Are not dormitories excellent samples of the first law of social life "like attracts like"? Clubs follow the same laws, but this is their defined nature.

But we cannot deny that the Tar Heels give us a sense of community. In our times of victory and defeat, we

momentarily transcend the cultural barriers. However, this is only another example of "like attracts like" on a larger scale. We are all rooting for the same team; if you want to see a flare up of prejudice, throw a Virginia fan in the midst of Carolina fans during an intense match. Even teachers and preachers use this factionalism to integrate themselves into the community by commenting on our sports teams, or beer drinking, or sex.

Simply, we the members of this University, do not find institutional encouragement for the creative and dynamic exchange of diverse ideas easily available here. Parallel to racism and sexism, "like attracts like" is fostered and nurtured. We are encouraged to focus our attention and intellects to such an extent that we are left few common denominators for communication and sympathy. There is a need for a real collegiate system to develop our abilities to think, not merely from our standpoint, but from the standpoint of others as well. Communication is in danger, not because of the illiterate, but the extremely literate.

There are many solutions all of which need institutional aid, contrary to the opinion of idealists and cynics. Some examples of reforms are reorientation of some housing by restructuring into smaller units with a purposeful, rather than random mix. In such an environment, courses such as the capstones could be taught and discussed; a re-definition of eating places could take place in which we would get away from the massive buffets or Franklin St. expenses, into an eating community gathered for faculty and students; a Faculty club could be built; outside educational funds could be used for new concepts of co-op housing, etc. There are many such ideas.

As long as we continue in this tradition of stratified groups and independent research orientation, we will flourish as technicians and followers. We shall gather great amounts of knowledge. However, we will never be known for quality of thought, or for cosmopolitan, fully developed individuals. Even more, unless we, like doctors, treat the causes of racism and sexism and not the effects, we shall never have a just and healthy society, even if we have databanks of knowledge. But, of course, we shall continue to focus on research, because the *New York Times* rankings of universities cannot rank us according to any other qualities — as blacks and women know so well.

Scott Granowski is a senior classics major from Owatonna, Minn.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Don't fuel 'Carolina Snobbery'

To the editor:

In reference to the editor's note, ("Better red than . . ." *DTH*, Feb. 21), I am angered by the way you reinforced the stereotype other schools in the university system have of UNC. Contrary to what you would like us to believe, not everyone wants to come to Carolina and work for the *DTH*.

Somehow, the image of "Carolina Snobbery" has evolved over the years, and in one issue, your first I might add, you have alienated a large portion of this campus who do not feel that NCSU students are an inferior breed of students. While I do believe that *The Technician* picked a poor way to spoof UNC by picking on particular people, secure individuals are not offended by humorous portrayals of their own weaknesses and mistakes.

A healthy rivalry is a good thing. The State-Carolina rivalry has been a good one for many years. The schools have complementary programs which help to build such a rivalry. Don't get me wrong. I'm as much a Tar Heel fan as the next guy, but I feel that a rivalry should be confined to the athletic arena. Because the academic emphasis within these two schools is so different, there can be no comparisons made.

Cynthia Johnson
Carboro

Gays not laughing

Editor's note: This letter is a copy of that sent to the editor of *The Technician*.

To the editor:

As president of the Carolina Gay Association, I am writing to express my dismay at the insensitivity shown toward gay people in the Friday, Feb. 18 spoof of *The Daily Tar Heel*. Before enumerating my specific complaints about this spoof, I would like to explain what this letter is not a complaint about.

First of all, I am not expressing a "sour grapes" attitude toward NCSU's victory Saturday afternoon, nor at the idea of spoofing UNC and *The Daily Tar Heel*. I am very supportive of interschool rivalry and the reasonable humor associated with such rivalries (i.e. the football season spoof of *The Technician*). However, when such humor transcends being good-natured jibes at a school and singles out a specific minority group for repeated and vicious attacks, the boundaries of good taste have been trampled upon and can no longer be condoned.

Second, I am not categorically opposed to humor directed toward gays or any other minority groups for that matter. In fact, I myself have engaged in such humor and firmly believe that it should be judged in respect to good taste and a sense of pro-

portion. This spoof fails miserably on both counts.

Now that I have explained my basis for discussion, I would like to express exactly what it was about this spoof that drives me to write for redress.

First, the overwhelming proportion of anti-gay humor is unwarranted in light of the fact that there are many aspects of life at UNC and Chapel Hill that would serve equally as well as targets for a spoof, without degenerating into bad taste. In fact, the emphasis on homosexuality says more about the mentality of those who wrote the spoof than it expresses about those to whom it is directed.

Second, the tactic of using homosexuality as a means of degrading one's target is unacceptable, for it implies that gay people are somehow second class citizens whose only reason for existence is to be used as a joke against others. In truth, gays are not that; they are people just like you with their own hopes, desires, problems and dreams.

Last, the scandal-mongering of the Campus Y orgy article and the justification of violence implied in the *Queer Hunter* ad are the most serious lapses in this spoof. In fact, according to informed sources in the N.C. State gay community, at least one act of violence has been attempted or perpetuated due to this ad.

For these reasons, I feel that in the sense of fair play and responsible journalism, any further spoofs of UNC and *The Daily Tar Heel* should be conducted with greater sensitivity toward minorities in general and gay people in particular. Secondly, a written apology to the Carolina Gay Association and gay people in general is in order, for this form of humor has surpassed being merely a good-natured attack on UNC, and has become, rather, a vicious attack on gay people all over, including at NCSU.

Joseph E. Carter
CGA President

State fans obnoxious

To the editor:

I was one of the few unfortunate Carolina students who attended the State game Saturday in Raleigh, and what I saw during and after the game made me very glad to be a Tar Heel.

The language and actions by many of the State fans were very disgusting. Due to the fact that I was wearing a Carolina sweatshirt, I was a prime target for some very crude behavior. Besides being cussed out, I found myself and a few other Carolina fans being flashed while driving through a mass of State students.

I can understand the excitement the State students must have felt after beating Carolina for the first time since 1980, but

their behavior was low class. Some of our North Carolina politicians who believe Chapel Hill to be a zoo should have been on the State campus Saturday. I'm glad we Carolina students have enough respect for our basketball team not to lower ourselves to this level.

I'm aware that not all State students behaved in this manner, but those who did should realize that respect must be earned, and I believe that the Carolina basketball team and fans are respected by many opposing coaches, players and fans.

Keith Askew
Carboro

Anachronism

To the editor:

Regarding the review of Raleigh Little Theatre's "The Crucible" by Mont Rogers ("The Crucible" production problem-ridden," *DTH*, Feb. 9), whatever it was the people were talking about in "16th-century Massachusetts," it has little to do with what happens in this play set in the 17th century. For the play to effect the language of a prior century makes it astonishingly retroactive.

There is something to be said for history lessons. And editing.

John Adams
NCMH

Lacrosse lovers unite

To the editor:

In regard to the controversy surrounding your column titled "Women in Advertising," (*DTH*, Feb. 14), as far as we are concerned, you may print anything you like as long as the UNC Lacrosse team continues to run by our window every afternoon.

Terr Blackwood
Peggy Cleary
Aycock

Letters?

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor and contributions of columns for the editorial page.

Such contributions should be typed, triple-spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing.

Column writers should include their majors and hometowns; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.

Break the huddle

By RON RICCI

No, Professor Laurence Thomas, you didn't get things wrong in the end "Separate but equal?" (*DTH*, Feb. 22). You simply stated a problem that needed stating. I'd like to respond to your thoughts from a white perspective.

Huddling. Black huddling. I never thought of it as "huddling." But like a newborn baby gasping for its first breath of air, I now understand what it means.

I don't know if blacks really huddle to survive the effects of racism. I'm not black. It appears to me that blacks stay together like they do to protect themselves. Being white, I can't understand this.

Sure, many blacks are tired of always being the ones to take the first step when it comes to breaking the ice with whites. But it is exactly this attitude that creates black huddling. And I'm going to call this huddling dangerous. Why? Because it is.

No one said beating racism was going to be easy. I don't know if we'll ever beat it; it's like trying to swim against the ocean tide during a hurricane. If any ground is going to be broken, it's going to start with some kind of compromising — blacks will have to stop huddling and whites must agree to start understanding what it means to be black.

Well, I don't expect blacks and whites to start dancing together in the Pit tomorrow. What I'd like to expect is a little effort. Blacks must shed some of their protectionism and whites need to look at blacks for what they are — human beings with black skin.

Much of the problem between blacks and whites is that they don't know anything — or know very little — about each other. In particular, whites have made no effort to explore black culture and black history. I grew up in an all-white, middle-class neighborhood. I point to this upbringing as the main reason why I don't understand why blacks listen to different music than me; it's because we come from different heritages, different neighborhoods. It's the same reason Russian college students don't listen to Bruce Springsteen.

My black friends will always have black skin. Mine will remain white for the rest of my life. I accept this. What I can do, though, is take the step to understand why black people do the things they do. I do this in the same way I try to understand why the Chinese students in my dorm are celebrating their new year when mine began two months ago.

Let's do something radical. Let's start a Racial Awareness Week. Let's ask the UNC administration and the Student Government to require every professor on campus to donate one class period a semester to racism. Let's ask every class to spend 50 minutes talking about racism. We might learn something.

So, you're calling me an idealist. If there weren't idealists in the world, then there might not be any chance of cracking the ice on racism.

Thank you, Laurence Thomas, for explaining huddling to me. You explained something to me, now I'll try to understand it. I hope someone else does the same.

Ron Ricci is a second-year graduate student in journalism from Valhalla, N.Y.

