# The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate 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

#### Raising a ruckus

Late last month, a reporter from the Raleigh News and Observer was permitted to begin copying records showing the kinds of consulting work done by UNC system faculty for private businesses. That didn't last long. UNC President William C. Friday, acting on the advice of the state attorney general's office, halted public inspection of the records. The attorney general's office said the records are private, and that disclosure of them could carry a criminal penalty under state law.

What has ensued is an overblown dog fight between UNC and the N&O. And all that it has accomplished is a muddling of the original issue — whether the sought-after documents should be made public. The N&O, upset over the fact that it might miss out on a scoop, has created its own. For the past six days the newspaper has used its front page, the local news section front and the editorial pages to lambast President Friday for denying the public its right to know.

It all started when an N&O reporter followed up on a lead that indicated a potential conflict of interest; apparently the paper was investigating the possibility that UNC system professors are consulting for private firms and conducting research in the university paid for by those firms at the same time. Reporters were denied the "exclusive," though, when the records were declared private.

This flabbergasted the editors at the N&O, and shortly afterward they let the ink flow, most of it running on President Friday, who is obviously caught in the middle of a difficult situation. But his handling of the situation has been admirable. Friday told the N&O: "All through the years I've worked here, the attorney general has acted as the university's attorney. There's nothing unusual or different about what we did here."

At the same time, Friday told the N&O how its reporters could obtain the information they seek. He said he could supply the public with the names of those professors who had been involved in consulting work, general information about the companies employing the professor (not including the names) and the number of times each professor had been involved in consulting work. Raymond H. Dawson, UNC system vice president for academic affairs, then said that the N&O could learn for whom the faculty members at the 16 campuses worked by asking each of them.

N.C. law defines a personnel file as "any information gathered by the department" relating to, among other things, an employee's application, salary and promotions. Andrew A. Vanore Jr., senior deputy attorney general, said a faculty member's consultant status could affect promotion, thus committing such information to the employee's private personnel file. Vanore's reasoning is comparable to an argument that what style of clothing a professor wears could alter his appearance, possibly leading to a promotion.

Vanore's own boss, Attorney General Rufus Edmisten, has hinted that the original ruling may be overturned. He told the N&O that "when at all possible, I've always given rulings that tend toward opening up matters to the public. And in this case if it doesn't fragrantly violate some state law, then I'll want to open up those records." As of last night, Edmisten had still not ruled on the matter.

Not that anyone's listening. The matter has degenerated into a brawl between UNC and *The News and Observer*. Only when the dust settles will anyone remember to check whether the documents were made public.

#### Standard swindle

Eliminating waste was on the minds of Reaganomic budget cutters two years ago when they tightened the eligibility standards for Social Security disability benefits. They'd hoped to trim about \$2 billion from the program by canceling payments to those they believed didn't really need the money.

And since then, the new standards have saved the government some money — about \$9 million last year. But much of the \$9 million came from the pockets of those who really needed the benefits. Across the nation, 374,000 people had their benefits canceled; 10,000 in North Carolina.

The recipients were told they could appeal any cancellation of their payments and in North Carolina seven of every 10 who did were successful. But the appeals process takes months, and meanwhile the recipients have to make do without the much-needed money.

Last week Gov. Jim Hunt came to the rescue by ordering a moratorium placed on removing people from the list of benefactors. Except in cases of fraud, all disability benefits would be distributed until the recipient was proven able to work and no longer had need of the money. Hunt added that even without federal backing this state would provide its own standards, joining Arkansas, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania which have already imposed similar moratoriums.

Hunt's actions should show disabled North Carolinians that they have at least one less thing to worry about. And perhaps, just perhaps, the moratoriums nationwide will show the federal government that its time to review standards and find a way to save money that's a bit more humane than taking it from the disabled.

#### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Frank Bruni, Charles Ellmaker and Kelly Simmons
Assistant Managing Editors: Joel Broadway and Michael Toole

Assistant News Editor: Melissa Moore

News: Tracy Adams, Joseph Berryhill, Ashley Blackwelder, Keith Bradsher, Lisa Brantley, J. Bonasia, Hope Buffington, Tom Conlon, Kathie Collins, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Lynn Davis, Dennis Dowdy, Suzanne Evans, Kathy Farley, Genie French, Kim Gilley, Sherri Goodson, Marymelda Hall, Sue Kuhn, Liz Lucas, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelly, Ellen Orahood, Rosemary Osborne, Heidi Owen, Beth Ownley, Cindy Parker, Donna Pazdan, Frank Proctor, Linda Queen, Sarah Raper, Mary Alice Resch, Cindi Ross, Katherine Schultz, Sharon Sheridan, Deborah Simpkins, Jodi Smith, Sally Smith, Mark Stinneford, Carrie Szymeczek, Liz Saylor, Amy Tanner, Doug Tate, Vince Trefethen, Scott Wharton, Lynda Wolf, Rebekah Wright, Jim Zook, Kyle Marshall assistant state and national editor, and Stuart Tonkinson,

Sports: Frank Kennedy and Kurt Rosenberg, assistant sports editors. Glenna Burress, John Hackney, Lonnie McCullough, Robyn Norwood, Michael Persinger, Julie Peters, Lee Roberts and Mike Waters.

Features: Dawn Brazell, Clarice Bickford, Tom Camacho, Toni Carter, Margaret Claiborne, Karen Cotten, Cindy Dunlevy, Charles Gibbs, Tom Grey, Kathy Hopper, Dana Jackson, Charles Karnes, Joel Katzenstein, Diana Massie, Warren Miller, Kathy Norcross, Jane Osment, Clinton Weaver and Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: Steve Carr, Ivy Hilliard, Jo Ellen Meekins, Gigi Sonner and David Schmidt, assistant arts editor.

Graphic Arts: Jamie Francis, Lori Heeman, Ryke Longest, Jeff Neuville, Zane Saunders and

Lori Thomas, photographers.

Business: Anne Fulcher, interim business manager; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution

manager; Patti Pittman, classifieds.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Laura Austin, Melanie Eubanks, Kevin Freidheim, Patricia Gorry, Terry Lee, Doug Robinson and

Anneli Zeck ad representatives.

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

# A unity of spirit

By JOHN PATRICK GRACE

With the furor over the Soviet-downed KAL jetliner, the devastating summer drought and bloodshed in Lebanon, Nicaragua and El Salvador, there is no lack of vital issues to ponder and debate. The issue raised in Joel Katzenstein's column ("Strides toward religious unity," DTH, Aug 30) about the increasing harmony between campus religious organizations and the ensuing letters challenging his focus on just Christian and Jewish bodies is, however, as important a matter as any.

The greater openness and sharing among the bodies Katzenstein singled out is not limited to UNC or Chapel Hill. Rather, it mirrors a worldwide phenomenon that I have seen taking shape in Europe over the past two years, as well as elsewhere in the United States. I refer to nothing less than the healing of the wounded and divided Body of Christ in this world. After four centuries and more of bitter, often murderous quarreling and infighting, Christians of many denominations are getting caught up in a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation that is sweeping the planet.

At a conference in Strasbourg, France, that I attended to celebrate Pentecost 1982, Catholics and Protestants were actually saying things to each other like, "I'm Catholic; will you forgive me for the divisions in the Body of Christ?" and, "I'm Protestant; will you forgive me?"

More and more ecumenical ministries are developing, and people are starting to see that God is calling upon Christians to share the truths of the faith they have received and be open to receive other truths of doctrine and practice from fellow Christians of other traditions. This sharing is leading to a fusion of part of the Body that had previously been at odds with — sometimes openly scornful of — one another.

Two hundred evangelical Christians who took part in the recent Vancouver congress of the World Council of Churches signed a statement saying that the meeting "challenged stereotypes some of us have had" about the cooperative organization of Protestant, Eastern Orthodox and Anglican churches. Their letter praised "an overarching spiritual and biblical orientation" of the congress and said "the dimension of worship was both central and spiritually refreshing,"

Those, on either side, who have followed the years of suspicion and even hostility between evangelicals on the one hand and those who espouse the social-action approach of the World Council of Churches on the other

... Christians of many denominations are getting caught up in a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation that is sweeping the planet.

will appreciate the degree of reconciliation the evangelicals' letter represents.

As for the Jewish link to this unity in the making, there has of late been more and more emphasis by Christians of many different theological persuasions on the key role of Israel in God's plan for the world, and on the fact that by profession of faith in Jesus — the Jew who best exemplified the spirit of the Law (rather than the letter) — gentiles are grafted onto the vine of God's chosen people.

Saint Paul says this explicitly in telling the Christians at Ephesus that they, as gentiles, had once been excluded from membership among the Chosen People of Israel and were without hope and without God. However, he goes on to say, through the blood of Christ shed on the cross, the barrier between the Jews and gentiles has been broken down and the two have been made into one body and reconciled with God.

Daniel Ange, a French priest who is very impassioned in the cause of promoting this unity, during the Strasbourg congress dramatically asked pardon of "my Jewish brothers" for the way "we Christians have so disfigured the face of Jesus (through prejudice and strife) that you have not been able to recognize him as the Messiah."

Nonetheless — whether recognized by all or not — I believe it is Jesus himself, risen and reigning and acting through the power of the Holy Spirit, who is the animating force of this global effort to unite believers of both the Old and the New Covenants.

As for adherents of non-Christian and non-Jewish religions and cults, agnostics, atheists and the just plain indifferent, no, you are not excluded from this unity movement. But if indeed Jesus is the catalyst of it, and if indeed it is his spirit that is drawing people together, then it follows that gaining access to the mighty assembly that is gathering comes from acknowledging Jesus as Lord and submitting to the direction of the Holy Spirit. Katzenstein's omission of non-Christian and non-Jewish campus religious groups from his article may have been unintentional, but the omission was significant all the same.

John Patrick Grace, a native of Chicago, is a graduate student in Italian.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Why drag in old news?

To the editor:

Should the article titled "Three lacrosse players arrested for assault" (DTH, Sept. 12) be interpreted as a precedent of crime coverage by The Daily Tar Heel? Will any future story concerning a black, for example, also include all previous arrests of other blacks? Residents of Morrison Dorm? If a person who wears glasses is charged for a crime, will we again see a paragraph like the one we saw Monday noting that "the incident was not the first

involving near-sighted persons...?"

Dragging in a separate incident of a different nature that happened more than two years ago — and was linked only because it too involved another lacrosse player — was uncalled for. Yet in Mon-

Is this a subtle conspiracy to degrade, with sweeping generalizations, the individual members of the lacrosse team through guilt by association? Probably

day's paper it accounts for almost half the

### Yellow journalism

To the editor:

I have to question the logic and order of your "expose" on lacrosse players ("Three lacrosse players arrested for assault," DTH, Sept. 12). The tenuous connection between the newsworthy item of the arrests Friday morning and the so-called "background" solicited from unrelated persons (namely, Art Chansky), leads to confusion and wonderment.

Why devote nearly half of the article to a two-year-old incident which is neither newsworthy or relevant? Sure, there is a connection, but the "background" deserved only about one paragraph worth of ink. The portion concerning lacrosse team players' goings-on at Four Corners restaurant came off mostly as a filler of some type. Such careless treatment of news is unexpected coming from a publication as noteworthy as the *DTH*.

It appeared as if the *DTH* was making a point about lacrosse team members' antics. But if a point was made, it was that slipshod, yellow journalism is eye-catching—especially on the front page.

Robert G. Griffin Chapel Hill

#### Only barefoot

To the editor:

On Thursday, Sept. 8, the front page of the *DTH* featured a photograph of a female student, sitting outdoors, barefoot, reading. The caption read, "Barefoot and..."

This phrase was clearly intended to suggest the formula, "Keep 'em barefoot and pregnant," by which men have traditionally kept women "in their I personally find this caption offensive, and I am certain that women at UNC find it even more so. I believe that the *DTH* owes an apology to all women at UNC, and especially to Susan Epps, the student in the photo-

Allan Rubinoff Craige not. Probably closer to sloppy reporting.

All this wouldn't bother me — not as much, at least — if these three players already had been convicted. They've only been charged, though; the case stands as a civil complaint, to date based solely on the word of a woman and a number of police not determined by the reporter. One? Twenty? The fact that "the police" witnessed the incident (the alleged incident) provides no more comfort — police are human, too, and charges have been known to be dropped when police later have their cases destroyed by defense lawyers.

Perhaps the "Lacrosse Three" are guilty. But don't try to build the prosecution's case; just report the charges. Who knows? Maybe a lowly judge will drop the sentence already imposed (or at least forecasted) by The Daily Tar Heel.

I hear the court date is set for some time in October. Do the trio, your readership — and the rest of the lacrosse team — a favor, and give the accused their day in court. Report the verdict, guilty or not. Better yet, catch up on the verdicts of all the other people whose arrests have been reported in *The Daily Tar Heel* since school began. Could be some innocent people there, too.

In the meantime, tighten up the reporting of criminal charges. That or give us another crossword puzzle with the space.

> Dean Foust Carrboro

### Let's make an effort

To the editor:

One of the luxuries of living in a residence hall is being able to take full advantage of the utilities — electricity and water. At present, one of these utilities, water, has become even more of a luxury. Chapel Hill is in one of the driest periods in its history. OWASA has placed mandatory restrictions on the town of Chapel Hill to aid in water conservation, and as members of this community, all of us living in residence halls should strive to do our best in sharing this responsibility.

This is a plea to everyone who lives in a residence hall, whether it be Morrison, Old West or Cobb, to make a conscious effort to save water. In doing this, you can be an important part of the community effort to make Chapel Hill a more comfortable place for everyone. If we as students don't make a voluntary effort, who's to say that

we won't be placed under uncomfortable restrictions ourselves?

The ways to conserve water are numerous. When taking a shower, do not run the water continuously. Lather up with the water off. Limit yourself to one shower daily. Men should not run the water continuously when shaving. Use disposable plates and cups instead of utensils that have to be washed. Drink cold canned drinks so as not to use ice unnecessarily.

Do these things yourself and pay attention to your hallmates and suitemates. If they are unaware of the situation, remind them. Be a role model. When you see posters that say "Don't be a drip," pay attention to them.

Mark Dalton President Residence Hall Association

# West German worries

By ANDREA STUMPF

October. It is a month that deserves your attention. You probably think immediately of orange pumpkins, Carolina blue and cheers, ghosts and witches, falling leaves. But there is more to this October, and it is neither for comfort nor complacency.

October promises to see blood in the streets of West Germany. Scheduled demonstrations, predicted by most to result in public turmoil, are on the agenda. The demonstrations in West Germany up to this point will have been only the playful beginning of a public show of emotion. Unless negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva bring concrete results soon, the tensions in West Germany will be pushed to the point of eruption.

Most West Germans are not optimistic about the progress in Geneva. Already by last summer, the majority of West Germans polled doubted the seriousness of the United States and of the Soviet Union in negotiations — and by now this doubt is heightened by the rift in relations resulting from the Korean airline incident.

No one can blame West Germans for being skeptical. Yet, this skepticism puts the whole schedule of U.S. nuclear deployment in serious jeopardy. Last spring, when Chancellor Helmut Kohl won the election, he was chosen on a ticket that called for double-track negotiations in Geneva: The acceptance of deployment of Pershing missiles on German soil would require that, as a premise, serious negotiations working toward arms reductions would take place.

This proposal — deployment coupled with negotiations — was acceptable last spring to the majority of West Germans, but since then there has been concern that the promise of negotiations has been abridged by the United States. Consequently, some Germans feel that the promise to deploy should not be upheld either.



As the time for deployment nears, the number of West Germans calling for postponed deployment and extended negotiations is increasing. The latest poll of this past summer indicated that 75 percent of the West Germans wanted to postpone nuclear deployment, and more significantly, that included 62 percent of the ruling party, the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Socialist Union. Most West Germans are only willing to allow deployment if there is no other way to maintain a balance between the superpowers. They realize that chances are very slim that the Pershing missile, once deployed, will ever be removed - except in the event of an ac-

One problem with nuclear deployment is that there are no in-betweens. You either do or you don't. The nature of this issue is forcing West Germans to one extreme or to the other, and the polarization is cramping the West German ability to deal with the issue.

Polarization of public opinion in West Germany is further heightened by the emotional depth required to take a stance. And taking a stance means choosing the best means of survival — West German survival, NATO survival, Soviet survival, human survival. It is that basic.

The emotion in play is fear, and it becomes a matter of deciding which fear is greater: fear of the Russians, which calls for strong deterrence, or fear of nuclear potential, which calls for no more and preferably fewer arms. The pendulum of public opinion is swinging to the latter—and the need to halt deployment is growing in urgency.

If predictions for this fall are correct, the peaceful demonstrations will snap into violence if they are unheard or passed over. No one can know exactly how bad the scene will be, but the ominous fear of imminent destruction hangs over every West German's head.

There will be no referendum to allow the voice of the majority to determine government actions. Without this as a recourse, West Germans must choose an alternative means of ensuring just representation, and they will be prepared to go to great lengths — for some this could mean death — in this demand. The democratic process is being put to the test in West Germany, for politicians are not moving in step with the majority of public

opinion. If politicians do not represent the will of the people, are they part of a functioning democracy?

In a worst-case scenario, it is conceivable that Kohl — with about two-thirds of his own party and three-quarters of his total population advocating postponed deployment; with people of all ages, all classes, all parties, all creeds demonstrating against deployment; with blood and destruction littering cities and countryside in the name of peace — it is conceivable that Kohl may be forced to appear before NATO and say, "Look, guys, I'm sorry, but I can't do this to my people. We can't follow through on the deal and deploy your Pershings."

It does not matter which side of the issue you are on, for you to need to be concerned about the tenor of events in West Germany and the possible breakdown of the present NATO alliance. It is an irony that, in this year when we are celebrating positive interaction through 300 years of German-American emigration, we are also facing a serious and potentially detrimental turning point in our mutual relations. The gravest U.S. failure at the present time is an inability to recognize the chasm in understanding between the two countries.

As agents of deployment, the United States must confront the volatility of this issue in its true perspective. As it is, the physical distance from West Germany is great, and we are not in as great a danger of being the first nuclear battleground. The psychological distance is even greater, and we do not know the West German fear that for them the past has instilled, the present must impose and the future possibilities tend to infer. But we must be willing and striving to draw these differences into our consciousness; we cannot afford to determine nuclear stability by adhering to our perspective alone and ignoring all others. Cohesion among allies must be based on consensus among allies.

While the West Germans tear their social fabric to shreds, we are wrong to assume our security is assured. Far from it.

Andrea Stumpf is a German and international studies major from Chapel Hill.