

# The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor    JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor    JOHN CONWAY, City Editor  
CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor    KAREN FISHER, Features Editor  
MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor    JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
BILL RIEDY, News Editor    CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

## On the air

An idea on campus to exploit Village Cable's University-access channel, at present a blank channel silent except for Muzak, is so obvious that until now the opportunity has been virtually ignored. It has taken the impressive initiative of two UNC students, John Wilson and Walt Boyle, to spark interest in putting the channel to good use. Their plan to air student-produced programs, perhaps in the *P.M. Magazine* genre, deserves commendation and support of all students.

According to John Bittner, chairman of the department of radio, television and motion pictures, the concept of student-run TV is being talked about at universities all over the nation. But a successful *P.M. Magazine* format would be a national first. At Duke, a campus cable system already in operation is the largest in the world. Students there air programs 15 to 20 hours per week, offering broadcasts of football games, nightly newscasts and talk shows.

There are endless possibilities for expanding, developing and enhancing broadcasts of University events. Wilson and Boyle suggest that only a few hours of programming be shown per week at first, but even in that time special University goings-on could be covered like never before: rallies in the Pit, poetry readings, plays, concerts and speeches.

The only limit is imagination and, of course, money. Already, Wilson and Boyle are trying to obtain money from the Carolina Union and the Campus Governing Council for electronic news-gathering equipment such as portable videotape cameras and recorders, along with editing equipment. After setting up, the student broadcasters would have to provide and maintain quality programming, but it should not prove difficult to pull an attentive audience. The only hurdle is that programming would not be available to all UNC students; cable-TV hook-ups will not be installed in residence hall rooms for at least another couple of years. But off-campus students and Granville residents could still tune in, and students living in residence halls could watch the shows on videotape in the Union.

Important now is a display of support by students. Wilson said that a questionnaire will be ready soon, and you can rest assured that administrators will take note of the results. They want to find out how pressing the issue is, if on-campus students want cable hook-ups in their rooms and if they support the proposal to air shows over the University-access channel.

Once the logistics are taken care of, the budding Charles Kuralts can get down to the productive business of putting to good use a medium that can inform and entertain both students and townspeople alike. With, and only with, student support, the University-access channel can become an established UNC information outlet.

## Powerless act

Let's play a game; we'll call it Subverting the War Powers Act; the object being to twist the law to your own advantage. First, you say the Act can't apply to you. Next, you say it's against the law. Then, you simply ignore it exists, make up your own, and congratulations you win — or is it lose.

If you're confused, just ask Ronald Reagan for advice. In the middle of controversy over control of U.S. Marines in Lebanon, he was able to make a deal with congressional leaders to ward off enactment of the 1973 War Powers Act. The Marines would stay where they were — and for 18 months. It didn't seem to matter that the War Powers Act mandated that the president notify Congress when troops faced hostility and then withdraw those troops within 60 days unless Congress decided otherwise.

Of course, Reagan didn't always have it this easy. At first he tried to say the Marines weren't in hostile territory. They were on a "peacekeeping" mission designed to stabilize the Lebanese government. Then, four Marines were shot and killed. Reagan continued the rhetoric on the merits of peacekeeping, but this time Congress wouldn't listen. The lawmakers began questioning the right of the president to decide what were "hostile" conditions, anxious for a voice in that decision.

In the end, a law designed to eliminate more "Vietnams" was turned into a central support for Reagan policy destined to create them. Reagan got what he wanted: continued control of the Marines' positions. And the once-miffed congressmen were happy at not being left out.

Realistically, the 18-month agreement was nothing more than a flimsy cover for continued confusion in U.S. policy toward Lebanon. Such an agreement only delayed a decision until after the 1984 elections. Reagan has called it a victory for the U.S. "bipartisan" peace effort. But that somehow rings hollow against the realization that 1,200 Marines will stay in Beirut, helping the Lebanese army while they save the remnants of the peacekeeping mission.

Controversy surrounding the War Powers Act has enabled federal officials to continue ignoring the reality of the Lebanon struggle. They've granted themselves the right to keep the Marines in battle zones without every justifying why.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Frank Bruni, Charles Ellmaker and Kelly Simmons

Assistant Managing Editors: Joel Broadway, Tracy Hilton and Michael Toole

Assistant News Editor: Melissa Moore

News: Tracy Adams, Dick Anderson, Joseph Berryhill, Angela Booze, J. Bonasia, Keith Bradsher, Amy Brannen, Lisa Brantley, Hope Buffington, Tom Conlon, Kathie Collins, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Lynn Davis, Dennis Dowdy, Chris Edwards, Suzanne Evans, Kathy Farley, Steve Ferguson, Genie French, Kim Gilley, Marymelda Hall, Andy Hodges, Sue Kuhn, Liz Lucas, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelley, Janet Olson, Rosemary Osborne, Heidi Owen, Beth Ownley, Cindy Parker, Donna Pazdan, Ben Perkowski, Frank Proctor, Linda Queen, Sarah Raper, Mary Alice Resch, Cindi Ross, Katherine Schultz, Sharon Sheridan, Deborah Simpkins, Jodi Smith, Sally Smith, Lisa Stewart, Mark Stinneford, Carrie Szymeczek, Liz Saylor, Mike Sobiero, Amy Tanner, Doug Tate, Wayne Thompson, Vance Trefethen, Chuck Wallington, Scott Wharton, Lynda Wolf, Rebekah Wright, Jim Zook, Kyle Marshall, assistant state and national editor, and Stuart Tonkinson, assistant university editor.

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

Features: Dawn Brazzell, 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, Kathy Norcross, Jane Osmont, Clinton Weaver and Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: Steve Carr, Ivy Hilliard, Ivy Ellen Meekins, Gigi Sonner, Sheryl Thomas 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, business manager; Tammy Martin, accounts receivable clerk; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; William Austin, assistant circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman, classified advertising manager; Julie Jones, assistant classified advertising manager; Debbie McCurdy, secretary/receptionist.

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

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

# The nuts and bolts of atheism

By KEN LANGSTON

Why is an atheist organization needed in the United States today?

Because this question aroused my curiosity, I decided to attend and participate in the first meeting of UNC's American Atheists. So, at 7:30 p.m. Monday, I entered Room 205 of the Carolina Union, prepared to be intellectually challenged and morally stimulated by the views of people whom I expected to be both psychologically mature and mentally astute. Instead, I was confronted with black-board diagrams and printed materials. I was zealously — and, dare I say, religiously — preached a sermon on what it meant to be a "true" atheist.

In a style characteristic of the religious right, the group denounced America's greatest evil, religion, as a demon which oppresses minorities, hinders scientific progress, and produces a class of "nuts" who want to impose their values and beliefs on everyone else. (For those of you who are unfamiliar with reality as this particular group of atheists perceive it, there are right-wing nuts who hold to the tenets of a fundamentalist faith, main-line nuts who profess ridiculous creeds and adhere to anachronistic values, and liberal nuts who, although somewhat intelligent, nevertheless say silly things based on emotion rather than reason. Of course, there is nothing unreasonable or emotional about lumping all religious individuals together as "nuts." After all, this conclusion was arrived at by "enlightened" minds.)

Perhaps they are unaware of the fact that the Civil Rights struggle in this country was motivated to a large

extent by the deep religious convictions of such men as the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., that many of our greatest scientific breakthroughs were made by deeply religious men — such as Newton, Sedgewick, Mendel, Darwin and Einstein — no matter how unorthodox they may have been, and that many "nuts" — such as Baptists, Deists, Jews and Unitarians — have not only helped establish and maintain a separation of church and state, but have also continued to push for even stronger, stricter, and clearer separation today.

sentiments, these apostles of reactionary atheism demanded that true atheists wage a holy war against religion whenever and wherever possible. Let my position be misunderstood by my atheist friends, I am not attacking the political goals of atheism. That we maintain a strict separation of church and state, that we limit the social and economic power of organized religion, and that we defend freedom "from" religion as well as freedom of religion — all are vital concerns in a pluralistic liberal democracy such as ours.

... the ground denounced America's greatest evil, religion, as a demon which oppresses minorities, hinders scientific research and produces a class of "nuts" ...

But subtle distinctions, tactful approaches and historical reality were as irrelevant to the group as they are to many members of the new religious right. In the black-and-white conception of reality, one was either an "enlightened" atheist or an ignorant and malicious theist: There was no middle ground for those who considered themselves agnostic or for those who considered themselves both atheist and religious (as many Buddhists, Hindus, Unitarians and Jews do) — much less for anyone under the false assumption that he or she could be both religious and enlightened. What was important for these "fundamentalist" atheists was (1) that "true" atheism be strictly defined, (2) that atheists remain pure of any religious influence and (3) that atheists destroy religion before religion destroys society. Proudly admitting that they sought neither alliance nor dialogue with those who held any type of religious

However, in pursuit of these goals, let us not replace the prejudice and intolerance of those who adhere to a strict religious world view with new forms of prejudice and intolerance based on a narrow interpretation of scientific reality. Let us be clear that we are attacking neither religious sentiments nor fundamental theological beliefs; but rather, as truly enlightened people, we are struggling against the absolute sanctification of any set of prejudices — whether scientific or religious — in hope of defeating the intolerant position of any "fundamentalist" mind-set, whether theistic or atheistic.

Ken Langston is a senior political science and religion major from Grifton.

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## A threat of nuclear holocaust

To the editor:

A new U.S. nuclear missile, the MX missile, is about to be deployed. This new and deadly weapon will hold 10 nuclear warheads (bombs). If Congress approves funding for the MX through the 1984 Department of Defense Appropriations Bill (the vote on this bill will come up in a week or two), at least 27 of these will be produced next year.

And what is worse is that because of its promptness, accuracy and destructiveness the MX is undoubtedly a first-strike weapon. The basing strategy will be to put MXs in vulnerable, outdated Minuteman silos. Since this means the missiles will be vulnerable to Soviet attack, the only use for them would be as offensive weapons.

And yet President Reagan calls the MX the Peacekeeper and says it will be a good deterrent and useful as a bargaining chip in arms reductions talks. Nothing could be further from the truth. The MX is destabilizing. It threatens our security by increasing the threat of nuclear war because it will force the Soviet Union to deploy a similar weapon to keep up with the United States. And not only this but all the money spent on it (at least \$2.5 billion next year) will be taken away from social programs, including student aid and loans.

You must ask yourself if this is what you really want for your country. Do you want to live under the constant threat of a nuclear holocaust? If not, you must speak out. I believe it is time that we, the future

leaders of our country, make our voices heard. It is our duty to educate ourselves, to vote, to write our congressmen, to support and work in disarmament groups. We must all take part. We must try to save our

country from the threat of nuclear war before it is too late.

Kathryn Dowling  
Chapel Hill

## Remember the Alamo?

To the editor:

Watching the halftime activities during one of the recent college football games, I stumbled across a representative picture of what our newspapers and corresponding White House media have labeled the "revulsion" with which Americans are reacting to the atrocious gunning down of Flight 007 by Soviet airmen. Revulsed, I sat idly watching the game between two college teams, neither of which I'd heard much about.

But it was a hot day and the beer was cold. About halftime, I'd gotten sick of the incessant blabbering by the announcers, so I cranked up the stereo and sat watching the video. While Bob Dylan

sang, "It's All Over Now, Baby Blue," the marching band whipped about very martially, the helmeted drummer beating his bass drum, majorettes hurling batons, all reacting with identical and rigid cadence to their leader's wand.

Before long, I realized that the band was forming the numbers 007 across mid-field. Flabbergasted, I jumped out of my armchair to turn up the volume on the set. "John Brown's Body?" I surmised. When the sound came up, I was eased considerably. It was only the latest theme song to one of the James Bond thrillers.

Luke Powers  
Carboro

## Beer and circuses

To the editor:

Football Saturdays are a delightful reminder that our University has a function in today's world: it serves beer in a circus atmosphere. But it is sad to see how far we are ready to go.

Last year we all were told about how if we drank on the street we would be fined, and some of us sophomores believe that we aren't allowed to drink on campus. But one glance at the Tar Heel fans reassures us. Hip flasks and beer cans outnumber

programs. Does the Campus Governing Council support this? Does the Law School, that vital concession to supply-side education, really want us all to know that any law in the land can be gotten around? Or do folks who just came here to study have a hope of seeing that the president's speeches about how good we are still mean something?

Lenny D. Andersen  
Chapel Hill



PROFESSOR... I THINK IT'S TIME WE UPDATED OUR SCIENCE PROGRAM. THE WEEK IN REVIEW

# Support is crucial to Marines' safety

By CHARLES ELLMAKER

Peacekeeping strategies in war-torn Lebanon have taken a decidedly different bent since Monday, when U.S. warships began shelling Syrian-backed Druse rebels in support of the Lebanese Army's defense of Souk el-Gharb, a town overlooking Beirut.

Defense Department and White House spokesmen said direct support of the Lebanese Army in defense of the town was crucial to safeguarding U.S. Marine and other peacekeeping contingents.

The cruiser Virginia and the destroyer John Rodgers moved to within a mile of the Lebanese coast Tuesday and fired 5-inch shells successively at rebel troops during the morning and afternoon.

The actions were the first use of a week-old order allowing Marine commanders to call on Navy and Air Force firepower to defend the land-based troops. But direct support of the Lebanese Army again raised the question of whether the United States is a neutral peacekeeping force or an active participant in a Lebanon torn by civil war and invaded by both Israeli and Syrian armies.

### Presidential power

Despite increased U.S. military action against Lebanese rebels, President Reagan and key congressional leaders reached a compromise resolution Tuesday concerning troop activities in an attempt to avoid a direct White House-congressional clash over the War Powers Act.

Debate over whether Reagan has the authority to keep troops in Lebanon has escalated following increased U.S. Marine activity in the Lebanese conflict. Under the War Powers Act — enacted 10 years ago in the waning days of the Vietnam War — the president must notify Congress if troops are involved in hostile situations.

The president then has 60 days to withdraw troops from the region unless Congress authorizes continued action. Reagan has been skirting the act by maintaining that all Marine actions have been

defensive measures and as such did not constitute hostile activity.

The resolution, expected to pass through Congress quickly, signaled strong bipartisan approval of Reagan's peacekeeping efforts in Lebanon. Under the agreement, Reagan will maintain control over the 1,200-man contingent for the next 18 months so long as U.S. troop involvement does not escalate past defending itself and other peacekeeping contingents. Also, the land-based peacekeeping troops cannot be expanded beyond the present 1,200, and Reagan must make a full status report to Congress every six months.

The compromise marked significant concessions by both Reagan and congressional leaders. By agreeing to the compromise, Reagan is recognizing Congress' war powers while reasserting his power as commander-in-chief. And because the agreement extends over 18 months, the question of military authority in Lebanon will not affect the 1984 U.S. presidential race.

### Rioting in the Philippines

Rioting continues in Manila, where 11 people — seven civilians, two firefighters and two marines — were killed Wednesday following a massive rally called by government opposition leaders to mark the 11th anniversary of the imposition of martial law by President Ferdinand Marcos and to mourn the death last month of former Sen. Benigno S. Aquino. Aquino was assassinated just seconds after he stepped off a plane in Manila following three years of self-exile in the United States.

Rioting began when riot police attacked thousands of students and other anti-government supporters as they marched on the presidential palace. About 500,000 people attended the anti-government rally Wednesday.

### Here's what's what

Closer to home, a minor U.S. United Nations diplomat, Charles M. Lichenstein, shocked a U.N. host country relations committee meeting by urging that all U.N.

diplomats who felt unwelcome in the United States pack up themselves and the U.N. assembly and move elsewhere. He added that the United States would "be down on dockside waving you a fond farewell as you sail into the sunset."

Lichenstein's strong comment came as a retort to a Soviet diplomat's condemnation of the United States for prohibiting Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko from landing at either Kennedy or Newark airports. Soviet aircraft are restricted from landing at U.S. commercial airports following the Soviet downing of a Korean jetliner in which 269 civilians were killed. Gromyko was offered landing privileges at an Air Force base outside of New York, but he declined.

Critics of Lichenstein have called for his resignation, and though the diplomat's comments were not White House-approved, President Reagan has now come out in support of Lichenstein, advocating that U.N. diplomats spend six months each in New York and Moscow to see how each country's citizens live.

### Playing Sherlock

According to documents released under the Freedom of Information Act, the

Federal Bureau of Investigation in the late 1960s and early 1970s planted spies in many student organizations — including the then-newly formed Black Student Movement at UNC — believed to present a threat to the security of the United States.

After searching through 750 pages of partially censored FBI documents, UNC Law School graduate Alex Charns released information acknowledging FBI infiltration into many campus organizations across the nation. The BSM, founded by a group of black students disenchanted with the local NAACP chapter, originally advocated violence to achieve its goals and was suspected of having ties with the militant Black Panthers.

One document identified UNC President William C. Friday as an FBI "Special Correspondent." Although the meaning of the title is unclear, Friday has said that, while he had limited correspondence with the FBI during that time, his role was not of a subversive nature.

Charles Ellmaker, a senior journalism and English major from Orange Park, Fla., is an editorial writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

