

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROGHI, 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
 MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
 BILL RIEDY, News Editor CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

One more time

It is indeed rare on this campus to have an issue continue for a year, remain unresolved, yet never disappear in a haze of student boredom. This week, however, Student Government officials revive an issue torn by apathy and heavy-handed politicking—an increase in the Student Activities Fee. By deciding to postpone any vote on an increase until the February general elections, they recognized the importance of such an issue and provided adequate time for information to be distributed on it.

The battles waged over raising the \$15.25 per semester fee began at this time last year when members of the Campus Governing Council began haggling over whether to hold a referendum. In February, they asked students to vote for a \$1.25 per semester increase, only to be told by the Student Supreme Court that the election would never be counted because of election irregularities. The CGC tried to hold another vote a few weeks later, only to have this one killed by student apathy. According to the student Constitution, 4,100 votes were needed to certify the election; only 1,800 voted.

With this dismal record behind them, CGC this year began tampering with the issue, hopeful to arrange a fall election. After realizing that only a handful of students would vote in such an election they changed their minds. As Student Body President Kevin Monroe argued, the delay would allow adequate time for students to learn both sides of the issue. In a February election, the issue would receive media attention as well as the attention of the candidates for student body president, *DTH* editor, and the CGC. By that time all students would have had the experience needed to decide whether they saw a need for more money to be given to the student organizations.

But more importantly, the delay would ensure that enough students actually voted and that this time the results would be counted. About 7,000 students usually vote in the February elections, more than enough to satisfy constitutional requirements and more than enough to represent a consensus of student opinion.

Because the Student Activities Fee is an investment, any decision affecting it must be weighed carefully. The action by Student Government in delaying the vote represents a pragmatic decision. Officials recognized the futility in trying to rush an election this fall, thus allowing an important issue to be considered in an important election.

What's Watt

"I never use the words Democrats and Republicans. It's liberals and Americans."

James Watt didn't use many words correctly. "I have a black. I have a woman, two Jews and a cripple." What he didn't have was a silver tongue.

He was the man with a foot perpetually lodged in his mouth. The man whose affinity for the verbal *faux pas* provoked Congressional attempts to pass a resolution urging his resignation. The man who Sunday night issued his resignation from his post as Secretary of the Interior.

Yet the insensitivity of Watt's public comments is most significant because it parallels the insensitivity with which he treated environmental issues. As Secretary of the Interior, the custodian of the nation's environmental resources, Watt drastically departed from the notions of those who created that department. He believed that the tide of environmental conservation had grown too strong and that it was time to exploit the nation's resources for the purposes of economic growth and national security. He transferred many public resources to private industry.

Watt seldom listened to the outcries of the opposition. He alienated members of Congress and environmental groups to the extent that he became a serious political liability to the Reagan administration. The tension between Watt and the Congress swiftly crescendoed to the point where Watt's effectiveness was undermined. In September, the Senate countered many key Interior Department initiatives by placing a moratorium on the leasing of government-owned coal to private developers by 1985. And just last week the Senate supported a House bill that would curb offshore oil and gas development.

In light of Watt's controversial policies, perhaps we all should be grateful for his big mouth which is what ultimately precipitated his resignation. The widespread opposition Watt's policies met should demonstrate to President Reagan that it's time for his administration to clean up its act where environmental issues are concerned. As Watt declared in his resignation speech, his usefulness "has come to an end."

He couldn't have said it better.

The Bottom Line

For a long time, it seemed that students living in mobile homes were the inventive, frugal ones. Then Jennifer Beals and *Flashdance* came along and showed all of us that, yes, with a few tacky lamps and some tapestries and a homemade aerobics floor, a warehouse can become a cozy abode.

Well, what a welder/dancer can do in Pittsburgh, two enterprising college students at the College of William and Mary can top.

In a flash of brilliance nurtured by a hatred of dormitory life, sophomore Vikki Ehrich and junior Amanda Clements transformed an old brick lighting tower into a low-rent apartment.

A free apartment.

All went well at first. The handy homemakers beat the austerity of the ivy tower with carpets and furnishings. They wired the place and installed a makeshift kitchen. They didn't even mind the short walk to the

nearest bathroom facility.

With all their planning, however, Ehrich and Clements overlooked—or perhaps merely ignored—a few small details. Like who might own the tower and whether they would mine its inhabitation. Perhaps Vikki and Amanda had read *Swiss Family Robinson* too many times.

After seven months of domestic bliss, the two were betrayed by their own stereo. A police officer heard rock music coming out of the tower. Alas, the two Rapunzels had let down their hair. And the blue knight climbed the tower.

What he found didn't please him, and it wasn't long before William and Mary's two most celebrated interior decorators found themselves in a more, well, typical apartment. One that even required rent.

Vikki Ehrich and Amanda Clements may be a little low on cash at present, but they have become the lucky recipients of *The Daily Tar Heel's* 1983 "Homemaker of the Year" award. And that's the bottom line.

Separation of sport and state

When athletes become nothing more than political puppets

By MICHAEL DESISTI

A week ago Monday, two University students stood in the Pit, each holding a sign expressive of his disdain and wearing a face expressive of his grief at the Sept. 1 downing of a South Korean commercial airliner by a Soviet interceptor jet. A third distributed copies of a handout which denounced the Soviet Union's action in the event.

These individuals had something to say, and so they made a statement. They made it in a respectable way.

Seven American universities had been scheduled to play an exhibition game with the Soviet national basketball team this winter, but all canceled in recent weeks. They did this in reaction to the same 269 deaths which had the above-mentioned students demonstrating.

Vanderbilt, and the universities of Maryland, Alabama, Kentucky, Kansas, Oklahoma and Houston all had something to say, and so they made a statement. Again, what was said was worthy. How it was said was a lot less.

These seven universities are by no means political institutions of the United States. But their reaction to an unfortunate event was by all means political in nature. This mixing of politics and athletics is getting more than a bit bothersome.

We need a separation of sport and state. It goes without saying that no player on the Soviet national team has been in a cockpit to open fire on any commercial airliners. Nor did the coach give that ill-fated order for destruction from some remote control tower. So why should the athletes—both Soviet and American—be punished?

Do you think Maryland's Adrian Branch wouldn't get a kick out of hitting 20-footers against the Soviet nationals, then going around College Park the next day vaingloriously spouting about how he bombed the Russians—and congratulated them afterward?

Do you think the Russians wouldn't like a chance to go back to Moscow and talk about how they ran circles around Kentucky's most talked-about player, center Sam Bowie, neglecting to explain that he's a conversation item not only because he's a ticket to the Final Four, but also because he's on crutches most of the time?

Think again. One might well argue that the Soviet national team represents the Soviet nation; and so giving it the brushoff is one way of chastising the Soviets for a misdoing. That makes sense until you consider the makeup of a nation.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a body



Illustration by Cahel Firth

of people—the John and Jane Doe-mitlokovs, so to speak—didn't shoot that plane down. The Politburo did. How many Americans would want every one of Ronald Reagan's actions and words to be considered their own?

The people whom the Soviet National team really represents are innocent. They don't need to be chastised.

One might also argue that every game the Soviet national team wins is, for the Russians, a case in point for the superiority of the Soviet system. For this person, a win on the basketball court would be sufficient to show the world the advantages of communism. Why give the bigwigs in Moscow an opportunity for pretentiousness?

But this argument fails as well. The refusal to play the Soviets, in an effort to prevent the game from becoming an instrument of Russian propaganda, perpetuates the same manipulation of amateur athletics that is supposedly being prevented.

If there are any international hostilities to vent, let them be vented in athletic competition, be it professional or amateur. Any injuries will be permanent. The satisfaction will last. It has before:

• 1982 World Cup: In an early-round game of the soccer championship of the world, the Polish side plays the Soviet Union to a scoreless tie, knocking the Russians out of the tournament by doing so. With Poland still under martial law, you think there will be some celebrating. There is.

Though the game never materializes, Argentinians

wait feverishly, just months after the Falkland Islands' debacle, for a chance to challenge England in something that *really* counts. No kidding.

• 1980 winter Olympics, 1972 summer games: An upstart and unknown American ice hockey team shakes both the world and the shoo-in Soviets with a gold medal at Lake Placid; the Russians put an end to the United States' decades-long domination of Olympic basketball with a controversial win in the last two seconds of the championship game in Munich.

• 1936 summer Olympics: With world stability in balance, the games in Berlin and Hitler in the stadium, black American Jesse Owens wins four gold medals. So much for the Aryan race.

The United States, upon the urging of a well-meaning but misguided Jimmy Carter, boycotted the 1980 summer Olympics in Moscow to protest the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. It didn't change anything except the attitudes of hundreds of American athletes regarding the ends to which they were devoting their lives.

And now the Soviet Union is hedging on participation in this summer's games in Los Angeles, saying it fears for the safety of its athletes.

Let's just play ball. And shake hands afterwards.

Michael Desisti, a junior English and journalism major from Greece, N.Y., is sports editor of *The Daily Tar Heel*.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Hurrah for responsive administrators

To the editor:

In recent weeks, it has been difficult to pick up a copy of *The Daily Tar Heel* or a local newspaper without finding some sharp criticism of UNC President William C. Friday or other University administrators. It is rare, if not non-existent, to find complimentary words for these administrators, but I would like to provide some.

I graduated from a college one-tenth the

size of UNC, where if I wanted to speak to the president or a dean, I was invariably stopped by the ever-protective secretaries. These secretaries insisted that I could neither speak to nor see the administrator unless I had already spoken to everyone of a lower rank in the bureaucratic ladder. This served to discourage most individuals from voicing their opinions about anything.

A few weeks, ago I wanted to speak to

Friday. I picked up the phone and called his office, where, as expected, his secretary answered the phone. However, when I asked to speak to him, she asked me my name and said, "Hold on, please." Seconds later, I was talking to the president of the whole UNC system—piece of cake. Amazingly, I encountered a similar situation at Dean Donald Boulton's office. What was even more amazing was the fact that both Boulton and Friday listened to

what I had to say, and then they actually did something about it. In short, I expected nothing more than the proverbial "runaround" and I encountered nothing less than responsive, sympathetic administrators.

Thank you for dispelling my feelings that all bureaucracies are designed to impede individuals rather than help them.

Jonathan Green
Stratford Hills

A racial issue?

To the editor:

This is not a letter of disgust, but rather a letter of response. Ava D. Greene made some comments concerning the mikeman issue in the Oct. 7 *DTH* ("Disgusted with the mikeman issue") that really bothered me.

Her ideas were spawned by anger and misunderstanding. She's divided the world into two camps—black and white, right and wrong.

The original issue dealt with the performance of the mikeman. Admittedly, Kenny Ward did make some mistakes, but the results were not due to the color of his skin. Ward tried to do a good job, but he became understandably frustrated.

Frustration similar to Ward's could be felt in Greene's letter. I wish things weren't the way they often are. Sometimes, though, change must begin with the individual.

We can go ahead with choosing sides and feeling hatred—that will make us a people more divided than ever before.

Instead of tightening our grasps into fists or pointed fingers of accusation, let's open them to accept new ideas and to grasp the hands of our brothers and sisters.

I hope Greene will think about what I've said. And maybe Ward and I can take in a game together sometime.

Tim Thomas
Carr

To the editor:

I have never written a letter to the editor before, but Ava D. Greene's letter ("Disgusted with the mikeman issue," *DTH*, Oct. 7) prompted an immediate response. It is not the mikeman situation I find disgusting, it is Greene's obvious attitudes that I detest.

Greene's insinuations that whites are afraid of blacks because of the roles that they play in campus life are simply ludicrous. I think it's great that blacks and whites interact socially together. It is not Greene's skin color that I resent; it's her blatant prejudice against whites I find disgusting.

I am sorry Ward was called upon to resign. But let's judge him solely on his qualifications and not on his skin color.

If Greene could be white, I know she wouldn't last a day. The shock alone of the discovery that all whites are not racists would be more than enough to do you in.

Mark D. Matthews
Hinton James

To the editor:

In response to Ava D. Greene's "reaction" to the mikeman issue, let's clear up a few points. As to her pronouns of "you people" and "we black folks," I would like to know which "you people" she is referring to and which "we black folks" does she mean. No, 2, to her reference to Kelly D. Barrett as wishing she was black is not only biologically impossible but also mentally incompetent on Greene's part. No, 3, I thought the issue was the mikeman. Why does she have to resort to implicating the football and basketball teams? If anyone should grow up it should be Greene, because we as a black race have to stop crying when things don't go our way and resorting to using our color as an excuse.

Tonnette Golden
Morrison

'I am appalled'

To the editor:

Once again, I am appalled at the inadequacy of the UNC advisory system. I am a senior, and I am still surprised at the difficulty of minor adjustments to one's schedule.

The most disturbing element is the lack of faith of the administration in the ability of the students to make decisions. The advisory system of UNC is the most restraining of any of the 16 member schools. This is contradictory to the fact that it is also the school that has students more capable of making their own decisions than others, if indeed acceptance standards can be the basis of such a judgment.

On Friday, poor planning was truly visible. Until 1 p.m., there was only one adviser available for drop-add procedure.

Bryan E. Hall
Durham

Socialism no solution

To the editor:

I would like to comment on Michael Harrington's visit to the campus last Thursday afternoon. He is a concerned humanitarian who stimulates us to think of and treat the economic situation in America and the world today as a crisis.

I find it unfortunate, though, that his solution advocates socialism, because for me, that makes his visit here, and his efforts in general, a waste of time. There are a lot of economic problems, but socializing our economy will never solve them. Socialists seek to limit the freedoms of businessmen and corporations by political legislation, when in reality any abuse of freedoms in the corporate world can only

be many solved by educating business leaders in ethics.

People like Harrington would do better advocating the need to create educational institutions which can foster a new view of man toward man. The final solution to hunger and poverty in America and worldwide is not socialism. What is necessary is a spiritual awakening. Until businesses can function like families, based on love, the ideals of even socialism will never be realized. What that calls for is spiritual growth, the maturing of the heart, through the advocacy and application of spiritual, not political principles.

Peter Reiner
Chapel Hill

'A pretty good crossword'

To the editor:

I read with interest your editorial on College Bowl ("X=V%#S&%\$!T," *DTH*, Oct. 10). While the *DTH* has never been known for its exemplary coverage of the game at UNC (when Carolina won the national championship in 1981, it took the *DTH* four days to report this event), the editors have never before resorted to such snide abuse.

The author of this editorial obviously has never played College Bowl and could never realize that the game is: (1) fun; (2) not that hard; (3) not helped by random efforts at memorization; and (4) played by persons other than those straight off "Are you a Nerd?" posters. The name of the game is to see how much you retain of all that you learn, and if you can come up with it quickly. Some of the information

may seem a little extraneous, but isn't a bit of everything we learn like that? I, for one, learned nothing at all from your recent editorial.

By the way, I have never played High Q, have never carried around a calculator, and have never had the square root of three dance in my head, but I have derived considerable enjoyment from College Bowl at UNC. I do occasionally pass on little-known facts that people never wanted to know, but more often people ask me for them. As a source of public information, the *DTH* has a pretty good crossword. I would be happy to take on four *DTH* staffers in a match singlehandedly.

Ron Black
Law School

