

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor

STUART TONKINSON
Managing Editor
BEN PERKOWSKI
Associate Editor
DICK ANDERSON
Associate Editor
JANET OLSON
University Editor
JAMI WHITE
News Editor
ANDY TRINCIA
State and National Editor

LEIGH WILLIAMS
City Editor
MARK POWELL
Business Editor
LEE ROBERTS
Sports Editor
FRANK BRUNI
Arts Editor
SHARON SHERIDAN
Features Editor
LARRY CHILDRESS
Photo Editor

Blue day for the Navy

Navy Secretary John F. Lehman announced Wednesday that he felt the Naval Investigative Service had been overtaxed of late and that ultimately it "was a victim of Congressional and press hysteria over some of the trendier issues." Well, let's see. . . .

In an article printed in *The New York Times*, Lehman cited reports of outrageous purchasing contracts as having distracted Navy investigators' attention and as having been a determinant of the Navy's failure to uncover recent major security breaches. In the article, Lehman acknowledged that the Navy's internal security had grown lax, but he went on to indict outside factors as having been at fault — including "press hysteria" and subsequent demands that the Navy should investigate obscene budgetary waste on high-priced airplane toilet seats, ashtrays and hammers.

Lehman maintained that he and his investigators had been "stampeded" by both Congress and the media, whose "topmost priority in the world was finding those toilet seats and hammers." Thus, he said, "very little effort was being addressed to espionage and the kind of espionage-style theft that the F-14 ring involved."

Response to Lehman's remarks was none too short on wit. Republican Sen. Charles Grassley of Iowa, who has been a key figure in publicizing the embarrassing purchasing frauds, said the Navy secretary seemed to be expressing a hypersensitivity to issues of public relations.

Bum alum stands for dumb

As UNC students picked up their copies of *The Daily Tar Heel* Thursday morning, they found the year's first issue of *Newsweek On Campus*, which featured a cover story on the scandalous adventures of college athletics. The exposure of athletic illegalities has become increasingly frequent, to the point where it seems to be a daily occurrence.

Thus, is it any surprise that yet another quagmire of major illicit activities was uncovered between the magazine's press run and publication?

The full extent of the latest scam to rock college athletics came out Tuesday. A hotshot alum at Texas Christian University admitted his role in the recruitment of as many as 60 TCU boosters who made cash payments to 29 players between 1982 and this fall. Seven members of a team with bowl-game potential, including All-American running back Kenneth Davis, have been given the boot by Coach Jim Wacker. In his third year at TCU, Wacker repeatedly has vowed to run a clean ship and is not implicated.

Said Grassley: "He's still the secretary of the Navy, and whether his investigators investigate waste or espionage is his decision. If he has been distracted from it by the press, that's got to say something about his administrative ability."

Grassley's point is well-taken, of course, but one must bear in mind that his own efforts to bring attention to the purchasing frauds also might have been guided by an acute appreciation for public relations. After all, there is always the desire to be re-elected. All the saints in this realm make use of two-edged swords.

But to expand upon what was nevertheless an excellent point, the two espionage cases in litigation were uncovered not by the Navy, but by the FBI and the U.S. Customs Service, organizations that certainly are just as overtaxed as the Naval Investigative Service. Aside from that, one of the "spy rings" is purported to have operated undetected for nearly 20 years, and the other is purported to have operated for the last five years.

To blame recent publicity over purchasing fraud for the failures of the Naval investigators during the course of as many as 20 years is to whitewash public appreciation for the issue. Lehman certainly has the right to try to pass the buck. Unfortunately, the average American citizen would prefer to save the buck and pass on the \$1,000 toilet seats. In short, it is difficult to feel much sympathy for Secretary Lehman.

What makes this scandal any different than Florida, or Clemson, or SMU, or any other school that has been caught cheating? Well, in this case a central figure in the dispute came forward and confessed his role. Dick Lowe, a Texas oil man who was a TCU lineman from 1947-50, has offered complete cooperation to officials with the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Southwest Conference.

Lowe was overcome by the same "they won't catch me" mindset that has afflicted so many boosters. It has resulted in a major erosion of one trait that used to be so much more prevalent in college sports: honesty.

Cases of what seems to be disregard for that inevitable question — "When will they ever learn?" — leaves the public more perplexed with each incident. The actions of people such as Lowe show that these lawbreakers are learning. We hope more of them show willingness to accept the punishment they deserve, because it is the only way these improprieties will be eradicated.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Keith Bradsher and Jim Zook
Assistant Managing Editors: Anjetta McQueen and Cathy Cowan

News: Crystal Baity, Lisa Brantley, Loch Carnes, Kerstin Coyle, Randy Farmer, Charles Fernandez, Katy Fridl, Jill Gerber, Edward Mark Gilgor, Todd Gossett, Loretta Grantham, Mike Gunzenhauser, Kenneth Harris, Sharon Hodges, Denise Johnson, Robert Keefe, Scott Larsen, Donna Leinwand, Lana Lewin, Mitra Lotfi, Dora McAlpin, David McCullough, Anjetta McQueen, Yvette Denise Moultrie, Linda Montanari, Kathy Nanney, Beth Ownley, Rachel Orr, Grant Parsons, Gordon Rankin, Rachel Stiffler, Rachel Stroud, Joy Thompson, Jennifer Trotter, Elisa Turner, Laura Van Sant, Devi Sen, Rhesa Versola, Kim Weaver, Lorry Williams, Laurie Willis, Katherine Wood and Karen Youngblood. Guy Lucas, assistant university editor.

Sports: Scott Fowler and Tim Crothers, assistant sports editors. Rick Beasley, Mike Berardino, Kimball Crossley, Phyllis Fair, Paris Goodnight, Tom Morris, James Surowecki, Biffie Velliquette and Bob Young.

Features: Marymela Hall, assistant features editor. Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Louis Corrigan, Kara V. Donaldson, Heather Frey, Matthew Fury, Keith Griffier, Wayne Grimsley, Jane Mintz, Mary Mulvihill, Peggie Porter, Tara Reinhart, Laurie Rodgers, Liz Saylor, Denise Smittheman and Martha Wallace.

Arts: Elizabeth Ellen, assistant arts editor. Mark Davis, Jim Giles, Aniket Majumdar, Alexandra Mann, Alan Mason, Sally Pont, Deanna Ruddock and Garret Weyt.

Photography: Charlotte Cannon, Dan Charlson, Janet Jarman and Charles Ledford.

Copy Editors: Roy Greene, Gina Little, Cindy Parker, Kelli Slaughter and Vince Vargas.

Artists: Adam Cohen, Bill Cokas and David Sumner.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Angela Booze, student business manager; Angela Ostwalt, accounts receivable clerk; Doug Robinson, student advertising manager; Alicia Brady, Keith Childers, Alicia Susan D'Anna, Staci Ferguson, Kellie McElhane, Melanie Parlier, Stacey Ramirez and Scott Whitaker, advertising representatives; Stacey Ferguson and Kelly Johnson, classified assistants, and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager; Tucker Stevens, circulation assistant.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway and Rose Lee, production assistants.

Printing: Hinton Press Inc. of Mebane

READER FORUM

BCC more than just a dollars-and-cents issue

To the editors:

Philip Thomas' letter "BSM should bury its holier-than-thou attitude" (Sept. 25) reflects a total lack of understanding with regard to the proposed Black Cultural Center. The BCC proposition did not come from within the Black Student Movement. It is a proposal initiated and maintained through the Office of Student Affairs and will not be a student organization. The BCC and BSM are separate, although there are some students, such as BSM President Sibby Anderson, who are members of both. The BSM does not even have

adequate office space and certainly would not request "square footage" for a cultural center as a priority when the central committee of the BSM shares one desk, one telephone and one broken typewriter. Though the groups are separate, the BSM supports the idea of a BCC much like that of the International Center on the main floor of the Student Union. I do hope that the "British Student Movement" that Thomas referred to is utilizing the International Center and that other UNC students visit the center to learn of cultures unlike their own. I am very disappointed that the BCC is viewed by some as a dollars-

and-cents issue. Maybe now that Thomas realizes that the BCC is not a BSM-sponsored project, he will no longer fret about the BSM receiving additional monies.

The accusation that the black members of the BSM use their race as a crutch is an insult that deserves addressing. While there are some black people who do just that, these persons are more of a detriment to blacks than whites. Although Thomas did not back up his accusation, I will remind him that Sherrod Banks was not and Sibby Anderson is not weak and neither relies upon racial crutches to maintain their footage.

Thomas, if you do not see a difference between British and black students, I suggest a visit to Pearle Vision Center as well as enrollment in a race-relations class next semester. You say that you are not a racist but you targeted the BSM and insulted its members. Perhaps it would be best for you to submit a second condescending letter to the *DTH* Reader Forum that will better enlighten the masses of "angry young blacks" here on campus as to the meaning of the word "racist."

E. Louis Best
BSM Central Committee

BSM leadership suffers from selfishness, greed

To the editors:

I would like to thank Philip Thomas of Carboro for saying, in his Sept. 25 letter ("BSM should bury its holier-than-thou attitude"), what has long needed to be said about the Black Student Movement.

First, the BSM was allocated more than \$10,000 by the Campus Governing Council for this year, which is more than was allocated for the CGC, Association for Women Students, Association of International Students, the Carolina Indian Circle, Student Television and the Carolina Athletic Association combined. And now they are demanding a cultural center larger than their existing office.

Anyone who is a member of one of the above-listed groups must work in an area no larger than the BSM office, and we do not see them clamoring for more office space. Yet I think it is safe to say that most of these groups do a much better job than the BSM can manage with a much larger budget and comparable office space.

The problem with the BSM leadership can be summed up in two words: selfishness and greed. Listen to BSM president Sibby Anderson, as she was quoted in the Sept. 19 *DTH*, begin three separate sentences in her defense of the BSM's "need": "We wanted. . . ." "We wanted. . . ." "We wanted. . . ." In the same article, Anderson admitted that the

BSM wanted its own building(!), but conceded that "that is not feasible."

How does the BSM get away with such outrageous statements and demands? By playing off guilt and imagined discrimination, as Thomas pointed out in his letter, and by playing politics as shrewdly as it gets.

Anderson claims that the University is being insensitive to the needs of blacks, but I believe discrimination no longer exists here to any greater extent for blacks than it does for any other cultural minority in a community dominated by one race. I am not claiming that undeserved discrimination does not exist, but I think that all of us will be

discriminated against at some time, if not for our skin color, then for our looks, height, sex, voice, nose size or for any other ridiculous reason.

Still, the BSM will not foster better race relations by setting itself outside the University community through this type of power play. I, for instance, am a white freshman. I am neither a bigot nor a racist, nor am I against BSM funding. But I have been turned off by the comments of the BSM's leadership, and my formerly ambivalent attitude toward the BSM's ridiculously high funding has now changed to outrage.

Mark Hornburg
Ehringhaus



Priority mix

To the editors:

I was appalled that the University would even consider using the former Fastbreak area in the Student Union for an all-purpose lounge rather than something as important and needed as the proposed Black Cultural Center ("BSM wants Fastbreak area for Center," Sept. 19). I am also taken aback by the University's allotment of a corner for the BCC when a central and large location is available for use.

The big question that I am addressing is how the University can even compare the importance of another place to "mix, mingle and relax" to the importance of a place to educate the entire University community on Black culture. I feel that the upstairs lounge, the downstairs lounge and the art gallery are enough places for relaxation and mingling in the Student Union.

The BCC would also be beneficial in that it would provide an administrative office where black students could go to get the guidance so desperately needed at a predominantly white university.

I think that it is high time for the University to get its priorities in order.

Jack Brown
President,
Black Greek Council

Irresponsible lyrics clutter young minds

By STEVEN B. EPSTEIN

You've done it now. You've made me, an ardent *DTH* supporter, mad. I refer specifically to your editorial "Between a rocker and a hard head" (Sept. 20). You made a terrific case for the U.S. Constitution, but beguile the reader by failing to mention that the current drama unfolding in the committee structure of the U.S. Senate has nothing to do with the Constitution. You say "the U.S. Constitution guarantees such music can be played." I would like to know who is disputing that fact? Your inference, that the Parents Music Resource Center is disputing it, is pure sophistry. Since when does the placing of a warning label on a product equate with the banishment of that product? Does this mean that millions of cigarette smokers in this country have been acting out a marvelous charade since the Surgeon General demanded that warning labels be put on cigarette packages? Ironically, you use the case of cigarettes to point out how lethargically warning labels are treated by the public — but you still are terribly piqued by them.

I will devote this paragraph to substance, because I just happen to believe in its efficacy. If PMRC is to get its wish, and the odds unfortunately do not prophesize such results, records with vile and lascivious lyrics, such as the poignant set chosen by you in your editorial, will simply be labeled as such. The record will still be for sale, and any person of any age will still be permitted to purchase it without adult supervision. One could not even stretch the case that this is as strenuous a restraint as banning minors from viewing X-rated movies, or better yet, disallowing minors from purchasing pornographic magazines or cigarettes. These are all laws — laws that have been upheld as constitutionally by the U.S. Supreme Court. Incidentally, the same language used in the host of material that PMRC seeks to forewarn parents of, when placed on the audio of a motion picture, would in itself constitute an "R" rating; in a movie theater, a child would need the presence of an adult if he or she were to be allowed to hear such language. These facts were conspicuously omitted from your editorial. If freedom of expression — and here the Constitution is relevant — can be limited in this sense, can't a warning label be produced to allow busy, hard-working 20th-century parents (who unfortunately don't have the time to consume every lyric of every record purchased by their children) to be warned that the values they have attempted to inculcate in their children may in some way be blemished by such a record? If it is to be assumed that parents have an inherent right to



teach their children values, and I would hope that at least the *DTH* would concede to me on this point, then is it right for society to clandestinely and willfully impede them?

If you think that most children are unaffected by the lyrics of the music that they listen to, think again. Sociological study after study is illuminating the variety of adverse effects that rock 'n' roll music has on nurturing children. Just imagine a well-intentioned grandmother Christmas shopping for her beloved grandchild and snatching a package labeled "Twisted Sister" off the shelf. Do you think she would have made this decision if she was cognizant of the contents? Does she not have a right to know the contents before she purchases the product, analogous to the FDA's requirement that ingredients be clearly printed on the outer wrapping of food products?

In your last paragraph, you make the fatuous assertion that "This is little more than the far right's latest attempt to control the devilish influences on America's youth." Do you know who heads up this group? The wife of none other than James Baker III, secretary of the treasury, but more importantly, former chief of staff for Reagan. Do you know why Baker no longer

holds his former post? Because the right-wing of the Republican Party condemned him as "too liberal" and begged for his ousting since his inception as chief of staff. It would seem quite unlikely that his wife was imbued in the coterie seeking his removal.

Finally, your last phrase "just let the good times roll," is indicative of the ethos precipitating the current malaise of the American youth. It is this crass philosophy that has witnessed the teen-age suicide rate increase more than twofold over the last 30 years; last year nearly 6,000 teens took their own lives. It is this irresponsible gobbledygook that stimulated the atmosphere in which the number of forcible rapes in this country has doubled in just the last 10 years. It is this myopic malignancy that must be warned against, if this nation is ever to be great. While it is true that the First Amendment makes freedom of the press sacrosanct, it is intrinsically false that it gives Dee Snider and those like him the freedom to reverse the values that we seek to teach our children.

Steven B. Epstein is a junior political science major from Oceanside, N.Y.