

The Schreiber Times

Volume XXIX Issue 7
 Paul D. Schreiber High School
 Port Washington, New York
 11050
 Dr. Sidney Barish, Principal
 Robert Albert, Adviser
 March 31, 1989

Judi Rimerman
 EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Oren Blam
Jay Berlan
 MANAGING EDITORS

EDITORS:

NEWS
Elissa Blum

INSIDE SCHREIBER
Pete Fornatale

OPINIONS
Daniel Saul

ENTERTAINMENT
Dan Mulvihill

SPORTS
Noah Krieger

PHOTOGRAPHY
Dan Fisher

COPY
Jeremy Weintraub

TECHNICAL
Dave Pfister

LAYOUT
Jung Lee
Arash Salemi

ASSISTANT NEWS
Robert Weisz

EDITORIAL ASST.
Lauren Gelman

ASSISTANT SPORTS
Dan Juceam
James Weiner

ADVERTISING/DESIGN
Laura Yurdin

REPORTERS:

Brian Armstrong, Hal Bienstock, Matt Blankman, Steven Engel, Craig Glantz, Jordanna Glantz, Todd Hazelkorn, Roy Hoffman, Craig Johnson, David Kaminow, Jason Levy, Carrie Markowski, Alan Meyers, Stefanie Mollin, Heather Osterman, Jill Otruba, Jodi Perelman, Rob Pittman, Rafi Reza, Amanda Sacher, Dan Shodell, Brian Stein, Justine Suh, Seth Yablans

PHOTOGRAPHERS:
 Henry Chen, Matt Blankman

Published by the student body of Paul D. Schreiber High School. Letters to the editor should be addressed to The Schreiber Times, Schreiber High School, 101 Campus Drive, Port Washington, NY 11050. The editors reserve the right to refuse print or return any submitted material.

Middle States Report Should be Open to All

In the end of February, Schreiber was presented with the Middle States Evaluation report. The report, which critiqued each school department based upon a year-long self-evaluation conducted by teachers, students, and parents, and upon a visit by an evaluating committee, provides basic recommendations for improvement and general commendations. The school then responds to the critique in the form of written plans for dealing with the suggestions.

Based upon these general facts, one would conclude that the evaluative procedure encourages open interaction between students, teachers, and administrators. Despite this fact, however, the report is being kept under virtual lock and key. Dissemination of information has been handled strictly by Principal Sidney Barish and

department chairpeople; these are the only individuals at Schreiber who have full access to the report. Teachers may only obtain the evaluation through the various resource centers, and even in these cases they may peruse only the portion of the report pertaining to their particular field. The students have even less access; they will be able to view the report "some time in the future," and it is then likely to be in paired-down form.

Why the big secret? The evaluation involves the entire school, faculty and students alike. As such, everyone has a stake in it. We all participated in the construction of the self-evaluation, just as we were all involved in the visit by the Middle States board. Continuing along these lines, we should also participate in the reading of the report.

Moreover, one must also look at the stated purpose of the evaluation. It has been expressed time and time again that the purpose of the report is not to judge Schreiber as good or bad, but to see if it is achieving the goals it set for itself. This idea is clearly not conducive to the administration's present policies of limited access.

Clearly, the reasons for limiting access to the report are valid. By sheer logic, it seems rather unfair to have critical information concerning the various members of the Schreiber community available to everyone. Likewise, it is possible for statements to be taken out of context. Yet though the dangers inherent in disseminating information about individual school departments are clear, isn't it more dangerous to limit student and teacher access to this information? We must

trust that students and teachers will take the report as was intended. And, if the entire report is available to students and teachers, how likely is it that statements will be taken out of context? We all have a right to see the report in its initial form and to draw our own conclusions.

It is time for the administration to give the students and teachers of Schreiber the credit they deserve; they are mature, responsible individuals and should be treated as such. Keeping the report available only to a select few is a form of censorship that doesn't quite fit the administration at Schreiber. We are perhaps one of the most liberal of schools on Long Island with regard to freedom of expression. This is no time for the policies to change. Accreditation is something that will benefit all of us; don't we have some say in the process towards this goal?

Rushdie Controversy Offers Model for High School Battles Against Censorship

Several months ago, the world was faced with the 1980's version of "the shot heard round the world": the Ayatollah Khomeini's death sentence for a British author who dared to insult the institution of Islam. World reaction was varied; while bookstores in our own backyard refused to furnish their shelves with the writer's work due to concern for "the safety of employees," the members of the European Economic Community withdrew ambassadors from Iran, authors united to demonstrate against the tyranny of the Ayatollah's words, and Britain refused to reveal the location of the hidden author.

Though the controversy

over *Satanic Verses* has died down, the implications involved are still ripe in the minds of most Americans. A clear blow has been struck in the body of repression; once again we have shown that words cannot be caged, that one should not die for speaking what, for him, is the truth. Yet if this is an idea significant to the average citizen, then it is doubly so to high school students. By virtue of our age, we are perhaps the most vulnerable of citizens to censorship in its various forms; as such, we must also be the most highly attuned to infringements upon our freedom of expression. One such case in point is last year's infamous "Hazelwood decision," a verdict by the Supreme Court

which granted school authorities the right to determine the content of school publications. To consider the decision a "done deal" would be a grave error. On the contrary, whereas most of Mr. Rushdie's fear can now be dissipated, we as a generation are still faced with a constant struggle towards free expression. And while we at Schreiber are fortunate enough to live in a community supportive of free thought and publication, many of our neighbors on Long Island, from Lynbrook to Roslyn, are not quite so lucky. These neighbors need the type of support Rushdie received; these neighbors need the action of their peers, through free press organizations and letters to our con-

gressmen, to free them from censorship.

The ultimate message to be reaped from the Rushdie controversy is not that we are trapped in a sea of repression; rather, it is that we must take the quick action of the European and American communities upon the Ayatollah's death sentence as a model for our own activity. And just as our "elders" would not allow one portion of the population to dictate to them what may be written or said, nor can we allow such behavior to go on in our own county. The time has come for us, the generation that will inherit today's and tomorrow's headlines, to take a stand and to act upon censorship in our own neighborhood.

Times Supports Joel Steinberg Sentencing

When justice is carried out, our faith in our judicial system is often renewed. On Thursday, March 23, Judge Harold Rothwax sentenced Joel Steinberg, a man convicted on a manslaughter charge for killing his six year old daughter, to eight and a half to twenty-five years in a maximum security state penitentiary. The judge additionally recommended that parole be denied so that Steinberg would have to serve his full time. This sentencing, the maximum one allowable for manslaughter in New York State, came after a long and tedious trial in which Steinberg was shown to be a dominating, callous, and brutal monster. The sentence was undoubtedly a just one.

The trial took a discerning look into the lives of Steinberg, his common law wife, Hedda Nussbaum, and their illegally

adopted daughter, Lisa. It was shown repeatedly that Joel demanded complete submission and servitude from Hedda and Lisa. He was said to have beaten both Hedda and Lisa, and this abuse was evident from the post-mortem pictures of Lisa's corpse and the grotesque footage of Hedda's battered body. Though Steinberg asserted that he did not abuse Lisa and that her death was not his fault, evidence pointing to the contrary was overwhelming. Hedda's own testimony was most damaging to Steinberg's case; she recounted numerous examples of Steinberg's domineering and egotistical personality in addition to describing the events leading up to Lisa's death.

Joel Steinberg never threw himself at the mercy of the court; he never admitted that he was criminally negligent, and he

never showed remorse for his own actions. Though he did claim at the end of the trial and before the sentencing that he would have to live with the loss of Lisa's life and that he was extremely sad, this last minute attempt at pity was more affected than real. As Rothwax stated, Joel still did not accept responsibility for Lisa's death.

Joel's sentence was an appropriate one; he deserved the maximum sentence. Many argue that he should have been convicted and sentenced for second degree murder, a crime carrying a harsher maximum sentence than manslaughter. But the jury decided not to do so, and Judge Rothwax chose the harshest sentence for Steinberg. If Steinberg serves his sentence with good behavior, as much as one quarter of his maximum sentence can be taken off, and he

would stay in jail for no longer than 17 years. Yet no matter what happens in the future, the sentencing was definitely deserved, and Steinberg was brought to justice.

Write to the Schreiber Times

We need your input on the articles we print, the editorials we present, and general school issues. Submit letters in the Pub Room and let yourself be heard.