

GEORGE SHADROU, Editor

DINITA JAMES, Managing Editor  
BRAD KUTROW, Associate Editor  
THOMAS JESSIMAN, Associate EditorKAREN ROWLEY, News Editor  
PAM KELLEY, University Editor  
MARTHA WAGGONER, City Editor  
JIM HUMMEL, State and National EditorBILL FIELDS, Sports Editor  
MARK MURRELL, Features Editor  
TOM MOORE, Arts Editor  
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor  
MELANIE SILL, Weekend Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

## A day in the life

It was a cool October day when the Carolina student stepped out onto his front porch and picked up the morning newspaper. He had just taken his last midterm of the week the day before and he actually felt good. The air smelled wonderful, filled with a cleanliness and crispness unique to fall. It had an invigorating effect, and the class he had in 10 minutes no doubt would go on without him. So our friend sat down at the kitchen table and opened the newspaper, happy, relaxed and satisfied.

Naturally, he immediately turned to the sports section. The Yankees and the Royals were going at one another and the surprise Houston Astros were battling the Philadelphia Phillies. This would have been OK except our friend was a Boston fan. He had been for many years. The sports page only depressed him, so he turned to the news section.

Iraq and Iran were at war, and the possibility of it escalating appeared imminent. In Greensboro, the potentially explosive trial of several Ku Klux Klan and Nazi members continued, with witnesses describing the events that led to five people being killed. Our friend wondered what would happen if these violent and bitter men went free. He didn't want to think about it. So he skipped to another story.

The defense status of the United States was in bad shape, the story quoted a State Department spokesman as saying. Should a war between the United States and Russia break out, the United States would do well to hold out for more than a few days. Our friend could not stand any more. He wondered why the great powers of the world talked about war so much, but never encouraged the rest of the world to talk about peace, about building instead of destroying.

A story on the inside pages reported that World Bank President Robert McNamara foresaw severe starvation and poverty in numerous Third World countries if the Western Powers, particularly the United States, did not make a sincere effort to combat the problem. Our friend was beginning to wish he had gone to class. After all, at least there people talked about parties, theories and grades. The thought of all those people starving and all those people dying was sickening.

So he took a sip of coffee and a bite of toast and searched for the election coverage. Surely the men who wanted to lead the greatest, freest country in the world would have something to say about the state of the world, something profound, something that showed they understood the threats to world peace and the role that this country should play.

But, our friend found neither high ideas nor realistic proposals spewing out of the mouths of the candidates. Republican nominee Ronald Reagan was wearing a hard hat this day, telling the group of mill workers how President Jimmy Carter had botched up the country. Reagan never detailed how he would make things better; he just talked about keeping government out of the lives of people, perhaps thinking that such a noble idea would suffice without further elaboration.

President Carter said in a story that to elect Reagan was to invite racism, war and everything else bad in the world. But the president never talked about those pressing issues. He just listed some of the things he had done for the group he was talking in front of and then smiled and waved. Such a nice man.

And John Anderson, a man who claimed to be the alternative to these incompetents, continued to drop in the polls. The story went on to detail Anderson's vindictive and acerbic campaign rhetoric. He seemed a little better, but he couldn't win.

Our friend put the paper down. He looked outside and found that the sunny day had grown dark, that clouds loomed overhead. He didn't know what to do, so he threw the paper in the trash. Then, without thinking he turned up the rock music on the radio, crawled into bed and pulled the blankets over his head.

## Laundry: Speed Queen and Tide in Hades

By DAVID POOLE

Whoever made up the cliché saying that the only certain things in life are death and taxes left one out. You can always depend on at least one other thing—the fact that the dryer into which you just deposited 50 cents will not dry your clothes.

If, when I die, I am sent to the place of eternal torment, I'm positive I'll get laundry duty. That thought alone is enough to make me repent.

Let me give you some idea of the degree of hatred we're talking about here. I'd rather listen to "John Davidson Sings Donna Summer" for the rest of eternity than wash clothes.

You have to understand that I am not the domestic type. Until I came to college, I thought my clothes were washed via some mystical power. I just threw the dirty ones into a huge pile in the middle of the floor of my room. The next time I saw them, they were cleaned, pressed, folded and stacked neatly in my drawer.

Imagine my surprise when I learned that I would either have to wash these clothes myself or hire, at great expense, my own valet. As we all know, nothing can be done at great expense when you're in school, so I was elected.

As time passed in my early days here, I honed the practice of putting off laundry into an art. But as intervals between laundry trips widened, I began to notice signs from those around me. Fellow dorm residents would come into the TV lounge, look at me, sniff the air and ask, "When's the funeral?" My roommate, no stickler for personal hygiene himself,

bought a case of room deodorizers.

My clothes never really got all that bad. I am compelled to do laundry about once every 10 days because that's when my supply of underwear starts touching bottom. Let's face it, we can all fake it with anything else by making little jokes like "My jeans are so dirty they could stand in the corner by themselves," or, "I wore these pants with the holes in them to my senior prom," but most of us just can't bring ourselves to fake it with underwear.

This, for me at least, goes back to my mom, who had a morbid fear I would someday get hit by a car when I had on dirty underwear.

"What if you're in an accident and they take you to the hospital?" she used to ask. "The doctors and nurses would look at your underwear and say 'Gosh, this kid must have a sorry mom.'"

Life in the Turn Lane

Because of her fear, I had this mental image of myself lying on a road somewhere, bleeding profusely after being run over by a speeding Greyhound.

An ambulance screeches to a halt and two attendants rush toward me.

"Quick," one says, "let's stop that bleeding."  
"Wait," the other interjects, "check his underwear first."

Laundry is always an adventure for me. The first

time I did it myself, I piled my clothes into two washers. I saw no need to sort them. How should I know that towels tend to shed?

When the little red light on the machine went off 30 minutes later, I opened the machine and took out my pants. They looked like they had been to a lint convention. "Oh well," I rationalized, "it'll come off in the dryer."

Wrong. Not only did the lint root deeper into the cloth, I had chosen two dryers with opposite personalities. One had two settings, Arctic and Tundra and it took three hours and most of the dimes in the Western Hemisphere for those clothes to get dry. The other dryer had approximately the intensity of a blowtorch. That load came out looking like a pile of crumpled paper.

When I do laundry now, things aren't usually as eventful. They're just boring. There's never a good time to wash clothes because the laundries are always packed. That means that you have to wait around for a dryer that probably won't work anyway.

The quickest and easiest way I know to get my laundry done is to go home for a weekend. Mom says the only reason I ever come home is so she can wash my clothes. Mom knows me too well.

If indeed there are washing machines in hell, and I'm sure there are, the one I'd have to spend an eternity running would likely break down during every rinse cycle, and I, forever more, would have to load those sopping clothes into another machine.

Does anybody know Billy Graham's phone number?

David Poole, a senior journalism major from Gastonia, is a columnist and assistant sports editor for The Daily Tar Heel.

## Letters to the editor

### University ignores needs of flight students

To the editor:

At a Chapel Hill Town Council meeting Monday night, John L. Temple of the University Business and Finance Office proposed that all flight training be terminated at Horace Williams Airport. This proposal stems from a UNC Medical Foundation request for a special building permit to allow the construction of a hangar on airport property, but because of Town Council objections to present noise and residential safety concerns, the University has been forced into a compromise. That compromise involves the loss of all University student's flight training privileges at Horace Williams Airport.

Being a University student and a flight instructor, I would like to clear up some misunderstandings that the University and Town Council have regarding this matter. First of all, this airport is operated for the benefit of the University which, in any definition of the word, is for the students and faculty.

By terminating flight instruction, students and faculty will be forced to continue flight training at the Raleigh-Durham Airport.

Regarding safety, records clearly indicate that there has never been an accident involving flight instruction that resulted in injury or property damage to any Chapel Hill resident. Residents' worries of aircraft accidents occurring over Chapel Hill are unwarranted.

Another misunderstanding concerns the noise level of these low-powered training aircraft. Training aircraft produce less noise than any other aircraft, and much less noise than the multiengine aircraft flown by the medical foundation.

Because of the University's "misunderstandings" of the situation, students and faculty are losing the chance to take advantage of a valuable

'BATTLE RAGES ON BETWEEN IRAN AND IRAQ'  
—NO, DOESN'T FAZE ME...



'CHEMICALS CONTAMINATE ENVIRONMENT'  
—NOPE. I'M STILL NOT DEPRESSED...



'REAGAN, EAST MAY JOIN HELMS IN CAPITAL.'  
—OH, TAKE ME NOW, LORD....



opportunity that otherwise would be open to them. I believe the University administrators are clearly sacrificing student interests to satisfy their own.

Steve Robbins  
Steve Stenersen  
Mike Matthews  
Chapel Hill

#### Flying flags

To the editor:

I am proud to be a graduate of Carolina and I am proud to be a native and a resident of the state of Georgia.

As such, I was upset to see the lack of respect shown to the newest member of the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Georgia Tech Yellow Jackets specifically, at a recent football game, the UNC Athletic Department had the outdated Georgia state flag flying over the visitor's side of the field. For nearly 25 years the major portion of the Georgia flag has been the well-recognized Confederate battle flag, not the one white and two horizontal stripes on the flag I saw Saturday. One would think that 25 years is plenty of time for the Athletic Department to become aware of the change, yet I do hope it was merely a case of oversight and not one of apathy.

Granted, the mistake probably was due to the long absence of a Georgia team from Kenan Stadium, and most of the fans present were not even aware that a flag was even flying, but Carolina has always prided itself on its class, and I hate to see it embarrassed by such an unnecessary and absurd error. Let us hope that by the next time the Yellow Jackets play in Chapel Hill the Athletic Department can come up with a few bucks for the right flag. I'll be happy to send them the name of a good flag maker in Atlanta.

Barry W. Burt, '78  
Athens, Ga.

## Anderson's chances

### Independent deserves thought

By JOHN SCHAEENMAN

In the last week, *The Daily Tar Heel* has printed three quotes from students complaining about either the lack of specifics from the candidates for president, or about the "blatness" of this election year. They seem to embody a feeling that I have noticed on campus that candidates never say anything specific, and that this year's election has no real choices.

Admittedly, there were parts of John B. Anderson's speech that were rhetorical, but to say that "nothing meaty came out of it" is untrue and an example of what is wrong with many voters on this campus.

Some of the "meat" in Anderson's speech, included: "In the Anderson-Lucey National Unity Campaign Platform, we have specifically pledged that we will enforce the 'Toxic Substances Control Act'...that we will work to accept or to adopt and to implement the 'Toxic Waste Superfund Legislation'.... We ought to have an investment credit on the statute books, in the internal revenue books that would give credit for those qualifying research and development expenditures that will help America regain the competitive cutting edge that we once had."

"I haven't promised America the easiest thing in the world to promise, and that is a tax cut in 1981...I propose a \$2 billion youth jobs program in the next fiscal year...a \$1 billion program to put to work the unemployed youth in the cities of our nation...we cannot afford to cut taxes in 1981 just to please the political instincts of a couple of presidential candidates."

Earlier, in a press conference, Anderson said he favored the federal government's anti-smoking

campaign and that he would eliminate tobacco price supports.

I cannot believe that anyone would expect a candidate to get more specific in a 20-minute speech. All three candidates have published and stated specific proposals, and it is our job to know them and to make a decision based on who we believe has the best solutions to the ills befalling our nation.

If anyone does not know where to find these proposals, I would suggest that he read the platforms published by all three parties.

Or, they can watch the numerous network reports on the election—shows like *Washington Week in Review*, or *Face the Nation* or the evening news shows. They could watch some of the nominating conventions and the televised presidential debates. They could read editorialists like David S. Broder or Rowland Evans and Robert Novak of the *Washington Post*. They could read *Time*, *Newsweek* or *U.S. News and World Report*.

If we do not know what specifics the candidates have offered, it is our own fault, not the fault of the candidate.

This year's election does have real choices, and the person we elect will have an impact on our lives that could be permanent.

To those who say that this is an uninteresting and boring election, I have only to remind them that in 1968 the same adjectives were used to describe the race between Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey. Many people felt that there were no real choices then, but six years later they realized their mistake.

We cannot afford another mistake of that proportion, and it is our responsibility to see that we do know the candidates, that we do know their records and their proposals, and that we elect the best man to run our country in 1980. If we do not, we have only ourselves to blame.

John Schaeenman is a sophomore political science major from Spring Creek.



Congressman John B. Anderson  
...a viable candidate?

### Anderson could put Reagan over

By ROGER N. LANCASTER

He won't poll a single electoral vote, and his popular support has been dwindling since August. With John B. Anderson splitting the moderate-to-liberal vote, Republican presidential candidate Ronald Reagan has the chance of carrying key populous states that are traditionally liberal and Democratic, like New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Clearly, in the 1980 election, the "Anderson difference" is none other than Ronald Reagan. Why then, does Anderson remain in the race when his presence is almost calculated to elect Reagan?

According to Anderson and his supporters, Anderson is staying in the race to get fresh ideas into the campaign, to give the American people a choice. A progressive mystique surrounds the silver-haired gentleman, especially among white, middle-class college students. But what are those "fresh ideas," and what is the source of that "progressive mystique?"

One of Anderson's favorite proposals is a 50-cent-per-gallon gas tax that he holds up as the paradigm of progressive policy. Actually, this sort of tax is a regressive tax; it unduly burdens the poorest who can least afford it. When asked about his solution to inflation, Anderson never bats an eye, but replies "fiscal responsibility," a euphemism for austerity and cuts in social spending.

It seems the only thing "independent" about the Anderson campaign is that his media image is independent of his voting record in the House. His record is clear and revealing: he is a Republican, and he votes like one. In 1978 he supported the Kemp-Roth tax plan. In a typical flip-flop fashion, he now calls his support irresponsible. According to the League of Conservation Voters, he voted "wrong" on all

20 of the nuclear-power issues that came before the House, even those that came up after Three Mile Island. One of his brochures claims that he was one of the first representatives to come out against the war in Vietnam; this is a pure fabrication. He voted pro-war until the troops were withdrawn. His record on issues affecting labor, blacks, the elderly and the poor are all conservative and Republican.

If there is anything "progressive" or "moderate" about this Republican then, it is only in comparison to the extremists who have seized power in the Republican Party and nominated Ronald Reagan. In fact, Anderson seems to have opted for campaign positions between (and not to the left of) Democratic and Republican positions. So much for the "fresh ideas" and "progressive" hoopla. His position should be clear, despite his media image: He is a moderate-to-conservative Republican, not a free-thinker, not a progressive, not an independent.

What the Anderson campaign does emphasize is a possible dissolution of the two-party system as we know it. The Republican Party already has lost virtually all its liberals. As it slides further and further to the right, it is now precipitating most of its moderates out of the party. This process, transforming the Republican Party into the Conservative Party, is also creating a lot of jobless political hacks that will neither affiliate as Democrats nor get out of politics. New Yorkers will remember how archconservative Republican James Buckley was elected to Senate in a liberal state: The moderate Republican incumbent, after being displaced in the primary, ran as a third-party candidate and split the liberal vote. A similar situation may be developing again in the New York Senate race, with displaced Republican Jacob Javits running as a third-party candidate. The lesson should be clear, even to Anderson: His campaign at most can throw the election to Reagan. One can only conclude that, despite his righteous protests, ego and vanity are the real reasons he remains in the race.

Roger N. Lancaster is a junior anthropology major from Goldsboro.