8/The Daily Tar Heel/Wednesday, Januar '9



91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

EDDIE WOOTEN, Managing Editor

CHARLES ELLMAKER, Associate Editor	FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor
KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor	MICHAEL TOOLE, City Ed
KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor	KAREN FISHER, Features Ed
MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor	JEFF GROVE, Arts Ed
MELISSA MOORE, News Editor	CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Ed

Actions speak louder

After years of bellicose rhetoric, President Reagan issued a White House statement Monday that the United States was finally ready and able to negotiate with the Soviet Union in arms talks. Finally? According to the president, the United States has only in recent years grown militarily and economically to the point where the shutters on the window of vulnerability are snugly shut. Unfortunately, the snug optimism of the Reagan speech failed to include any specific proposals with which to lure the Soviets back to the bargaining table.

In the president's eyes, the first years of his administration were a time of catch-up. Among his missions were the restoration of both vitality to the American economy and safety to the American people. The president now feels that he has accomplished both. And he feels that the defense spending which helped the United States to achieve the latter can now help us achieve world peace.

It's a marvelous routine of political gymnastics — this equation of defense spending and the chance for world peace — but it's one that the

Soviets aren't buying. Despite the absense in the Monday speech of the president's characteristic references to the Soviet Union as an empire of evil destined for the "ash heap of history," the Russians aren't fooled. The Soviet press agency Tass responded to the Reagan statement by saying that his proposals were "basically of a propaganda nature" and were devoid of new ideas. In this case, Soviet journalists couldn't be more accurate.

Reagan's speech failed to recognize that it wasn't so much an atmosphere of hostility that led to the cessation of arms talks with the Soviets; it was more the failure of either the United States or the Soviet Union to take a first step. The president's speech assured those Americans willing to believe him that the administration is putting arms negotiations at the top of its list of priorities. It portrayed the president, whose re-election may hinge on his ability to convince the nation that he is not a warmonger, as a man of peace. That Reagan's speech recognized both the importance of arms reduction and the need for a less belligerent vocabulary in dealing with the Soviet Union is unequivocally a good sign, but it is only a beginning. Mere rhetoric will not limit the numbers of nuclear weapons spread across the globe. If Reagan truly wants the world to be a safer place, he must face the fact that someone has to take the lead, has to offer the first tangible concession. If Reagan really wants to convince the world of the strength of the United States, he will show them the strength of U.S. leadership.

In favor of lending a helping hand

By KATHERINE SCHULTZ

Highways. These concrete and asphalt roadways tend to convey a stark and cold image. The world rushes by at 55 miles an hour with everyone in a hurry to reach his destination. Highways are desolate and lonely and produce little enjoyment unless you are lucky enough to be on one with gorgeous scenery and no billboards.

Whenever I get on the highway I start feeling defensive. It's hard not to when there is an 18-wheeler five feet behind you and the right lane is filled. It's hard not to feel defensive when the news is constantly filled with stories about accidents, drunkdrivers, robberies, etc., that plague these paths of transit.

Highways aren't places that you expect to see the better qualities in mankind emerge. Most of us are probably under the impression that if you get in trouble on the highway, then you are on your own. It's almost too dangerous to accept help from strangers these days.

With these negative connotations set into the subconscious part of my mind, I set off Saturday on Interstate-85 to Greensboro. I had a friend with me, and we expected to go to Greensboro, shop and then come back home.

The first 20 minutes of our trip was interrupted by something I'm sure many people see but do nothing about. About a mile from the 751 exit to Duke University, we passed a sight that only helped reiterate the callousness of some highway travelers, and to an extent, our society today.

Good samaritans in short supply, but incident restores some faith

In the grass median close to the left lane of I-85 sat five dogs. They weren't trying to cross; they were just sitting and staring at the vehicles that roared by. No cars, houses or people were in the vicinity to indicate that these poor animals belonged to someone.

One look at Susan confirmed what I knew immediately; we had to go back and do something.

So I pulled across the median and drove back to where the dogs sat. We parked in the median leaving our hazard lights on to indicate trouble, although no one seemed to care. Trucks and cars rumbled by as if we didn't exist.

Five lonely faces stared at us with looks that seemed to say, "Why are we here? How did we end up here?" Two of the those pitiful faces belonged to sixmonth-old puppies.

The first thought that ran through my mind was total contempt for the owner of these dogs. Either the dogs were dumped on the highway, or the owner was too irresponsible to have a pet. Too many dog owners think they are doing animals a favor by letting them run loose. They inevitably end up getting hit by a car or lost.

These dogs had no sense of direction. They weren't going anywhere; they just sat and whimpered as we tried to coax them into the car. We had hoped to take them to an animal shelter, but they were too scared to get into the car. With much regret we decided to leave and go call someone for help.

At the first exit we found a phone and called the highway emergency number. After explaining the situation and location of the dogs to the dispatcher, I received a rather irritatingly nasal reply of, "Well, miss, I'll see what I can do, but the dog warden doesn't usually pick up on Saturdays unless it is an emergency." (Dog warden is Orange County's fancy term for dog catcher.)

At this point I was slightly disgusted with the human race, so I asked the dispatcher very nastily why this didn't qualify as an emergency. "If the dogs tried to cross the highway and caused several cars to wreck, then would it be an emergency?" I said. The point was taken and I received the ever-effective "I'll see what I can do."

We then headed back to the site with a bag of dog food in hand, in hopes that it would help lure them away from the roadside.

Much to our surprise, two other women and a highway patrolman had pulled off and were trying to get the dogs into one woman's station wagon. It eased my mind a great deal to see that someone else actually cared enough to stop and help.

We pulled over and approached the group, but we saw that it was already too late to help one of the dogs. The mother of the two puppies had been hit by a truck that hadn't bothered to stop, according to one woman. Its crippled body lay on the other side of the road as one dog ran circles around and howled.

With much coaxing we managed to get one dog and the two puppies into the station wagon. The third dog ran up and down the road frantically and then disappeared into the woods.

If this intense highway melodrama does anything, maybe it will convince others to act as good samaritans when needed. I had begun to think that it had become extinct until Saturday afternoon. We may have only saved three of the dogs, and we may have only prolonged their lives for another week or so, but they were better off in the animal shelter than they were on I-85.

Too often we hear of isolated incidents of good samaritans being turned upon by the peole they are trying to help. Our society has become afraid of lending a helping hand.

I may have gotten dirty and cold, and I could have easily been bitten by one of the dogs had they been aggressive, but I know I would have felt a lot worse if I had just driven on by without doing a thing.

Katherine Schultz, a junior journalism major from Winston-Salem, is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR DUbrothers should apologize for tasteless 'joke'

To the editor:

The near-execution of James W. Hutchins last week stirred strong and sometimes odd emotions in many people. The U.S. Supreme Court's conservative wing (Powell, Burger, Rehnquist, O'Connor, et al) displayed vehemence in their majority decision not to grant a stay of execution - anger clearly directed against the defense lawyers for manipulating the legal system to save a man's life. The defense team manifested a relief that bordered on jubilation at the temporary success of their life-and-death struggle. Hutchins and his family seem to have been more restrained, which is understandable considering that his murder by the state has probably only been delayed. The families of the murdered policemen were horribly upset, to the point of breakdown, that Hutchin's life was not taken as planned.

know of took place right here at UNC and is not to be dignified with the name "emotion." The brothers of Delta Upsilon fraternity had the disgusting bad taste and lack of moral consciousness to name their Friday the 13th party "Come its citizens, namely you and I and the brothers of Delta Upsilon.

Since I'm not a judge and their act was not unlawful but simply base and shameful, I can do nothing but demand that, regardless of their individual or collective could find. Her action may even have been unlawful, but the whole issue of the death penalty today forces one who considers it seriously to choose between what is right and what is law.

This is the same choice that death row

Power failure

Nuclear power took a sound beating this past week as one half-finished nuclear generating station was abandoned and another, nearly completed, plant was denied a license to operate by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. These two major setbacks are the latest and most grave in a series of blows to the future of nuclear power in the United States. And denial of a license to Commonwealth Edison's Byron Nuclear Power Station near Rockford, Illinois, shows a new tough line by the NRC board, a stature which many power companies feel may be too stringent in its strivings to protect the public.

Spokesmen for Edison Electric say the ruling by the board was unanticipated but did not think the thumbs-down position would stand long. The NRC board denied the license not from any supported doubts about the plant's safety but because the company has failed to provide adequate documentation concerning safety checks during construction. The company has invested some \$3.5 billion in the project so far, and Edison says the board should have given an earlier indication of its new, tougher rules. Commonwealth Edison is generally respected as the leading nuclear power utility.

Several questions arise from this unprecedented situation. First, have nuclear generating station builders not been ensuring proper public and worker safety? Have nuclear plants been automatically granted licenses because of their high cost? And has the NRC been lax in spelling out their safety expectations?

Some 60 nuclear generating plants are under construction at present, and the NRC denial could have grave consequences for their builders, especially since many builders see Edison as the standard-setter in the industry.

As other countries pull ahead in the nuclear power field and as electric utilities in the United States shy away from nuclear power and toward possibly more environmentally endangering power supplies such as coal, the NRC and the industry must sit down together to discuss exactly what freedoms and constraints will apply to nuclear power plants. The public and the environment must be protected from potentially harmful radioactive products, but the United States cannot sit by and allow inefficient rules and communication to threaten the country's energy future.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Assistants: Bill Riedy and Gigi Sonner. Assistant Managing Editors: Joel Broadway and Amy Tanner News Desk: Tracy Adams, Joel Katzenstein and Sheryl Thomas

News: Tracy Adams, Dick Anderson, Diana Bosniack, Keith Bradsher, Amy Branen, Lisa Brantley, Hope Buffington, Tom Conlon, Kathie Collins, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Lynn Davis, Dennis Dowdy, Chris Edwards, Kathy Farley, Steve Ferguson, Genie French, Kim Gilley, Heather Hay, Tracy Hilton, Andy Hodges, Melissa Holland, Reggie Holley, Sue Kuhn, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelley, Janet Olson, Rosemary Osborne, 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, Sally Smith, Mark Stinneford, Carrie Szymeczek, Amy Tanner, Wayne Thompson, Vance Trefethen, Chuck Wallington, Melanie Wells, Lynda Wolf, Rebekah Wright, Jim Yardley and Jim Zook. But the most staggering reaction I

Doctors and abortion profits

To the editor:

Regarding the Jan. 12 letter from Doctors Hendricks, Gray and Ewing: It is truly grisly to hear medical professionals boasting about the safety of a procedure whose very object is to inflict death and destruction. One might wonder whether Get Numb — In Honor of James W. Hutchins."

The degree of their callousness, irresponsibility and plain lack of human feeling goes way beyond a bad joke and comes very near to being a crime. Were it so, and were I the presiding judge, I would sentence all of them to spend next Friday night soberly watching films of past executions by the horrifying process of cyanide asphyxiation. They would have to watch the prisoner's body twitch and thrash against his bonds as he emits indescribable sounds of pain for as long as 18 minutes before being pronounced dead — murdered with undeniable malice aforethought by the state in the name of

their perception of the matter is clouded by their own personal stake in the profitability of the procedure.

> Russell Board Homestead Court



views on the death penalty, they do the decent thing and make a public apology, addressing a copy of it to the family and defense team of Mr. Hutchins. I doubt, however, that they have the guts to do this.

The only commendable action in this whole incident was that of Wienke Tax, who tore down as many posters as she prisoner advocates make when they choose to defend guilty life before murderous legality (thus opposing them to Chief Justice Burger and his ghoulish majority). Wienke's choice, like theirs, does her honor.

> Peter L. Patrick Carr St.

More on SECS

Editor's Note

To the editor:

Cindi Ross' story on the Sexuality Education Counseling Service, "SECS provides a listening ear," (DTH, Jan. 11), was lacking in several material details. I would like to compensate for the article's omissions by revealing to your readers some little-known facts about this ugly little group.

SECS, formerly known as the Human Sexuality Information and Counseling Service, was founded years ago by Takey Crist, a Jacksonville pro-choice advocate. Abortion promotion remains an important part of the group's agenda today, showing up in the books and literature SECS provides on the subject and in the mindset of their "counselors," all of whom are trained at the Fleming Center in Raleigh.

SECS attempts to make homosexual activity and premarital sex acceptable to all with a "nonjudgmental" approach, translating into an anything-goes amorality. No matter what the sexual aberration, someone at SECS will stamp it with the SECS seal of approval. Director Brian Richmond freely admits that among his counselors are homosexuals and bisexuals. And the group's promo-

tains the following statement: "By helping people understand the facts about homosexuality, SECS hopes to end the fear, stigma, and prejudice that threatens the lives and happiness of all gay people." SECS is probably the only campus group that derives 100 percent of its funding from mandatory Student Activity

tional brochure, "SECS on Sex," con-

group that derives 100 percent of its funding from mandatory Student Activity Fees. Every student contributes to the SECS budget, whether he or she wants to or not. This year's budget is \$4,733 — an impressive sum to spend, especially in light of SECS's rent-free Union office space.

SECS people are secretive in much of what they do. Seldom do they hold strategy meetings open to the general public in accessible places; often they meet at one of their "counselor's" homes. I once attempted to attend a SECS dorm outreach and was rebuffed. SECS insults us all by refusing to be accessible to the very people who make its continued existence possible.

> Chris Kremer Carolina Students for Life

Although *The Daily Tar Heel* welcomes columns of opinion from both staff members and others from the University community, none of these columns necessarily reflects the editorial opinion of *The Daily Tar Heel* or its collective editors and writers. Only unsigned editorials in the left-hand column of the editorial page represent the official opinion of the newspaper.

Not out of the clear yet

By BILL RIEDY

When Ronald Reagan came into office he promised to increase defense spending, lower taxes and balance the budget. Three years later he has managed only the two easiest of those - increasing spending and decreasing taxes. Obviously it is much harder to accomplish his third objective of balancing the budget without reconciling spending and taxing. In fact, as most people had predicted would happen with more spending and less income, the federal deficit has soared - last year to a whopping \$195.4 billion. Thus in spite of the good condition of the economy, serious threats present themselves in the forms of the ballooning federal deficit and the challenge of foreign competition. But right now President Reagan is much more content to enjoy the fruits of and take credit for an economy enjoying low inflation, positive growth in the gross national product and a declining unemployment rate. The president is also too pleased with these results to be much bothered by whether their causes were monetarist, supply side or Keynesian. At any rate, they are no longer being called by what they once were. As Reagan pointed out in October, "You know that the best clue that our program is working is our critics don't call if Reaganomics any more." Nevertheless, much of the credit for the recovery belongs to a man whose politics don't exactly coincide with the president's, Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker. After squeezing the money supply tightly enough to reduce inflation from 12.4 percent in 1980 to only 3.9 percent two years later, the Federal Reserve eased the reins enough to push down the prime rate and trigger an unexpectedly swift upturn in the economy.

Not only has the administration been taking credit for the economic recovery, but Volcker has received credit enough to at least defuse much of the criticism previously aimed at him. As Sen. John Heinz told Volcker in committee, "The only things I can think of that you haven't been blamed for are herpes and giving up the Panama Canal."

But things aren't exactly perfect. Economists are hesitant about just how successful the economy will be this year due to a few imponderables. Most economists have been warning of harmful side effects of the ever-growing federal deficit. "I don't think there is any question about the corrosive effect of the abroau are proportionally more expensive. In other words, American producers are losing out, both at home and abroad, to the strength of the dollar. Many of the heavier industries such as autos, steel and rubber have been calling for more import protection. And though the Reagan administration has, in its rhetoric, rejected protectionism, in practice it often succumbs to pressure for import barriers. Meanwhile, many manufacturers are learning they have to shut down inefficient operations and streamline in order to remain competitive with foreign, manufacturers.

Industry is also rethinking its attitude toward labor. 1983 saw an unsuccessful strike at Greyhound, a food-workers' union take about a 20 percent pay cut and an AT&T strike that was unable to render any dire effects. Unions will certainly never regain the importance and strength they once had. Management has recently been taking a harder line than in the past to hold labor accountable at negotiations. With companies trying to reduce costs, labor unions had to suffer some pay cuts and lose clout. Business has, out of necessity, been handling some of its share of the problem in reckoning with foreign competition. Unfortunately, it is up to government to do something about the deficit. Even though the president's chief economist, Martin Feldstein, and many others have repeatedly warned that taxes may have to be raised, the president is unwisely disregarding their warnings. The administration seems to be counting on the current wave of the recovery to carry us to a solid, stable economy. But without remedying the deficit problems, it could easily find itself adrift in a weak, lopsided, unsustainable recovery.

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

Features: Clarice Bickford, Lauren Brown, Tom Camacho, Toni Carter, Charles Gibbs, Tom Grey, Marymelda Hall, Kathy Hopper, Charles Karnes, Joel Katzenstein, Dianna Massie, Kathy Norcross, Amy Styers, Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: J. Bonasia, Steve Carr, Ivy Hilliard, Jo Ellen Meekins, Sheryl Thomas and David Schmidt, assistant arts editor.

Photography: Larry Childress, Lori Heeman, Jeff Neuville, Susie Post, Al Steele and Lori Thomas. Zane Saunders, assistant photography editor.

Business: Anne Fulcher, business manager; Angela Booze and Tammy Martin, accounts receivable clerks; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; William Austin, assistant circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman and Julie Jones, classified advertising staff; Yvette Moxin, receptionist; Debbie McCurdy, secretary.

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

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

deficits," said Alan Greenspan, economist and unofficial presidential adviser.

Although some politicians and economists may argue that it doesn't matter how big the deficit is, most tend to hold large deficits responsible for higher interest rates. While it may be argued that high deficits have never been proved to have adverse effects on the economy, the general theory holds that huge deficits, meaning increased government borrowing, cause private borrowing to be squeezed out of the economy, thus starving companies of necessary investment.

Unfortunately, this is an election year, and both Congress and the White House are unwilling to do anything about the budget deficit. But with the danger of the economy weakening by 1985 there is the possibility that it will be too late if action is put off that long, at least for this recovery.

The other main threat to the current recovery is that of foreign competition. Under the current recovery, the U.S. dollar has fared particularly well against almost all other major currencies. This has not only made travel abroad much more affordable to Americans, but has made foreign goods here less expensive. On the other hand, American goods

Bill Riedy, a junior English and political science major from Raleigh, is an editorial assistant for The Daily Tar Heel.