JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor MICHAEL TOOLE, Associate Editor MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor WAYNE THOMPSON, State and National Editor MELANIE WELLS, City Editor VANCE TREFETHEN, Business Editor STUART TONKINSON, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor SHARON SHERIDAN, Features Editor JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

Long live the queen

They've taken the fun out of Homecoming — what little fun we had left. For the first time in modern Carolina history, no one will know the thrill of a bouquet of roses and a crown — the thrill of being Queen for a Day.

The fact is, Homecoming's problems extend beyond the apathy surrounding the election of a Homecoming queen. For the past several years, Homecoming has been little more than just another Carolina football weekend.

Given our druthers, we'd like to see UNC model itself after ACC arch-rival Clemson. Homecoming is not a display of mediocrity in Death Valley — it is an event. Tigerama, the school's annual Friday-night gala, boasts area personalities and more than 10,000 faithful. The mammoth display of floats by campus organizations is staggering. In the past three years, comedians Red Skelton, Bob Hope and Bill Cosby have provided post-game entertainment. And yes, Clemson does crown a homecoming queen.

We understand that the Carolina Athletic Association, with its paltry budget of \$1,575, cannot possibly stage a weekend of such grandeur. Increased student interest would be necessary to justify additional funding for Homecoming.

But the CAA is taking steps in the wrong direction. Eliminating a tradition as well-established as Homecoming queen is like converting the Bell Tower into condominiums. Or replacing the Old Well with a keg. These examples are extreme, yes, but so is the absurdity of replacing Homecoming queen with an award such as the Carolina's Pride.

It was last year's election of a male Homecoming queen, Yure Nmomma, that prompted this year's changes. But Nmomma taught us a lesson. His campaign was flawless in its execution; his constituents, by voting in droves, made it clear just how apathetic the student body was toward the whole election.

We deserve another chance. If the thought of electing another male Homecoming queen bothers some, they have two choices:

• Change the rules. Better yet, Get out there and vote.

The Carolina's Pride Award, a nononsense kind of accolade, is not the answer. In its defense, CAA President Jennie Edmundson says that "students' limited knowledge of the candidates decreases their motivation to take an active role in voting." But the same would appear to be true of the Carolina's Pride Award, given to the student who "goes the extra unrequired mile." The queen competition has always been more of a contest between the spirit of various residence halls and organizations,

winning candidate. There may be a place at UNC for the Carolina's Pride Award. But it's not on the Homecoming court during halftime ceremonies — unless, of course, it wants to share the 50-yard line with the Homecoming queen.

anyway; the largest turnout equals the

The interminable

One of the key issues of the presidential campaign is the so-called "evenness" of Reagan's economic recovery. Put simply, the issue revolves around who's benefitting most from the economic upswing and who's paying for it. The answer from Reagan's critics is that the poor and needy have been left on the outside looking in when it comes to any good economic news.

Reagan, on the other hand, contends that given some time the country's economic growth will reach everyone and we'll all be happy. But after Reagan pocket-vetoed a bill that would have employed thousands of young people in conservation work, the unemployed youth of America must be wondering, "How long do we have to wait for our recovery?"

The bill would have allocated \$225 million over three years for an American Conservation Corps, providing summer jobs for 50,000 and year-round programs of work and training for 35,000 more in three years. By most standards — a pretty good investment.

But Reagan said the bill would have only created "temporary make-work" jobs and denounced it as a "discredited approach to youth unemployment."

The intangible, but certainly real,

aspects of motivation and self-esteem cannot be dismissed as a "discredited approach." The chance to be active and working in a positive effort to clean up the nation's public lands might just be what a large number of the country's dispirited youth could use for a healthier attitude about themselves and their chances for permanent work.

Reagan defended the veto by saying, "America's unemployed youth would be better served by reducing federal spending so that more resources are available to the private sector. The private sector is much more likely to offer young people promising career opportunities."

This defense is at the heart of Reagan's beliefs about reducing big government, a philosophy that is both winning votes and responsible for many of the country's recent economic gains; but these facts should not cause Reagan to reject all such federal job programs out-ofhand as bad for the economy. The private sector would be better for longrange career opportunities, however just telling these young people to wait for the recovery to hit them doesn't wash when a relatively inexpensive and potentially very effective program is in

Impossible to 'stomach the mess'

By RENAE LIAS and ELIZABETH OCON

We take issue with The Daily Tar Heel's criticism of the Brown students' effort to stockpile suicide pills ("Don't take the Pill," Oct. 25). You claim "the obvious intent" of this act is that "upon holocaust, all those unable to stomach the mess could easily leave it." We applaud the brave DTH editor(s) who, we are to assume, will "stomach the mess" of a post-nuclear holocaust America. If you are just far enough away from the explosion to avoid immediate death, you will be seeking care for your radiation sickness in a city where medical care will be unavailable (since hospitals are usually in the city, where the explosion is most likely to occur); if you are beyond the radiation boundary, you await the joyous prospect of freezing in the nuclear winter which is likely to follow even a limited nuclear war (we abhor this term). And if you have a warm coat, DTHers, you await starvation as the food chain is disrupted by yearlong below-freezing temperatures resulting from the same phenomenon.

Furthermore, you call the Brown students' proposal "defeatist in attitude." Who's being defeatist, we ask. In your criticism, you are giving in to the Reagan administration's stance that a nuclear war is winnable. We argue that we must not give in to such irrationality!

Speaking of which, you have labeled the Brown students' act irrational. But it is not supposed to be a rational act. It is simply a symbolic act intended to point out the irration-



K. McIntyre ality of what it protests: the stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It is irrational (and costly) to develop an overkill capacity of 48 times. It is irrational to claim, as did Vice President George Bush, that a nuclear war is winnable because as long as five (that's 5) percent of the population is alive, you have your winners, and you have your losers. We believe everyone would lose in the event of a nuclear war. And we'd wager more people

would agree with us than would agree with you. We are repulsed by the DTH statement that "most people have at least a passing interest in the nuclear arms issue." On the contrary, every single one of us has an intrinsic interest in whether or not we will live or die, but not everyone can talk about it. Each person's own death is of vital importance to himself or herself. And, more importantly, the end of the human race has moral

ramifications for us all. The fate of mankind is at stake. Should we allow the idea of a winnable nuclear war to take root in the minds of citizens of any or all nations and in the minds of defense planners, as it has with the Reagan administration and apparently with the DTH? Does anyone really feel more secure when our leaders "rationally" discuss and plan nuclear war

We urge everyone to take a stand against such attitudes. We urge everyone to consider what President Carter said here last week: activism is important; it can stand and it HAS effected change. Whether or not you accept the tactics of the Brown students, their intent must be acknowledged and embraced. They have given us an example of rebellion - they have told the nation that, no, we thinking students will not accept the absurd notion of nuclear war.

All who agree with this sentiment must act. Vote for peace candidates - know where the Reagan administration has stood for the past three and half years - and participate in a vigil of solidarity with the Brown students' intent, as is occuring all over the nation. STAND will hold a peace vigil in front of the post office on Franklin

Street tonight at 7 p.m. We repeat, we have a moral responsibility to save the world. Better to have future generations look back on us and say, "Hey, they did something to make the world safer for us" -- than to have them say nothing at all.

Renae Lias, co-chairperson of Students Taking Action for Nuclear Disarmament, is a senior English major from Beaver, Penn. Elizabeth Ocon, a STAND member, is a freshman from Charlotte.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

IT'S JUST A STANDARD INSURANCE FORM STATING YOU HAVE NO INTENTION OF HANG GLIDING, SKY DIVING OR RUNNING FOR PRESIDENT OF THE PHILIPPINES...

Record check

All in all, it's great sitting on The Wall

To the editor:

To the editor:

onmental record.

Some North Carolinians seem

inclined to vote for governor this

year on the basis of the candidate's

personalities rather than their

positions on public policy issues.

This is not wise use of our right to

endorsed Republican Jim Martin

while taking issue with his opposi-

tion to the Equal Rights Amend-

ment and government funding for

abortions, his support for voluntary

school prayer and his poor envir-

needs to be examined. He voted

against many programs to improve

Martin's record on other issues

One newspaper inexplicably

We as seniors, (mature, not shiftless, having priorities, and more sure of our future endeavors) are four-year, wall-sitting vets. We feel obligated to discuss the benefits of sitting in contrast to the article in the DTH ("Beware the Great Wall

necessary to make the right decision about wall-sitting; we say, DO IT!!! Our reasons:

• The only place to observe the beauty of nature is outside. • For those of us who are "people watchers," there is no better place

to improve your skills. of Carolina," Oct. 30). There are Skipping class can be advanmany good reasons to provide tageous, i.e. a Friday skipped and everyone with the information sat makes for a livable Monday.

educational opportunity - college

loans and grants, school lunch and

child nutrition, vocational and

handicapped education, and the

voted to reduce Social Security and

against full funding for Meals on

Wheels. On civil rights, Martin is

the only congressman from North

Carolina to have voted against the

Rufus Edmisten, on the other

Paul Lindsay

Chapel Hill

hand, cares about education, the

environment, the elderly, and will

Martin Luther King holiday.

be fair to everyone.

On senior citizen's issues, Martin

Department of Education.

This does not apply to classes in which roll is taken, these should have been dropped during the first week of classes. For those who insist on going to class, pre-register around prime sitting hours, 10 a.m.-

 Wall-sitting provides us with a But please, don't take our seats! place where we can be found regularly. Friends know where we are in case of emergencies, such as

the latest rumors, jokes and betting

In conclusion, we would like to suggest to everyone that wall-sitting pros outweigh the cons. (It's hard on bluejeans.)

So everyone enjoy. WALL SIT.

Brad Blackburn Rusty Phillips Ernie Diggs, trainee

Win some, lose some

Editor Jeff Hiday is to be commended for informing his readers that he overrode a majority vote of his staff in making DTH's presidential endorsement. I believe that many editors would have done so without any explanation.

He need not feel embarrassed at having done this. In the final analysis, the editor speaks as majority of one. The student body elected an editor, not a committee.

The only thing he need feel embarrassed about is ever having ceded veto authority to his staff in the first place. He has very properly revoked that, at least on this one issue. However, he leaves readers forever wondering which past and present editorial positions are the result of 8 to 7 votes. I believe he should either: a) give the vote count on every future editorial, or b) publicly relegate his staff to an advisory position and face up to his responsibility as the editor.

John L. S. Hickey Chapel Hill

o the editor: I am appalled that Jeff Hiday abused his position as editor of The

Daily Tar Heel so that his political opinions could prevail over those of the majority of his staff. Editorial policy of the DTH as stated below Hiday's endorsement of Mondale Tuesday proclaimed that editorials normally express the opinion of the majority of the DTH editors. Hiday's excuse for his abandonment of the policy he created was his conscience. However, he failed to realize that by abandoning his policy, he has used his powerful position to wrongly influence the readers of the DTH. If Hiday is so adamant about expressing his own views, he should do so, but he should not abandon the editorial policy of the newspaper. The editorial staff's endorsement of Reagan should have at least appeared beside Hiday's own testament.

Disregard of policy often discredits the integrity of the leader who does so and the integrity of his institution (the newspaper). If Hiday was so concerned about the responsibility of the content of the DTH, he could not have conscientiously ignored the opinion of his staff and replaced it with a statement of his own beliefs.

> Allyson Mathis Hinton James

The real story

Because of an editing error, a requirement for the Carolina Pride Award was listed incorrectly in yesterday's letter, "Creative changes." The excerpt containing the requirement should have read: It is not for a student who holds

an office and fulfills the duties of that office; it is for the student who goes the extra unrequired mile. It is a thank you from the student body to a person who has contributed to the reasons we take pride in this

Vote against representation without representation Americans Act, which includes the meals on only full committee on which he sits, Andrews

By WAYNE THOMPSON

"Can Andrews continue to survive (political defeat)? It would help if he could display a more activist legislative record."

 The Almanac of American Politics 1984 "Has anybody seen Ike Andrews? He's not in

Washington and he's not in the district." - Former Chapel Hill Mayor and unsuccessful 4th District primary challenger Howard Lee in a campaign speech before the May 8 primary.

On Wednesday, The Daily Tar Heel endorsed Democratic incumbent Ike Andrews with less than total enthusiasm, essentially saying, "We don't like him, but he's better than Cobey. Anyway we hope he steps down in 1986, so young blood can take over."

I voted to endorse Cobey because I agree with the political almanac and many of those in press that Andrews has not been an effective legislator. According to my interpretation of the American political system, we elect representatives who represent our interests in the halls of Congress. Of course that means voting, sponsoring legislation and faithfully choosing the committees which best serve us - in our case, the people of the 4th District. That, Andrews has not done. Many justify this after a long pause, saying: "Well, Cobey is a clone of the Congressional Club. He's just like Helms." These charges ring false after a thorough comparison of the 1982 and 1984 Cobey campaigns, but Andrews' poor record needs examination first.

While a fairly high-ranking member on the House Committee on Education and Labor, the

missed 70 percent of the committee meetings this year, 64 percent in '83, and 70 percent in '82. Many of the meetings may be trivial debates, of course, but revision of legislation and mark up of budget items also takes place.

Andrews' voting record is not much better. According to Congressional Quarterly, he had only roll-call voted 68 percent of the time through July 26 of this year — the worst record of North Carolina's congressional delegation. He's missed 96 roll-call votes, in contrast to the seven votes missed by 6th District Democratic Rep. Robin

Maybe the congressman devoted his time to more important tasks confronting him in his office? But the debate over whether religious groups should have equal access to the public schools was an issue important enough to warrant front-page stories in The Washington Post and coverage by the major TV networks.

Where was Ike Andrews on this issue? He voted by proxy, and afterward he accused former Kentucky Rep. Carl Perkins of misusing his proxy by voting for an amendment that allows religious groups to use school facilities for

The Raleigh News and Observer quoted Andrews as saying that he instructed Perkins to use his proxy in the Education and Labor Committee, "only if the vote was close." If Andrews had been present himself, he apparently would have voted a different way. Even Democrats must see that in this case Perkins, elected by Kentucky voters, spoke for North Carolina's 4th District.

That is not to say that Andrews' 12-year legislative career is not without its merits. This year Andrews sponsored a section of the Older

wheels program and health care for senior citizens. Andrews' Health Maintenance and Illness Prevention Bill attempted to reduce the financial burden of medical care on the elderly by having public health students visit them in senior citizens centers and teach them how to take better care of themselves.

Still, after considering Andrews' record and his personal conduct - he was convicted of driving drunk in 1982 just weeks before the election — it's hard to see why even Democrats can say, "I like Ike," unless partisanship is more important than good representation.

Cobey would be a far better congressman. It is true that in 1982 he was strongly supported by Jesse Helms and based his election strategy on slick ads prepared by Jefferson Marketing Inc., a group reportedly linked to Helms. But what has happened since 1982? Congressional Clubber Tom Fetzer, who managed Cobey's campaigns for lieutenant governor in 1980 and Congress in 1982, was asked to leave, and nonclubber John King took his place. Cobey's advertising in 1984 is prepared by the Republican National Committee, and Cobey has openly wooed the black vote along with gubernatorial candidate Jim Martin - a political foe of Congressional Club Chairman Tom Ellis.

Cobey's reliance on the Club in 1980 is not a symptom of any dark conspiratorial in Cobey, but a reflection of political reality. With the Republican Party shifting rightward and support growing nationwide for the Congressional Club, it is not surprising that a Republican candidate from a Club-influenced state GOP would end up running as a candidate with their support.

Even Andrews himself does not believe the clone charge. "This Congressional Club and these ultra right-wing groups have a lot of money to spread around and they are tough . . . but Cobey ain't one of them," he said in an interview from his Washington, D.C. office.

Cobey distancing himself from the Club shows he can learn from past mistakes and is symptomatic of the changes — both in ideas and style - that have revealed his own capabilities to the voters of the 4th District. Cobey is not hiding behind anyone this time. More importantly, Cobey has offered voters ideas, not anti-Andrews rhetoric in 1984. His support of anti-poverty initiatives and his stated commitment of bringing

high-technology jobs to the district shows this. Cobey favors tax reform to lower the tax rates of low-income Americans, so that those near or below the poverty line should not have to pay

Cobey has shown a sensitivity to the needs of the district by stressing the need for the local agencies to work through the U.S. Department of Commerce and other agencies in developing overseas markets for locally produced goods and bringing high-technology companies to the Triangle.

"Frankly, when I talk to the county commissioners, they get excited about the idea of having a congressman who wants to help bring industry to the district," Cobey said.

His backround is well-suited for the task. He has an M.B.A. in marketing and a bachelor's degree in chemistry, and was a chemical salesman for the Dow Chemical Co. from 1965 to 1966. That kind of experience will help Cobey make the personal contacts that result in plant locations and local jobs.

With experience in education, as athletic director at UNC from 1976 to 1980 and academic counselor for the football team from 1968 to 1971,



Coby: He'll show up - with ideas

he will serve the 4th District well.

Whether one disagrees with Cobey's positions on abortion or school prayer or not, it is hard to believe that anyone can send Andrews back to Washington on the basis, as stated in the recent DTH endorsement, of his "commendable record of constituent service."

Cobey may be too "rightist" for whoever wrote the endorsement, but at least he understands the basic governmental principle that "you can't do the job unless you're on the job."

All voters in the 4th District owe it to themselves to look beyond partisanship and see the facts. A representative who isn't should be

Wayne Thompson, a senior broadcast journalism major from Roanoke, Va., is state and national editor of The Daily Tar Heel.