

JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor
MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor
BEN PERKOWSKI, Associate EditorKELLY SIMMONS, University Editor
VANCE TREFETHEN, State and National Editor
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor
DAN TILLMAN, Business Editor
LYNN DAVIS, News EditorFRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
SHARON SHERIDAN, Features Editor
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

Don't just sit and watch

The ArtSchool in Carrboro needs help — and soon. Right now, the school is faced with the possibility of closing down its doors because of lack of money, space and, worse, a lack of support. The entire situation is not just unfortunate — it's tragic.

The biggest problem the ArtSchool must surmount is the widespread, nonsensical notion that the school is not a big contributor to the community. In fact, it is the biggest source of arts and culture in the Orange County area — even beating out the Union in terms of variety of sponsored events. But because the school has been self-sufficient for so long, many people find it hard to see the ArtSchool as a charitable organization. Such thinking the school can ill afford, however, when so much of its funds come from private donations.

Since it opened in 1974, the ArtSchool has been a charitable organization, and it does need money. The school gets no money from Chapel Hill, although 75 percent of the people who use it reside in the town. The town of Carrboro contributes \$10,000 a year to the school, but that doesn't go far considering the ArtSchool's \$300,000 annual budget.

The ArtSchool is also expanding at such a rate that it has outgrown its space at Carr Mill Mall. The school is currently housed in 7,000 square feet, far too few to adequately host its various events,

rehearsals, activities and art classes. But there appears no place else to go. When its lease expires in December 1986, the ArtSchool may find itself out in the cold.

The school needs private contributions. Of the 60,000 people who take advantage of the school's films, concerts and other offerings, only 1,000 are members of the school. Too many area residents, we fear, feel that their mere attendance at events sponsored by the ArtSchool supports the school. This is not the case. The school needs financial support as well as support through attendance.

It is very easy to take the school for granted, despite its doing so much for the community. Through the ArtSchool, Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents are exposed to a multitude of interesting events, such as local folk musicians and artists displaying their talents. Few people realize that without the ArtSchool, the cultural atmosphere of the community would decline rapidly.

The ArtSchool is the single most important conduit around for films, concerts, events and plays, and its absence would be felt by everyone, especially Carolina students, who benefit from the school. We heartily support any attempt on the part of the ArtSchool to continue doing its fine job and encourage all others to keep the school open by contributing money. A mime is a terrible thing to waste.

Painted into a corner

Someone's done a sloppy job within the walls of Suite C.

Prior to the start of classes this semester, Student Union employees repainted the interior of the Campus Governing Council office. A coat-and-dry operation, right?

Sure. And the Watergate Hotel job was just another break-in.

Individual voting records — roll-call votes when each CGC representative must vote orally and individually — are missing from last semester. No one's quite sure why; blame it on poor filing, sloppy housekeeping or negligence.

Or, if you're CGC Speaker Reggie Holley, blame it on the painters. "They threw stuff around," he claims. "The CGC office was completely trashed."

Indeed. Finding the interior of the office a mess, with files strewn about the desk, Union housekeepers insist that they simply shifted the rubble about, taking care to throw out nothing whatsoever.

Who's to believe — the painters, who likened the office to a "windstorm," or Holley, who sees "no other way those records were destroyed"?

It all sounds like a whitewash to us. That Union workers would under-

mine the operation of a legislative body such as the CGC is highly unlikely. They, like most of us, don't lose much sleep wondering which members voted to send University-sanctioned hate mail to President Reagan.

The voting records may be history, but no wonder — buried beneath a clutter of documents, it would have taken a crew from the Smithsonian to salvage them. And if these records are as important as council members make them out to be, why didn't curator Holley see to it that they weren't strewn about the office like candy bar wrappers?

The loss appears to have hit CGC SEEDling Doug Berger the hardest. In an effort to get CGC members to vote on the record — and secure potential ammunition against re-election bids — Berger embraced a SEEDS-sponsored attempt to take roll call votes. Now Berger won't have it his way.

Obviously, a bit of housekeeping is in order for the CGC in general. This records snafu is just the latest in a series of misguided tangents that have become a CGC trademark.

Get your files — and your act — together, guys. Let's not forget that the CGC is a campus organization.

The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant News Editor: Steve Ferguson

Editorial Writers: Dick Anderson and Karen Youngblood

Assistant Managing Editors: Scott Canterbury and Elizabeth Huth

News: Mike Allen, Lisa Brantley, Richard Boyce, Tim Brown, Matt Campbell, Joan Clifford, Tom Conlon, Katy Fridl, Mike Gunzenhauser, Jim Hoffman, Beth Houk, Catherine Kury, Guy Lucas, Sallie Krawcheck, Georgia Ann Martin, Dora McAlpin, Andy Miller, Morris, Brian Mullaney, Kathy Nanne, Janet Olson, Beth Ownley, Ruthie Pipkin, Mark Powell, Robbin Robertson, Karen Rogers, David Schmidt, Rachel Stiffler, Amy Styers, Kevin Sullivan, Jim Surowiecki, Lisa Swicegood, Ray Tingle, Andy Trincia, Jennifer Trotter, Laura Van Sant, Kevin Washington, Leigh Williams, Lorry Williams, Laurie Willis and Jim Zook.

Sports: Scott Fowler and Lee Roberts, assistant sports editors. Tim Brown, Mike DeSisti, Paul Enslin, David McCullough, Mike Persinger, Kurt Rosenberg, Mike Schoor, Mike Waters and Bob Young.

Features: Maryelda Hall, assistant features editor. Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Tom Camacho, Vicki Daughtry, Loretta Grantham, Bryan Hassel, Jennifer Keller, Anjetta McQueen, Mary Mulvihill, Darian Marbury, Tom Rose, Liz Saylor and Sonya Terrell.

Arts: Ed Brackett, Frank Bruni, Steve Carr, Elizabeth Ellen, Ivy Hilliard, Eddie Huffman, Steve Murray, and Virginia Smith.

Photography: Larry Childress, Nancy London, Jamie Moncrief, Stretch and Lori Thomas.

Copy Editors: Angela Gunn and Carolyn Wilson.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Tammy Martin, student business manager; Angela Booze, accounts receivable clerk; Terry Lee, student advertising manager; Alicia Susan D'Anna, Greg Goomann, Patricia Gorry, Melanie Parlier, Stacey Ramirez, Doug Robinson, Amy Schutz and Scott Whitaker, ad representatives; Patti Pittman, classified advertising manager, Laura Bowen, assistant; Jim Greenhill, office manager; and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager; Lori Crow, assistant.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, assistant.

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Buckle up while you still have the choice

To the editor:

The Daily Tar Heel seems to have missed the point with its anti-buckle-up editorial ("Thumbs down to buckle-up law," Dec. 3). New York is only the first of many states that will institute seat belt laws. In July, Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole issued a new passive-restraint standard. It would couple a phased-in, passive-restraint rule with promise of rescission when or if two-thirds of the U.S. population resides in states that have seat belt laws meeting minimum federal standards by April 1, 1989. These standards include a penalty of no less than \$25 and a provision stating

that non-usage of belts may be considered contributory negligence. This new standard also allocates \$40 million dollars for a government-industry educational program that encourages greater use of safety and enactment of mandatory-usage laws.

Industry spokesmen for General Motors, Ford and Chrysler support a mandatory seat-belt law. Why? Because the industry is aware that consumers are very likely to resist an estimated \$320 to \$800 price increase for an air-bag system. I, for one, would rather buckle up for free than have to pay up to \$800 more on my next car so that the 88 percent

of the population that doesn't use seat belts can be better protected.

I fail to see how you can support the child-restraint law, which is now in effect in 48 states, and not support a buckle-up law. The buckle-up law is also "designed to protect not just the driver, but also the other people on the roads" like your passengers. In 1982 only 2.9 percent of all occupants killed in accidents were restrained. In case of an accident, a belted driver is more likely to keep control of a car, survive a roll-over or not be ejected from the car. When a driver refuses to buckle up, he endangers himself and his passengers. In 1982 only 15 percent of

all restrained occupants involved in accidents were injured.

An unbuckled driver also increases the cost of hospitalization and insurance. In 1982 injured survivors spent 3.3 million days in the hospital. The survivors lost a total of 11.9 million work days. Many insurance companies, recognizing the economic impact of these statistics, offer a discount to owners of cars with passive-restraint systems.

Thumbs up to the buckle-up laws. You may not have a choice by 1989.

Gene Galin
Chapel Hill

Fun with reader mail

To the editor:

Wake the kids, call the neighbors, bring the dog in from the garage! Sarcasm is rampant on our campus. Seems you can't turn around nowadays without someone offering a sarcastic remark. No, this doesn't bother us one bit. We love the warmth and humanity in each and every biting statement. For example, notice the signs up in Manly dorm this week. In advertising a pig pickin', they say, "We're having some fun," and claim, "I just love a dead pig." Words cannot adequately express our heartfelt joy at reading these signs.

You would think campus leadership would be immune. But our fine leaders refrain from sarcasm about as often as I put a Julio Iglesias album on the old Hi-Fi. Case in point: this weekend, in closing the UNC Model U.N. Club High School Conference, club Vice President Sid Stafford exclaimed, "So ends another fun UNC Model United Nations." Hand that man a hot towel! Why, just recently I shed years of inhibition and asked the winter girl of my dreams to the Christmas semi-formal. Imagine my surprise when she responded, "That sounds just too swell. Really keen. Why I've been waiting for a Neanderthal like you to ask me out since birth. I'll be catching the next bus to Burlington to buy my dress and

a new set of pumps." As I walked (no, crawled) back to my dorm, her sarcasm rang in my ears. "We'll be going out real soon," she laughed.

Why — ask yourself with uncontained interest — why is this trend sweeping our fine liberal university? The answer is simple: David Letterman. Face facts, too many of us are staying up too late. Oh sure, I like seeing Dave discuss nuclear physics with the Penthouse Pet-of-the-Year like anyone else, and I live to hear that gap-toothed genius say, "Get out the crushed ice, we're having more fun than humans should be allowed." Greg Lunsford, that Mikeman maniac, knew a good thing when he saw it. Those of you who actually stayed through the fourth quarter of the awesome Carolina football games will long cherish the memory of Lump yelling, "We're having some fun now!" Problem is, UNC students know a good thing when they see it, too.

But we don't mind. In fact, we thrive on it. Many is the time we've said to our parish priest, "Father, we'd be lost men without sarcasm." Just as often he'd reply, "Noooo. Really? And I always thought you guys were honest, sincere young men." What's the point? It's on your head. "Coors to you UNC."

Bruce Lillie
Chris Shearer
Chapel Hill

Preserve students' lives

To the editor:

In the editorial chiding the Campus Governing Council ("Reign the lofty beast," Nov. 9) for organizing against the likely invasion of Nicaragua, the DTH neglected to mention that the government responsible for these provocations is doing so in the name of the American people. No consensus has ever been asked for the bank-rolling of mercenaries in Honduras or Costa Rica, nor have the reasons for the multiple violations of international law ever been presented for debate.

Certainly there are a few of us who have some reservation about acts of terrorism, assassination and economic sabotage that for four years have been waged against a neighboring nation. The war is covert only in the sense that it is being hidden from the American people. The citizens of Nicaragua know perfectly well who is behind

the murder of their women and children.

As an alumnus of UNC, I wholeheartedly applaud the steps taken by the CGC on behalf of Carolina students. Nicaragua will not be overrun as easily as a divided, tiny island in the Caribbean and for the age group of the DTH's readership, it would do well to stop hiding its head in the quicksand of dialectics. Now is precisely the time to warn the war-makers in Washington D.C. that we will not be caught unprepared by swift executive action and the wanton spilling of American blood. It is the DTH's responsibility to its readers that the names of Carolina students will not be one day engraved in a memorial to a war that has been disowned by their country.

Guy Nickson
Class of '75
New York City

Infamous date shouldn't go unnoticed

By VANCE TREFETHEN

In 1941, President Franklin Roosevelt declared Dec. 7 "a day which will live in infamy." It was a day on which an oppressive, militaristic, imperialist nation committed a blatant act of aggression against a free country, and it shocked the United States and the world.

But December also marks another anniversary of that sort. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan is five years old this month, and the date goes largely unnoticed. It doesn't provoke campus rallies or protests; you don't hear a word about it (or other Soviet atrocities) during Human Rights Week; and even the omniscient Campus Governing Council can't take a moment from solving Nicaragua's problems to remember it.

Today, the Soviet Union has 115,000 troops entrenched in Afghanistan, and no one expects them to leave anytime soon. They're on a mission that includes mass shootings of peasants, burning crops, spraying villages with poison gas, and saturation bombings.

Jimmy Carter answered the invasion by cutting off wheat shipments to the USSR and boycotting the Olympics. The Soviets responded with more troops, more bombings, more gasings, and more shootings. Reagan has recently doubled the amount of covert aid to the freedom fighters resisting the invasion, supplying \$280 million in aid during the last fiscal year.

The Afghans bravely resisting the slaughter are a hardy bunch. "We will never leave them in peace, not if they stay for centuries," said Younes Khalis, a leader of one of the resistance movements. With a trickle of outdated weapons and few supplies, they have caused, according to some intelligence experts, as many as 20,000 Soviet casualties.

"First, waves of TU-16 bombers fly in from bases in the Soviet Union to obliterate our villages. Then the commandos swoop down in helicopters or by parachute.

"We have suffered many such ferocious attacks recently, particularly in the Panjcher Valley. They cause terrible devastation, but they have proved less successful than the Russians must have hoped." Khalis said in an interview with the Associated Press.



"They often find no mujahedeen (resistance fighters) in the villages, but they destroy everything left standing after the bombing," he said.

The impact on the Afghan people has been enormous. Crop-burning has turned nearly 2 million people inside Afghanistan into refugees on the brink of starvation. Four million have already fled to Iran and Pakistan. In a nation of 18 million, one-third of the population has been forced to leave their homes.

Unfortunately, the international political impact has not been as great. The Soviets have not been the target of any significant economic or political sanctions for their actions, and few nations have expressed much sentiment against the invasion since the traditional buzz words of "shock and disapproval" were spoken five years ago. In the world community, it's business as usual.

In the United States, the public largely ignores Soviet aggression when pressuring political leaders to "do something" about East-West tensions and the arms race. Just trust the Soviets and make enough concessions, and things will be all right, we're told. But ask an Afghani with burned out lungs from a gas attack if that's the solution. Ask a villager whose family was rounded up and shot. Ask the starving rural peasants what they would do.

Few of the issues noised about by campus politicians on soap boxes have the real human impact of this ignored anniversary. Maybe it's time to at least think about what the Soviets are doing to the Afghan people and pray on our knees they never get the chance to do it to anyone else.

Vance Trefethen, a junior economics major from Bangor, Maine, is state and national editor of The Daily Tar Heel.



Happy hour psychology

To the editor:

Psychologically, Rick Henderson is all wet in his letter concerning happy hour and DWI ("Happy hours not the problem," Nov. 26). The issue is not, or should not be, punishment. As B.F. Skinner would point out, punishment is neither an adequate nor efficacious way to eliminate undesirable behavior. Punishment indirectly reinforces the behavior that is deplored; it does not teach a different, less destructive behavior which the individual can substitute for the sanctioned behavior (in this case, drunk driving). The only thing a person learns from punishment is not to get caught the next time. What society gains from punishing offenders is the satisfaction of seeing the other guy get his just desserts — and the necessity of ever-increasing vigilance against the destructive behavior, because punishment will not make that behavior go away.

Elimination of "happy hour" is not a punishment, but rather a form of behavior modification, whereby behavior is changed by changing the environment in which it occurs. People will not be denied the right to buy drinks during what was happy hour; they will only be denied the artificial incentive to buy — and consume — more drinks in a shorter period of time.

As for the contention that happy hour is not related to increased likelihood of driving while intoxicated, Henderson is logically and physiologically mistaken. Happy

hour generally falls between 3 p.m. and 7 p.m. — at a time when most people have not yet eaten dinner. Drinking on an empty stomach dramatically increases the effect of alcohol on the nervous system. The structure of happy hour also encourages a person to drink more quickly than he or she normally would, to take advantage of lower prices. This, too, increases the effect of alcohol, since the body has less time to metabolize the alcohol. It only takes a few drinks to impair a person's ability to drive safely. Under these conditions, how many people will be in any condition to realize that they are in no condition to drive? Add to this fact that happy hour coincides with the heaviest traffic period of the day, when even sober drivers are tired, impatient, and likely to make mistakes. You are inviting the probability of increased alcohol-related traffic accidents.

No one is saying that eliminating happy hour will eliminate the problem of drunk driving; it will, however, contribute toward decreasing the problem, without interfering with an individual's right to choose to drink. Happy hour is essentially an economic invention to increase business, and I have no quarrel with that; but when an economic ploy aggravates a social problem — and studies do indicate that this is the case — then economic gain for entrepreneurs will just have to take a back seat to social well-being.

Marcia Decker
Chapel Hill

Letters and editorial columns should be triple-spaced and typed on a 60-character line. Deadline is 2 p.m. the working day before publication.