

The Daily Tar Heel

94th year of editorial freedom

JIM ZOOK, Editor
 RANDY FARMER, Managing Editor
 ED BRACKETT, Associate Editor
 DEWEY MESSER, Associate Editor
 TRACY HILL, News Editor
 GRANT PARSONS, University Editor
 LINDA MONTANARI, City Editor
 JILL GERBER, State and National Editor
 SCOTT FOWLER, Sports Editor
 KATHY PETERS, Features Editor
 ROBERT KEEFE, Business Editor
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor
 DAN CHARLSON, Photography Editor

Editorials

The dump sweepstakes

Whatever the outcome of Thursday's vote on where to store the Southeast's low-level radioactive waste, someone will be angry. But politicians and citizens bestowed this dubious distinction by the Southeast Compact Commission should remember two things: one, that the commission has deliberated the issue for several months; and two, that every member state of the commission will eventually get stuck with a waste site. The advice is especially pertinent to North Carolinians, as the Tar Heel State has led the "dump sweepstakes" since late 1985, when a compact commission study named the state as the most suitable for a disposal site. Alabama enters the vote as a distant second.

Members of the compact commission — who also represent South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida and Mississippi — have

admirably avoided the political maneuvering that would normally accompany such an issue. Perhaps the group's organization is the reason.

Two representatives from each member state reviewed the feasibility of putting a waste site in one of seven commission states. (The members rightfully voted to exclude South Carolina from consideration because its Barnwell site, scheduled to close in 1992, currently handles the region's waste.) The chosen state, members agreed, would handle the Southeast's low-level waste for 10 years. After that, each state in the commission would take decade-long turns hosting a waste site.

It's a logical plan, one deserving rational discussion among N.C. politicians and interest groups, not the hue and cry it's been getting. Even if — especially if — North Carolina is the selected state.

For Chief Justice, anyone else

More than 100 law professors across the nation this week signed a letter urging senators who "entertain the slightest doubt" about his merit to oppose the nomination of Chief Justice-designate William Rehnquist. With Rehnquist's record, senators should indeed have some grave doubts during confirmation hearings, which begin Thursday.

Along with Justice Lewis Powell, Rehnquist is considered one of the court's ranking intellectuals. But while Justice Powell's decisions often represent mainstream American thought, Rehnquist's extreme conservative nature reflects a throwback to the thinking of another era.

The professors focus their concern on the many recent revelations about Rehnquist's dubious legal ethics and fulsome memorandums. Here is part of the professors' objections to Rehnquist's confirmation:

■ Rehnquist knew of the literacy challenges to minority voters in Phoenix, Ariz., in the 1960s, yet did nothing to stop them. To the professors, this raises a question of "moral obtuseness."

■ Rehnquist has denied knowledge of exclusionary clauses in his property deeds, clauses which prohibit sale to Jews or blacks. While questioning whether he is telling the truth, the professors say the clauses ignore the "ethical and symbolic dimensions of

the law."

■ Rehnquist denies writing a 1952 memo in support of the "separate but equal" doctrine. Again, the professors question Rehnquist's story, but rightly acknowledge that the nominee's effort to shift the blame to a deceased justice is deplorable.

Perhaps the greatest cause for alarm is Rehnquist's decision as a Supreme Court justice not to disqualify himself from hearing a case in 1972 in which he was previously involved. The case focused on using the Army to surveil anti-war demonstrators, a plan that Rehnquist supported as a legal adviser for President Nixon. A conflict of interest was evident, yet Rehnquist shirked legal protocol.

The position of chief justice of the United States is one of service to all people, regardless of background. It is hard to conceive how Rehnquist — who has often adhered to prejudiced, obsolete thinking — could possibly serve the demographically diverse American people.

It is with good reason that Rehnquist's past has been spotlighted for the last few weeks. For as memo by memo is discovered, as each underhanded act is reported, it becomes more and more evident that Rehnquist is unsuitable to serve as chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. A judge unable to abide by accepted ethical codes does not deserve to direct the molding of American law.

Keeping up with the Cleavers

It's always nice to hear from a good friend. And we were fortunate enough to hear from one such person recently — Mrs. Ward Cleaver herself, June. You remember, everyone's favorite mom, mother of the oft-rambunctious Beaver and Wally.

We waxed nostalgic for the days of "Leave It to Beaver" as soon as we saw June's — pardon us, Mrs. Cleaver's — name on the envelope's upper left and the return address below, "211 Pine Street, Mayfield, U.S.A." (We began to suspect a marketing ploy, however, when we spied another return address on the back of the envelope: "70 Universal City Plaza, Suite 430, Universal City, California 91608." Oh, well, it's nice to hear from an old friend, anyway.)

The letter:

Dear Friends and Family:

I know it's early for my usual holiday letter, but with all the excitement over "The New Leaf It to Beaver" this fall, I couldn't wait to tell you what's going on in the Cleaver household.

First of all, you should know that this is an entirely new series, never before seen on television anywhere!

We're still at 211 Pine Street in Mayfield, and since Beaver and his sons Kip and Oliver moved in, there's never a dull moment around here. Wally lives next door with his wife, Mary Ellen (you remember, his high school sweetheart). She's expecting in November. They have a daughter named Kelly and, I have to admit, it sure is nice to have a girl in the family.

I'm so proud of my boys. I don't want to brag, but Beaver has a thriving business with

The Bottom Line

Wally's old friend, Clarence "Lumpy" Rutherford, and Wally's a successful lawyer. Well, okay, I bragged.

As for myself, I spend the day taking care of the house and family, serving on the Mayfield City Council and doing my best to avoid Eddie Haskell. Yes, he's still around, and he's married now. He and his wife, poor Gert, have two sons, Freddie and Bomber. And there's no mistaking, the Haskell boys are three peas in a pod.

I wish I had more time to tell you how excited we are about returning to weekly television on SuperStation WTBS, but I have cookies in the oven. I've enclosed a postcard in case you want to know more about us, "The New Leaf It to Beaver" or trade a recipe or two.

I hope to see you soon, and we look forward to seeing you for the exclusive premier of the show on Monday, September 8, at 6 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time on SuperStation WTBS.

Warmest regards,

June

P.S. Be sure to check your TV listings for local times.

Unfortunately, we received the letter after Monday, the aforementioned premier date of the show. But we'll be watching next week, Mrs. Cleaver. Knock 'em dead on the Mayfield City Council.

Tar Heel Forum

Great White North retains its heritage

This is the second in a series on Canada.

When I asked some native Carolinians what came to mind when I said "Canada," the responses had something to do with the wilderness or the French language. Just as I was about to shake my head and say something like, "That's all you think we have up there, huh?", it struck me that two posters on my dorm wall pictured the Rocky Mountains in Alberta and the majestic skyline of Quebec City. I realized that I had no souvenir with me of Toronto and that there were other places from Canada that I wanted with me instead, both as mementos and as something to show off the beauty of my country to the new friends I would make.

While we have a large urban population and many fine cities to visit, Canada's wilderness is both vast and beautiful. I once spent two months in the far north of Ontario, and the magnificent spread of lakes and forests there were far beyond anything you have ever seen in one of those Canadian beer commercials. (By the way, Canadians are not impressed with American beer. In fact, we tend to call it something that politely translates as "Love in a Canoe.") And "Moosehead" is far from Canada's finest brew!

French culture is also a very important part of Canada, both presently and historically, yet only about 25 percent of Canadians are francophone. Their fight to prevent assimilation has been somewhat successful, yet there exists some sort of barrier between Quebec and the other provinces, because very little of the marvelous Quebecois culture manages to spread beyond the provincial boundaries. As a result, many fine Canadian artists are unknown outside of their home province.

where they are enormously popular.

The European-style setting of Quebec has made it a popular tourist attraction for Canadians and Americans alike. Despite an abundance of T-shirt shops, it retains its charming atmosphere and unique culture — believe me, there is nothing quite as romantic as a summer evening stroll along La Terrasse Dufferin with the music of the Festival d'Ete in the distant background.

Canada may seem a quiet and relaxing place — and it often is — but there is also a "sporty" side of things that is evident year-round. Winter brings out the skiers and particularly the skaters. I think every Canadian boy for the last 100 years has gone down to the corner rink for a game of pickup hockey, and it's something a lot of grown men can't get out of their blood. Summer means swimming, canoeing, camping and, of course, baseball. Basketball has never been a big hit up North, but Canadians are just waiting for a Blue Jays-Expos World Series. With a few exceptions, notably Fergie Jenkins, Canadians aren't renowned as ballplayers, so when we brag about "our" beloved Jays, it is really a matter of our Latin Americans being better than your Latin Americans.

Sometimes, American perceptions of Canada are correct but often they are grossly exaggerated — there are stories of Americans visiting Toronto in July, skis tied to their car, wondering where all the snow has gone and asking where they can find some Eskimos.

In truth, there is far more to Canada than

just Mounties and lumberjacks, though I admit they are common symbols used in tourist promotions. Canada is home to events as diverse as the Stratford Shakespearean Festival and the Calgary Stampede, where the Cowboy reigns supreme. Canada is writers like Margaret Laurence and W.O. Mitchell, painters like Tom Thompson and A.Y. Jackson and profound thinkers like Marshall McLuhan and Northrop Frye, to name but a few. Canada has been both a medical pioneer (Doctors Banting and Best discovered insulin) and a leader in world peace efforts (Prime Minister Lester Pearson was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work in international peacekeeping).

Canada continues to be at the forefront of world affairs because, for example, we are held in high regard by other Commonwealth Nations who seek to place more pressure on South Africa's apartheid regime.

Though we are friends and allies of the United States, we are by no means a puppet. It is not uncommon for us to disagree with American policies and actions and to express our disapproval, whether by statements at the United Nations General Assembly or by refusing to take part in President Reagan's Star Wars plans.

Canada is independent and unique, retaining ties to its British and French ancestry and tradition as well as asserting its own position in NATO and the world. This combination has produced a nation with many friends and few enemies. It makes Canada a wonderful place to live, a fun place to visit and a fascinating place to study. Since most of you who are reading this have missed out on the first, remember that "two out of three ain't bad."

Brien Lewis is a freshman from Toronto.

Keep the faith

To the editor:

So now what? Sept. 1 is history and the law really did go into effect, no matter how much we all opposed it. The question is what are all of those faithful barhoppers who are under 21 years of age going to do now?

Frankly, not many of the folks who go to Troll's go there for the atmosphere! What about football games? Is the traditional sneaking in of flasks going to remain? What about court parties? This is a school of tradition! Are we just going to let tradition die?

Don't get me wrong, I don't think alcohol is the center of the universe, but it is a popular social activity on this campus. I guess the only place left to mix and mingle will be the Undergrad Pickup Lounge; it's the only place left where we aren't carded at the door!

BETTY ANN BURDIN
Sophomore
Psychology



Letters

Highway of irresponsibility

To the editor:

would be around other children who had been. Peer pressure would be greatly reduced.

Telling all 19- and 20-year-olds that on Sept. 1 they were no longer able to drink created new problems. There should be a grandfather clause in the law to cover these people who had had the right to drink. I don't believe that you can tell a person what he is doing is legal one day and not the next. You cannot expect to take away a right that someone has enjoyed and not expect some sort of animosity. Prohibiting 19- and 20-year-olds the privilege of going out and buying their own beer only means that people like me are going to be buying it for them.

Many will argue that in the short run, abolishing the drinking age would mean certain death to many young people. For the most part, this is probably true. However, it was the lawmakers who set a standard drinking age after repealing Prohibition. Because of this drinking age, very few of the young people who would certainly die have been taught the slightest thing about responsibility with alcohol. They have just been told not to drink without much further explanation.

The lawmakers who created this law would have no one to blame but themselves for this short-term slaughter. In the long run, however, many more lives could be saved if the parents of these youth were permitted to introduce their children to alcohol at an early age, teaching responsibility instead of inviting disaster by whetting desire through denial.

By raising the drinking age instead of getting rid of the law, the lawmakers may as well have raised the legal age to 30. When the youth who learn to drink irresponsibly because of this law once again come of age, they will only have their past experience with alcohol to fall

back on. With this in mind, if the drinking age is 21, 30 or 70, the result will probably be the same. If I had my choice of driving down the highway of today or driving a highway where youth were taught responsibility with alcohol early in life, I know which

highway I would drive. I would drive on the highway where a drunk teen was not going to kill himself.

LAURIN WILLIS
Senior
RTVMP

Non-aligned summit useful

To the editor:

The Monday editorial on the non-aligned summit seems to be geared towards reaching the impossible "objective" bliss which journalists attempt to attain.

By appealing to the Ramboistic, fanatical values of conservatives on campus, though, you have only shown either a total bias in editorializing or a very low ability to understand the concerns of the non-aligned countries (or both).

First, the editorial acknowledges that there are at least 101 countries which profess non-alignment, yet you concentrate on only two of them, without mentioning the fact that pro-Western, capitalist countries, such as Argentina and Kenya, also belong to the movement and attended the conference in Harare, Zimbabwe. We are sure those nations' statements were probably more to your liking.

Second, President Ortega cannot be regarded as a dictator since he came out ahead in an election in which the will of the majority was manifested. The Nicaraguan opposition called for blank balloting, and only a very small percentage of the ballots were left blank.

Third, we suggest the editorial staff read Ortega's statement again. He's not accusing American presidents of enthroning themselves in power. What he suggests, echoing many other leaders in Latin America, in his statement, is that the United States should relinquish its historic preponderance in the continent and let the nations of Latin America choose their

own destinies.

Also, your statement about Nicaragua — a country "at war with the United States" — is misguiding, for it is the United States which, through its actions, is waging war on a small, impoverished Central American nation. Ortega was only stating a very prevalent feeling among Latin Americans, that the United States has constantly intervened in (Guatemala, 1954; Chile, 1973), interfered with (El Salvador 1980s), and aggressively dealt with (Nicaragua at least 10 times in this century) Latin America. If you surveyed average Latin American people and asked them to mention an aggressive superpower with imperialistic tendencies, the immense majority would mention the United States and not the Soviet Union.

We would recommend your editorial board take some courses on United States-Latin American relations or on the Vietnam War so that a clearer idea as to why quite a few third world nations "talk of perceived aggression by the United States," (a very "pressing matter," especially in instances such as that of Nicaragua, where citizens are merely attempting to survive) and search for solidarity in movements such as non-alignment.

CARLOS CEREZO
Graduate
Political Science

PABLO MATEU
Graduate
Political Science