

# The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

JILL GERBER, Editor  
 AMY HAMILTON, Managing Editor  
 SALLY PEARSALL, News Editor  
 JEAN LUTES, University Editor  
 DONNA LEINWAND, State and National Editor  
 JEANNIE FARIS, City Editor  
 JAMES SUROWIECKI, Sports Editor  
 FELISA NEURINGER, Business Editor  
 JULIE BRASWELL, Features Editor  
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor  
 CHARLOTTE CANNON, Photography Editor  
 CATHY MCHUGH, Omnibus Editor

## Editorials

### Skip class, get an education

In its year and a half of operation, the Smith Center has proven effective in drawing big-name talent to Chapel Hill. This Friday, stars of a different kind will be jamming in the center, as both Democratic and Republican party hopefuls congregate at a presidential candidates' forum.

#### board opinion

The day-long forum, titled "Education '88," will center on all levels of education. In the morning, all seven Democratic candidates will appear: Bruce Babbitt, Joseph Biden, Micheal Dukakis, Richard Gephardt, Albert Gore, Jesse Jackson and Paul Simon. They will participate in a one-hour panel discussion moderated by former N.C. Gov. Jim Hunt and a question session with two top reporters.

After lunch, two of the Republicans — Pierre du Pont and Jack Kemp — will appear. The format will be the same, only the first half of the discussion will be moderated by Gov. Jim Martin.

Ironically, students won't be able to attend "Education '88" because they'll be in class. On Tuesday, University

officials said that canceling class and assessing penalties for missed class was at the instructor's discretion. Dr. David Dill, the project's on-campus coordinator, emphasized that the forum was being held on Friday to make it accessible to students, faculty and staff. Professors can aid this effort by allowing students to miss class without penalty.

Also this Friday, the pope will stop at the University of South Carolina as part of his U.S. tour, and the administration there plans to cancel classes. Certainly, Chapel Hill officials can follow suit. One of the people appearing at the forum is likely to be the next president. UNC students should have a chance to see firsthand the pool of applicants for one of the most important jobs in the world.

"Education '88" is a rare opportunity for the University community. The UNC system and the University should be commended for bringing the candidates to the campus. Students can show appreciation and concern for their future by attending the forum. But professors should allow them the freedom to take advantage of the event by canceling class, or at least not penalizing those who attend.

### Movie magic must be ad-free

Advertising and entertainment have always been woven together — Joe DiMaggio pitching Mr. Coffee, Brooke Shields caressing her Calvins. The commercialism plague has reached epidemic proportions these days, with Genesis backing Michelob (or visa versa) and David Bowie claiming that modern love is just a soft drink away.

But now advertising is treading on the hallowed ground of the movie theater, perhaps the last haven of pure entertainment. In the past, \$5 bought the thick smell of buttered popcorn, cushioned seats, tantalizing previews and the main feature. Aside from the occasional neon Coke sign over the concession stand, the theater was as much an escape from the real world as the movie.

At the Ram Triple in Chapel Hill, as well as many other theaters in the country, moviegoers are subjected to several advertisements before the show begins. At the Ram Triple, commercials for a Carrboro gym, a Chapel Hill restaurant, and a new space age video game have been shown on the big screen, not to mention a Cyndi Lauper video/record promotion.

Is nothing sacred? These annoying low budget commercials ruin the magic atmosphere of a dark theater. Worse, the theater managers conspire to force the audience to watch. The lights are dimmed, the doors shut, the audience waits, expectant, ready to suspend belief for two hours. First, the previews, will it be the new James Bond? No, it is the latest McCarthy's restaurant commercial, with long shots of empty tables and a droning voice-over. The audience is trapped, settled into the seats, eyes still adjusting to the gloom. There is nowhere to go. The once-magical theater screen has become a giant television.

Television has commercials to fund itself. No admission is charged for a sit-com; the money needed to produce a show comes from the sponsors. Movie theaters are funded by their ticket sales and by the outrageous prices of M&Ms and Milkduds. They should not be financed by the sale of screen time to independent businesses.

Perhaps the solution is to treat this bad advertising the same way as bad entertainment — boo it off the screen until the theater managers get the message. — **Brian McCuskey**

#### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Chris Chapman, Jim Greenhill, Mike Mackay, Brian McCuskey and Sean Rowe.  
 Editorial Assistant: Julia Coon.  
 Assistant Managing Editor: Deirdre Fallon.

News: Jeanna Baxter, Matt Bivens, Meg Craddock, Ruth Davis, Laurie Duncan, Kimberly Edens, Mark Folk, Kristen Gardner, Timothy Harrison, Lindsay Hayes, Michael Jackson, Kelly Johnson, Michael Jordan, Helen Jones, Sharon Keschull, Hunter Lambeth, Barbara Linn, Brian Long, Mitra Loffi, Leigh Ann McDonald, Justin McGuire, Smithson Mills, Lee Ann Necessary, Rebecca Nesbit, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Charla D. Price, Becky Riddick, Debbie Rzasa, Andrea Shaw, Clay Thorp, Nicki Weisenense and Judy Wilson. Brian Long, assistant business editor. Rachel Orr, assistant university editor.

Sports: Mike Berardino and Patton McDowell, assistant sports editors. Steve Giles, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Jim Muse, Andy Podolsky, Chris Spencer and Langston Wertz.

Features: Hannah Drum, Carole Ferguson, Jennifer Frost, Laura Jenkins, Corin Ortlan, Lynn Phillips and Kathy Wilson.

Arts: James Burrus, Scott Cowen, David Hester, Beth Rhea, Kelly Rhodes, Alston Russell and Rob Sherman.

Photography: Tony Deifell, David Minton, Matthew Plyler and Julie Stovall.

Copy Editors: Karen Bell, Julia Coon, Laurie Duncan, Lisa Lorentz, Toby Moore, Karen Smiley, Rachel Stiffler and Kaarin Tisue.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Bill Cokas, Greg Humphreys and Trip Park.

Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Peggy Smith, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Michael Benfield, Lisa Chorebanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovinsky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wenger, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary.

Distribution Tucker Stevens, manager.

Delivery Leon Morton, manager; Billy Owens, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway and Lisa Poole, production assistants.

Printing: The Chapel Hill Newspaper

## Readers' Forum

### Public needs foreign policy lesson

Pierre Tristam

Post Impressions

The Iran-contra affair has raised an issue which in a democracy cannot afford to be laid to rest: what role, if any, should public opinion play in the shaping of U.S. foreign policy? In their battle for an appealing answer, conservatives and liberals have only proved that the context of the debate must change before the answer is applied.

In a democracy — such as the United States — public opinion and makers of foreign policy are like duelists who are perpetually fighting with blank ammunition. Neither can afford to lose the other, each being the other's *raison d'être*, and neither wishes to trust the other. Both contend with an advantageous middle ground of mutual diffidence.

In a non-democracy — Syria, for instance — foreign policy makers control the little public opinion that dares exist like a trainer who controls his dogs at a circus. If a dog rebels, it is quickly replaced, if not put to sleep. Policy makers enjoy a free reign. There is no middle ground.

A conservative in the United States might, for good reason, sometimes wish public opinion here were as irrelevant as it is in Syria. The American voting public that indirectly but decisively influences policy makers consists of superficially informed constituencies, or at best constituencies whose concerns with domestic issues disproportionately influence the public's opinions of foreign policy, and thereby foreign policy itself. That public's so-called ignorance combined with its constitutional rights restrains the maneuverability of experts. Or so a conservative believes.

A liberal would contend that current foreign policy is entirely dominated by

conservatives and well ignores public opinion, that it is out of touch with its own capabilities, and consequently often ends up embarrassed and in disarray (the record proves it), and that American foreign policy still is determined and gravely undermined by a proselytizing itch.

Partisanship aside, two answers are equally valid and diametrically opposed as to who should have the last word between public opinion and foreign policy makers; that is, which of the two should lead:

■ Elected officials and their staffs are both implicitly entrusted with the leadership of the nation and are naturally better qualified to lead it. Therefore, they should be granted a mandate to lead. Without interference.

■ Public opinion, however, (a term that represents much more than graphs and numbers in newspaper surveys) actually represents the nation for whose sake officials operate. And foreign policy, no matter the expertise of its deacons — and specifically because of inevitable and far-reaching domestic consequences — should ultimately answer to the majority will of constituents in accordance with majority rule, no matter their traditional parochialism or separatism.

For policy-makers and public opinion to converge rather than duel, each side should live up to a certain degree of responsibility which is today absent from either's agenda. Policy-makers should work toward influencing public opinion well enough both to inform and to sway

it into a visionary path which at first may look unappealing by recognizing the legitimacy and necessity of public opinion. The latter should seek to become better informed as a surer means of commanding respect.

What should happen, of course, even if it is in everyone's interest, is not necessarily what will happen. Americans are unwilling to be informed beyond the merely superficial capsulizing of information epitomized by such travesties of journalism as USA Today and the evening news. And it seems no sufficient amount of "education" could ever be mustered to change the American's psyche toward politics which, if followed, are seldom analyzed. Proof is at hand: The massive education of the last three decades has not altered American perceptions of foreign policy in evident ways, nor has it tamed the nation's imperial presumptions.

The United States is spread thin throughout the globe in defense of its interests, real or imagined. The majority of the public is unaware of the extent to which the nation has mortgaged its domestic responsibilities in favor of foreign jingoism. And policy-makers continue to take advantage of the public's aloofness.

Given the present state of things, the United States is likelier to remain a "crippled giant," in the words of former Sen. J. William Fulbright, caught between constitutional restraint and superpower responsibilities. And scandals like the Iran-contra affair are not about to desert the front page of our useful, though ignored newspapers.

Pierre Tristam is a graduate student in history from Carrboro.

### Panty raid only a joke

Editor's note: The author is president of Parker Residence Hall.

To the editor:

Concerning the letter "Sexism Prevails on Campus" by Sally Schultz (Sept. 3), I agree that certain sexual attitudes on campus pertaining to females are sometimes very degrading and very serious, but I don't believe that the Teague panty raid should be considered a prime example of that sexism. I think the raid is just another of the Teague traditions that are carried on from year to year and meant to be taken very lightly. Apparently most of the females in Parker did take the panty raid as a joke, since many of the residents were out on the balconies waiting in anticipation of Teague's big arrival.

I'm not saying that all of the residents took the raid as a joke, and I regret that there may have been some residents offended by Teague's actions. The main problem I have with Schultz's letter is that some female halls on campus, including Parker, participate in joke raids. This shows that the Teague panty raid is a bad example to use in illustrating the sexism we have here on campus and does not show the seriousness of the issue.

I know many of the residents of Teague, and the intent of the raid was not to offend anyone, but rather to give the residents something to laugh about. I've also communicated with many of the Teague residents who did not participate in the raid because of such reasons as lack of time or prior engagements, not to preserve the dignity of female residence. To conclude, I would just like to say that from relating with so many people in Teague, I think they



have a great respect for the residents of Parker. Teague is like a brother hall to Parker, and I believe its residents would have no intent of offending anyone in our hall.

KAREN CHILDRESS  
 Junior  
 Psychology

### Column writers, use sensitivity

To the editor:

Members of the town council are ultimately responsible for the enforcement of laws and for public safety in the town of Chapel Hill. I would therefore invite the two student candidates for town council to respond to two columns that appeared in the DTH. On Aug. 27, Sally Pearsall's column, "Experiencing the joys of highway warp speed," condoned the illegal and life-threatening practice of driving 70 mph to 80 mph where the speed limit is 65. The next day, Chris

Chapman advocated murdering countless pedestrians ("And now a few words from our sponsor," Aug. 28). Unfortunately, these attitudes are reflected in the way many people drive in Chapel Hill, and people suffer for it. On two separate occasions I have seen students lying in the street next to campus after being struck by cars. This happens far too often and causes considerable pain and grief for those injured or killed and their loved ones. Do these writers have any sensitivity for other human beings? Let me also ask the DTH editor, Jill Gerber, how she would console a victim; say a student who had lost her boyfriend to an automobile accident.

ALBERT HARDY  
 Systems-Programmer  
 Data Processing

### One way to disaster

To the editor:  
 It is shocking for me to read

in the DTH (Sept. 2, "Proposed street extension may level fraternity houses") that still more streets in downtown

Chapel Hill might be converted to one-way streets. We know only too well from other American cities that one-way streets encourage more traffic and greater speeds. We love to visit

European cities with their pedestrian-friendly malls from which cars have been banned, but continue to destroy as quickly as we can whatever is left of our own inner cities.

CHRISTOPH SCHWEITZER  
 Professor  
 German

### We goofed

Lee Rosenbloom's name was misspelled at the end of letter Tuesday. The Daily Tar Heel regrets the error.

## U.S.-Soviet arms deal on agenda

Mike Mackay

Editorial Writer

After decades of nuclear escalations, the United States and Soviet Union now appear close to signing an unprecedented agreement that would eliminate a whole category of nuclear weapons.

An agreement on intermediate-range nuclear weapons has recently become a hot topic of conversation between Washington and Moscow. For Ronald Reagan, an arms agreement would provide a welcome change after a summer of Iran-contra hearings and help salvage the last 17 months of his presidency. For Mikhail Gorbachev, stable relations with the United States are essential for him to carry out much-needed domestic reforms.

But despite the needs of both superpower leaders to reach an agreement, major stumbling blocks remained until recently. One of those obstacles was removed when U.S. negotiators in Geneva eased demands for on-site verification measures designed to make sure the Soviets don't cheat on an arms agreement. It was an abrupt but much-needed change of policy for the Reagan administration, which had criticized the unratified Salt II

treaty for not having strict verification procedures.

Proposals currently before U.S. and Soviet negotiators call for the most stringent verification procedures of any arms control deal in history.

Another obstacle was 72 West German missiles tipped with U.S. nuclear warheads, which the Soviets argued should be included in a deal on intermediate-range missiles. West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl made the work of Soviet and American negotiators much easier by agreeing to retire the 72 missiles if an East-West deal was reached.

Steps toward an intermediate-missile agreement began earlier this year when Gorbachev and Reagan agreed to remove from Europe all those missiles with ranges between 600 to 3,500 miles. The deal

collapsed after Gorbachev insisted on linking the agreement to Reagan's treasured Star Wars program.

Gorbachev then surprised U.S. negotiators by proposing not only to rid Europe of intermediate-range missiles, but also to eliminate shorter-range missiles capable of hitting hit targets at distances of 300 to 600 miles. Finally, a superpower arms deal gained further momentum when Gorbachev announced last summer that he would accept Reagan's "global double-zero" plan for worldwide elimination of both missile classes.

A rumored Washington summit between Reagan and Gorbachev could mark the first East-West agreement that removes an entire class of nuclear missiles. From there, U.S. and Soviet negotiators can then get down to the far more difficult and vital work of dealing with over 24,000 remaining nuclear warheads.

Mike Mackay is a senior journalism and political science major from Greensboro.