

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

Deck is a gamble for students

Chapel Hill is a city. It has a large population in a small space, especially when the University is in session. When cities reach the size that Chapel Hill has reached, it's time to start thinking about rapid mass transportation.

board opinion

Poor planning has left the University with dire parking problems. For years, people have suggested building parking decks, but they've always been passed over in favor of other facilities.

The blame for this situation rests on the shoulders of the bureaucrats of 20 years ago. The task now is to deal with the problem as efficiently as possible.

One way is to build remote parking lots and have buses bring students and faculty in to campus. This is already working. Chapel Hill's comfortable and regular buses carry more people per mile traveled than any other network in the state.

Another is to build decks. Four have been recommended. One has now made it through a five-level maze of bodies of approval and will open in 1990 near Craige Residence Hall. It will house faculty, staff and students, all of whom need spaces.

It's tempting to criticize the way the deck's been handled. Spaces will be lost at Craige while it's being built. Parking there is likely to be expensive.

But building such facilities is a bureaucrat's nightmare. The new deck will hold up to 1,500 cars. Included in the \$12.2 million price tag are an estimated 500 surface spaces to replace those lost while the deck is built.

That's a maximum of only 2,000 spaces, at a price fully one-third the phenomenal cost of the Smith Center.

If applications for permits were to stay at their present level — and they're likely to increase — 2,000 people would still be turned down each semester.

The University's big facilities are funded by the state, research grants, alumni and corporations. It's not so hard to fund a glamorous facility, as the Smith Center demonstrates, but who wants to pay for a parking deck?

Gene Swecker, associate vice chancellor for facilities planning, said the deck is practical because of its location near the Smith Center. The University hopes that the deck's usefulness for special events will attract some private funding and hold the price down.

Although the deck should be welcomed, planners must hold the costs passed on to faculty, staff and students as low as they can. While people should accept other transportation, the administration should work more vigorously to conquer the parking problems. Most importantly, the University should plan parking facilities with more foresight than in the past.

Thawing the deep freeze

Like an aged actor with his last shot at an Oscar, Ronald Reagan stands on the verge of signing a historic arms control agreement on short- and medium-range nuclear weapons. But as the curtain call nears on his reign, Reagan risks ruining the deal for the sake of Star Wars.

As the United States and Soviet Union gradually move closer to an agreement, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has threatened to delay ratification until the Reagan administration ceases attempts to rewrite the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Unless these efforts end soon, Reagan risks losing the possibility of the first superpower agreement that would reduce the number of nuclear missiles held by both sides.

Although the agreement to eliminate all nuclear missiles with ranges between 300 to 3,000 miles represents only 3 percent of the nuclear weapons in the U.S. and Soviet arsenals, it does mark a significant first step. By thawing the deep freeze that has plagued superpower negotiations during the 1980s, it would represent progress toward dealing with the much greater threat of long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Blocking this agreement is Reagan's belief that the ABM treaty has a

loophole that permits unlimited testing and development of Star Wars. Describing this misinterpretation as a deliberate attempt to rewrite history, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has threatened to delay ratifying the agreement if the treaty's original meaning is not upheld. The ABM treaty, signed in 1972, prohibits the presence and testing of any offensive or defensive nuclear weapons in space.

At the heart of this dispute is Reagan's vision of Star Wars as an alternative to nuclear deterrence, under which nuclear war is avoided by the threat of mutual assured destruction. In his view, Star Wars should be a sort of protective umbrella that renders nuclear weapons obsolete. It is a plan that sounds good, but would never pass a truth-in-advertising test.

By rewriting the ABM treaty to permit unlimited testing and deploying of Star Wars, Reagan will only invite the Soviet Union to build nuclear arsenals that are capable of penetrating any space defense. By threatening to delay a symbolic step forward in the superpower arms race, the Foreign Relations Committee has attempted to stop Reagan from pushing progress several steps backward. — Mike Mackay

non sequitur

Bork flees rabid liberals in D.C.

Non was bored last week, so he decided to head up to Washington. A visit to the nation's capital, he thought, would be an uplifting and invigorating experience. Little did he know what lay in wait.

As he drove by the Capitol building, he was forced to bring his car to a sudden stop, as a figure with a straggly beard and darting eyes ran across the street. Non recognized him immediately. "You're Robert Bork!" he shouted. "But why are you running?"

Before Bork had a chance to answer, Non saw the answer to his question racing down the Capitol steps. A horde of senators was approaching with disturbing speed. There were liberals, foaming at the mouth and mumbling words like "ideologue" and "racist," and conservatives speaking of "moderates" and "judicial restraint."

Non could see Joe Biden, reading an old Neil Kinnock speech, and Ted Kennedy, struggling in vain to find a verb while he looked for the television cameras.

"Get in," he yelled, and Bork jumped in the car. Non gunned the accelerator and

his Chevy Impala vanished into the haze.

"Thank you so much," the distinguished-looking judge said. "They were driving me mad with their drivel about their legal philosophies and how I'm going to return America to the Dark Ages. Why should I be forced to listen to plagiarists and thoughtless clods expound on legal theory?"

"I guess that's just the way it goes," Non said. "In a democracy, being an intellectual is not easy. And it certainly doesn't make you popular."

"But I don't want to be popular."

"But you do want to be confirmed, don't you? You've already done such a good job of confusing people about what you really think. I admire you for that. Those confronting you have been dishonest about the way they see democracy, so there's no reason for you to be particularly clear."

"Thank you for that lesson," Bork said. "I feel a new sense of purpose. Let's return to the Capitol. I'm ready to face the slandering hordes again. And by the way, I love this car."

"No, thank you," Non said. "And if they really start bothering you, just tell them they're borking up the wrong tree."

Readers' Forum

Experience makes Bush first choice

Mark Kita
 Guest Writer

George Bush is the obvious Republican candidate for the upcoming presidential election. While other Republicans are qualified, none have experienced first-hand the ins and outs of the presidency like George Bush during his seven years as vice president.

Bush stands head and shoulders above any of the Democratic candidates. A dedicated public servant, he is an experienced student of diplomacy and political skill. His intellectual and moral qualities far surpass those of current and recent contenders for the Democratic nomination.

While it is true that the Reagan/Bush administration has cut federal funds to education, it is equally clear that two aims of Reagan's agenda have been accomplished in the area of education. First, as a result of tremendous growth and improvement in the national economy, universities and other educational institutions have benefited immensely. While the stock market has grown to new heights, so has the value of educational endowments. Where inflation has been brought from record highs to record lows, institutions have broken free from the vicious price spirals that plagued the economy during President Jimmy Carter's term. Also, in keeping with Reagan's New Federalism, more responsibility for providing education has been returned to the

states. This is a reasonable and logical objective as state and local governments have traditionally been responsible for education and should continue in this role.

Reagan's foreign policy has been attacked as anything but constructive and resembling the post World War II-McCarthy approach to world affairs. In light of his new and dramatic arms reduction agreement with the Soviets, I think any reasonable person can see the ignorance and stupidity in such a statement.

Finally, Reagan has been criticized for supposedly blackmailing the states to raise the national drinking age to 21. I would submit that Reagan was simply responding to the apparent will of a majority of congressmen, state legislators and concerned citizens who are grappling with solutions to the terrible problem of drunk driving. I rather doubt that Reagan's legacy will be judged inadequate for addressing this issue or that intelligent students will make the drinking age issue a priority in next year's election.

George Bush will proudly run for president in an effort to carry the Reagan legacy into the 1990s. Like Reagan, he supports reasonable solutions to the problems of education. When the Democrats say throw more money at the problem, Bush abstains. Instead, he advocates more practical solutions that first and foremost center around the need to maintain a strong and thriving economy. He will not jeopardize our current economic resurgence by raising taxes for hard-working Americans.

The average citizen can rest assured that Bush is in touch. He knows that the best use of the federal government is to promote policies that will strengthen the nation and promote an individual's opportunity to succeed. The Reagan/Bush administration can take credit for last week's news that 2.5 million jobs were created in the past year and that unemployment is at a decade-low 6 percent.

George Bush established himself as a leader early in his career. Seven years of grooming sets Bush apart from any of the other candidates, and establishes him as the logical choice to lead a strong nation into the 1990s.

Mark Kita is a senior chemistry major from Cary.

Give back film posters

To the editor:
 Over the weekend three movie posters that were on display in the Upper Gallery of the Student Union were stolen. They had been up for less than a week, and were serving as a pleasant artistic distraction for those who studied and worked in that area.

As chairman of the Union Film Committee, what really upsets me about the theft is that a lot of people have asked me if they can have the posters, and I have had to say no because I need them for publicity. I just hope that the theft was done in a moment of rashness and that the culprit(s) will have the courage to return the posters to the Union desk soon.

The stolen posters were for "Blue Velvet," "Something Wild" and "Down By Law." They are all dry-mounted and are not yet commercially available, so they should not be hard to track down.

Due to their popularity, there will be an opportunity to win some of the posters at the Union Bash on Oct. 2.

JAMES DEAN
 Junior
 History

Bring U2 to the Hill

To the editor:
 Considering all of the hoopla surrounding the Smith Center as being an incredible place to book concerts, we devoted U2 fans were completely mystified that the band Rolling Stone magazine called "the band of the '80s" was not scheduled to perform in Chapel Hill. It is reassuring to know that the University has assumed the role of our mothers in deciding when we should study and when we should not. Imagine the difficulty we seniors would have budgeting valuable study time in order to go see a concert. It boggles the mind.

Are Steve Camp and the University really operating under the delusion that if they refuse to schedule U2 at the Smith Center we will all remain in our rooms that evening, noses buried in books? Get real! Plans are already in the works for a mass exodus to either the



Hampton, Va., or Atlanta, Ga., concerts, depending on where tickets and transportation can be secured. Imagine what driving hundreds of miles in the middle of the night will do to our grade point averages! So, if the University really has our best interests in mind, they should immediately call Paul McGuinness, U2's manager, to apologize for the misunderstanding and beg the band to play not one, but two shows in our beloved Smith Center. We're sure that Steve Camp would appreciate the extra revenue, anyway.

BECKY BAWDEN
 Senior
 International Studies/
 Political Science

JUDY CITRON
 Senior
 English

Groucho quote offensive

To the editor:
 The DTH's quote for the day on Sept. 21 ("A man is only as old as the woman he feels" — Groucho Marx) stunned me with its blatant sexism, offensive objectification of women and poor taste.

The most generous interpretation of this statement is that Groucho Marx, and by implication the editors of the DTH, believe that women can have a rejuvenating effect on men. If a man "feels" himself to be like a younger woman, then he

himself begins to feel younger. Here the female sensibility is associated with a positive vitality and energy. Unfortunately, this interpretation is more than a little far-fetched.

The images of women that recur in Groucho's television show "You Bet Your Life" fall into only too familiar sexist and misogynist stereotypes: voluptuous young women seen only as sex objects and elderly unattractive spinsters who have no hope of landing a man. Groucho would doubtless find my generous interpretation laughable and absurd. I think he was referring to feeling women in precisely the way that the more direct reading of the quote suggests. And, I can only conclude that you do not find this brand of sexism offensive. The most generous interpretation I can find for your action is that you were giving Groucho more credit than he is due and that you are unaware of his record of sexism. I'd like to believe this. In any case, an apology to all the women and men on this campus is in order.

KATHY NASSTROM
 Graduate
 History

Smoking is a dirty habit

To the editor:
 Is Chapel Hill High School smarter than UNC? Students at CHHS are not allowed to smoke on campus, but UNC students seem to get little discouragement from a habit that kills more Americans every

year than all the deaths from alcohol, illegal drugs, traffic accidents, homicides and suicides combined — or more than all American deaths in World War II — or more than all the deaths from AIDS from when it was first reported up through 1991!

However, as your Sept. 15 article ("Library school sets no-smoking policy") indicates, a few parts of the University are beginning to heed the surgeon general's warning that smoking is "the No. 1 heart problem in the United States." Other parts of the University seem to be ignoring this habit which rewards smokers with lung and heart disease, strokes, stained teeth, bad breath, gum disease, numbed taste buds and reeking hair, clothes and furniture — not to mention its effects on bystanders. Can we afford "free choice" for a gruesome habit that murders as many as 46,000 innocent bystanders a year?

Thanks to the courageous people who have said, "No," including those in the School of Library Science, the English department, and North Carolina Memorial Hospital (which plans to confine smoking to a room in the basement starting in 1989). Hopefully, someday the rest of the University will be smart and ban this fiery weapon that's killing us at a faster rate than AIDS will even begin to approach for years to come, if ever.

JUDITH B. WOOD
 Assistant Professor
 School of Library Science

Analysis of Bork nomination was biased

To the editor:

I am writing in response to Mike Mackay's editorial "Bork nomination is injustice" of Sept. 21. He states that Bork's philosophy permits state powers to justly override such individual freedoms as privacy, abortion and advocacy of civil disobedience. Mackay also has the gall to say that Bork's nomination may haunt America for years to come. He even compared Bork with Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. These statements show Mackay's extremely misconceived view of Bork's philosophy. It is extremely obvious that Mackay has a tremendous lack of information which leave him with only his zealous liberal attitude to form his biased opinions.

In the past, Bork has had a tendency to argue that some activist groups have had weak premises which lead to weak arguments. He only tries to make the point that reasoning, which is illogical if not

supported by strong evidence, is worthless. For example, one state was trying to pass a law to make the use of contraceptives by anyone, including married couples in the privacy of their bedroom, illegal. In response, an activist group argued that this violated constitutional rights of privacy. Bork considered this argument weak due to the fact that the Constitution doesn't guarantee privacy. Many people misinterpreted his actions and assumed that he was against the freedom of privacy. This is definitely an absurd misconception.

Mackay seems to think that the Supreme Court should be able to change the Constitution at will. He then goes on to criticize Bork for believing that the judges should only hand down "neutral principles of law" which correspond with the original intent of the Constitution. The Supreme Court was formed for the purpose of abiding by the Constitution, which no one has the right to alter.

To make Bork look like a racist, Mackay ridicules Bork's criticism of the court's "radical expansion of the First Amendment." Mackay suggests the Bork is against minorities by implying that Bork thought of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. as a criminal. Bork's criticism of this expansion was only that it promoted civil disobedience.

Mackay mentions last week's hearing on the Bork nomination, but obviously he didn't tune in. His analysis is totally unreasonable and biased. It is evident that his basis for this column is purely emotional, because it is a far cry from being factual. In the future, he should be more informed and less one-sided in his subject analysis.

JEFF DUNCAN
 Political Science
 Sophomore