

# 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*

## Recycle this newspaper

At the rate of about 400,000 tons a day, Americans make more trash than any other people in the Western world. New York City dwellers — no doubt high consumers of newspapers and heavily packaged Le Menu dinners — toss away nine times their weight in garbage a year.

The places to put the fruits of American excess are rapidly running out. Half of the country's landfills will be full in the next three to five years, leaving 100 million people with no place to dump their garbage.

These bulging dump sites translate into soaring disposal costs. Much of Philadelphia's trash is moved to Ohio, for example, because the city's landfills are full. Its disposal costs have risen from \$20 per ton to \$90 per ton in the past seven years.

Although recycling was touted as the ideal solution in the '70s, it lost favor because dumping was cheaper. But the tables have turned. As a practical, cost-effective alternative, recycling has seen a resurgence across the country.

Some concerned students have brought this resurgence to UNC. This week, the Student Environmental Action Coalition (SEAC) hopes to submit a proposal to the University for a comprehensive campus recycling

### board opinion

plan. Under the plan, containers would be put in residence halls for glass and aluminum, so the materials could be taken to recycling plants.

The proposal could work well. Students would be able to play an active role in protecting the environment while exerting minimum effort. Although few people take the time to take discarded soda cans and newspapers to the nearest recycling site, SEAC's containers would make recycling as easy as tossing trash into a dumpster.

And while being environmentally responsible, the University could reap some financial benefits as well. Although the plan asks the University to pay some initial costs, recycling could prove cheaper than dumping in the long run.

Chapel Hill's lush trees and wide lawns may make indisposible mountains of garbage seem impossible. Yet the Islip, N.Y., trash barge that tried to dump its 3,168-ton bounty on Morehead City this summer brought the nation's waste crisis close to home.

A recycling program that could give students the hands-on experience of running a business while easing the University's potential trash disposal problems is one of the most innovative ideas to come to campus of late. Student initiative combined with University cooperation could make trash mountains into molehills.

## Redefining the right to know

It was a self-conscious, yet eager Bob Woodward who faced Mike Wallace Sunday night on "60 Minutes." He appeared, both in a taped story and then live, to discuss information about the late CIA Director Bill Casey he has revealed in his new book, "Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA."

Woodward's book tells of a covert plan against terrorism that backfired, resulting in the death of 80 innocent Lebanese bystanders. It also relates the story of how Casey confirmed that he had known all along about diversion of money to the Contras.

The first revelation about the covert plan, if true, would illuminate a grievous overstepping of power on Casey's part. President Reagan, through presidential order, had prohibited CIA involvement in the assassination of foreign leaders, terrorists or not. And Congress had stressed this order to the CIA. Woodward, assistant managing editor at The Washington Post, apparently felt this information would serve the public better in his book months later than reported in his newspaper at the time.

The second revelation deals with the question that obsessed the country all summer: Did Casey know about the diversion of profits from Iranian arms deals to the Contras?

After sneaking past CIA security into Casey's hospital room, Woodward asked the director if he had known about the money. Casey nodded. Thus, Woodward becomes the only person besides Ollie North to affirm Casey's knowledge about the transfer — something that Casey had denied to Congress.

The peculiar part of this story, however, is Woodward, not Casey. Not only is it questionable that the two ever held this conversation, Casey's wife and daughter argue that they never left his side during his last days. But if the conversation did take place in April, why did Woodward sit quiet during the Iran-contra hearings this summer while his newspaper carried headlines questioning the Casey connection?

Woodward likes to portray himself as a prominent defender of the public's right to know. He has stressed that it is the responsibility of the news media to report whatever is happening. In this case, however, he put himself first.

He can't have it both ways, using the idea of "right to know" when it serves him and disregarding it when it doesn't, even if the publicity that he's getting for his book now won't hurt its sales later. — **Jon Rust**

### The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Chris Chapman, Jim Greenhill, Mike Mackay and Brian McCuskey.

Editorial Assistants: Julia Coon and Sharon Keschull.

Assistant Managing Editors: Ruth Davis and Deirdre Fallon.

News: Jeanna Baxter, Matt Bivens, Meg Craddock, Ruth Davis, Laurie Duncan, Kimberly Edens, Mark Folk, Kristen Gardner, Lindsay Hayes, Michael Jackson, Kelly Johnson, Michael Jordan, Helen Jones, Sharon Keschull, Hunter Lambeth, Brian Long, Mitra Lotfi, Leigh Ann McDonald, Justin McGuire, Smithson Mills, Lee Ann Necessary, Rebecca Nesbit, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Charla D. Price, Andrea Shaw, Clay Thorp, Nicki Weisensee 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 Ortlam, 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 Tissue.

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 Chorbaniyan, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhaney, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovinsky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wong, *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 Leslie Humphrey, *production assistants*.

## Readers' Forum

### Bork uses judicial restraint when convenient

To the editor:

I am distressed by the recent spate of comments in the DTH which dangerously misrepresent what Robert Bork's nomination to the Supreme Court might mean for the future of American society (James Surowiecki's "Philosopher-kings keep court," Sept. 25, Jeff Duncan's "Analysis of Bork nomination was biased," and non sequitur, Sept. 24).

Surowiecki and Duncan both seem to agree with Bork that majority opinion ought to determine constitutionality, by referring to Bork's writings Connecticut contraceptive case. Bork criticized that ruling, saying, "The majority finds use of contraceptives immoral . . . Knowledge that it takes place and that the state makes no effort to inhibit it causes the majority anguish, impairs their gratification." Bork, Surowiecki and Duncan don't seem to remember or be overly concerned that the majority of people in the South did not wish blacks to eat in the same restaurants as whites or ride in the same buses. I have no doubt that the white majority certainly had its gratification impaired by federally enforced integration. This fact does not convince me that integration laws ought to be overturned. You are right, Surowiecki. "The people of a state may not decide under what (sic) laws they wish to live" when those laws are deemed unconstitutional.

Through checks and balances, the courts

are deliberately distanced from majority rule to check the whims of popular sentiment, which, as the Constitution's founders rightly assumed, may well run counter to constitutionally based law. It is evident that the founders of the Constitution greatly mistrusted majority rule without checks as a threat to a stable democratic system.

Another glaring misrepresentation being perpetrated by the Reagan administration and people of Surowiecki's ilk is that Bork is an advocate of the principle of "judicial restraint," i.e., that judges should not be activists in interpreting the law. The most telling evidence that this is not the case is that Bork's most enthusiastic supporters on the right are urging his nomination precisely because they expect him to be an activist for their positions. Although Bork consistently touts this principle, his own actions and words are self-contradictory. In describing his opinion that the First Amendment did not apply to those who may incite violence, Bork said that his thinking was influenced by violence on the Yale campus during the 1960s. I would bet good money that violence at Yale is nowhere mentioned in the Constitution. Nor, for that matter, do I recall any reference to a principle of "majority anguish."

Bork has also proven to be a consistent advocate of government and business rights at the expense of individual rights.

In a recent study of dozens of his opinions in cases of individuals vs. government, he sided without exception with the government. In cases of business vs. government, he sided without exception with business.

Despite my respect for the Constitution, I am somewhat baffled by the strong sentiment against judicial activism. The founders created a brilliant system of government, which rightly earns praise and is imitated by nations around the world. Yet it was also their intent to allow slavery to be continued, to count blacks as three-fifths of a person for whites' representation while denying them the right to vote and to deny women the right to vote. Indeed these deplorable facts now serve to illuminate the genius of the Constitution; that it can continue to evolve toward a more just basis for government than even its creators intended — through the making of new laws by Congress, the presidential veto and yes, the active interpretation of those laws by the judiciary.

Judicial activism is inevitable. Let us then, accept this reality and write our senators to let them know that our reputation as the world's most just society is on the line with the nomination of Bork.

MATTHEW TIEDEMANN  
 Senior  
 Russian/East European  
 Studies

### Tristram overlooks facts

To the editor:

Pierre Tristram is up to his old tricks! In his syrupy piece "Love and Courtship, American Style" (Sept. 22), he introduced Georges Sand to provide a touch of credibility to his ramblings and pontifications on love. In his haste, though, he overlooked a few "minor" details, for Georges Sand appears to have both a new vocation and a new sex. These mistakes might have been overlooked, except that his syntax ("Sand and his effusive Chopin") proved that he really had no idea that Aurore Dupin, alias Georges Sand, was a 19th century female novelist!

Tristram has repeatedly submitted his personal evaluations on a variety of topics. In many of them, he abuses common sense and simple respect for the public by an abundance of clichés. In his last article, he evoked "effusive lovers," "lyrical settings," "inspired declarations," and the "surreal world." If, on top of these ramblings, he cannot get his basic facts straight, his audience is likely to change completely over to those students who are just looking for a good laugh.

STEPHANE CHARITOS  
 Graduate  
 French/Comparative  
 Literature

ANDY SMALL  
 Graduate  
 French/Comparative  
 Literature

### It's humor, not sexism

To the editor:

I could hardly believe my eyes when I read the DTH Sept. 24. Kathy Nasstrom actually had the audacity to accuse the DTH of printing a sexist statement! Kathy, do you realize that the editorial staff consists of 11 females and one male? It is hard for me to believe that these 11 women spend their time searching for sexist statements to use for the quote. Anyway, what if it is a sexist



statement? I'm 99.9 percent sure it was not printed for its sexist connotations. Believe it or not, Kathy, there is such a concept as humor. I'm sure that it is a hard concept for you to comprehend. When you take life at face value, I'm sure something as subtle as humor is above your understanding of sexism.

Groucho Marx was a great comedian. A great comedienne of her time was Mae West. One of her more famous lines is, "It's not the men in my life but the life in my men that counts." I do not find that sexist. I find it funny. Then again, I don't sit in judgment of humor, I just enjoy it.

SCOTT JONES  
 Sophomore  
 Journalism

### Dance to the music

To the editor:

I have been reading this past week about the outrageous university policy for the Smith Center concerning the booking of concerts and other events. I am amazed at this type of policy.

When I was an undergraduate, I went to a university called Hofstra. For those who don't know its geographic location, it is on Long Island across the street from Nassau Coliseum. You know, home of the New York Islanders, a major concert stop for all the

big names, etc. In my time at Hofstra, university officials, to the best of my knowledge, never asked the coliseum not to hold an event because its students were too irresponsible. The students just never knew when to play and when to study, so they had to be told. It sounds pretty ridiculous for the university to call up the New York Rangers and tell them they couldn't come over to play the Islanders because there was an Economics 101 final in the morning.

It is a tradition for Islander fans to leave the coliseum honking their horns and screaming "We're No. 1" (only if they win, of course). I don't think that the U2 fans will follow suit. If Hofstra University can deal with an event almost every night of the week, why can't the Smith Center see fit to do the same? After all, how many nights a week is the Smith Center filled to capacity? If this is the way the university is putting the Smith Center on the map, it had better be a very selective map.

TOBI SCHWARTZMAN  
 Secretary  
 Department of English

### Thumbs down to letter writers

To the editor:

I am writing to express my utter disgust with the recent format of our beloved DTH's

editorial page. One cannot turn to the back of the paper these days without seeing some smart aleck's grotesque, critical overview of the latest editorial with any substance. What do these couch potatoes who write these letters do all day? They apparently have nothing better to do than grab a DTH, read the editorials, and quickly run to quill and ink to degrade the latest opinion. Thumbs down, guys.

How can we forget the sexism episode a few weeks ago caused by Sally Schultz, the RA from Parker? You people had a carnival with that. How often are we bombarded with letters such as those by Rob Friedman, the senior who had more fun cutting the sports editor to the quick than he did making his point, which was something to the effect that Joe Biden is an OK kinda guy. Letters such as these are little more than glorified fluff, unfortunately for the DTH editors.

Don't get me wrong. I enjoy a good, meaty letter just as much as the next person, and I feel the DTH gives a precise, fresh overview of most issues that are of interest to our microcosm of the world. Perhaps the student critics could help by cutting the pompous routine and helping to insure that the paper's professionalism endures all the way through the back page.

HEATHER SHULER  
 Sophomore  
 English

## Personal rights no consequence to judge

To the editor:

Jeff Duncan wrote that Judge Robert Bork was merely attacking "weak premises which lead to weak arguments" in his decisions, and not actually attacking basic freedoms and constitutional principles ("Analysis of Bork nomination was biased," Sept. 24). This is the impression that Bork would like to give, now that those same decisions are under scrutiny, but that is clearly not the case.

In the Connecticut contraception case, Bork ruled that a state has the right to regulate private sexual relations between consenting, legally married couples. It is almost impossible to think of a stronger violation than this of the basic freedoms that the Constitution is supposed to guarantee. If Bork thought this law was "nutty," as he said during the his confirmation hearings, why did he make no attempt to strike it down? He was presented with a law that flies in the face of the basic principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, a law with clear dictatorial intent, and the best he could do was uphold

it because the "arguments against it were weak?" If Bork is, as advertised, "one of the finest legal minds in our country," why did he fail to strike down an obviously unconstitutional law? The conclusion to be drawn here is that Bork is either in favor of such laws or is not nearly the legal scholar he is purported to be.

Let me emphasize that the question in this case is not one that Americans consider controversial. Most American Catholics do not feel that their own church, let alone the state, has the right to regulate whether or not married couples use contraception. This is not like the abortion issue where reasonable people disagree; this is a clear case of putting the government into each and every bedroom in America, something the founding fathers would not have stood for even momentarily. Such a clear failing in the knowledge of the intent of the founding fathers is shameful in a federal judge, unconscionable in a Supreme Court justice, and simply ridiculous in a man who claims to be a strong advocate of original intent.

Finally, let me point out that in firing Watergate Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox, Bork aided in the largest obstruction of justice this nation has ever seen. He could have followed the example of the top two Justice Department officials, and resigned rather than fire Cox. But instead he chose to stay on and try to keep one man, who happened to be the president, from being investigated for his crimes. If Bork had tried to "fix" parking tickets for his friends, there would be no question of his sitting on the Supreme Court. Instead, he tried to fix a conspiracy to thwart the basic electoral process, essentially joining a second conspiracy to keep the first one quiet. If his extremist, anti-freedom decisions are not enough reason to keep him off of the highest legal body in the land, his record in the Watergate case ought to be.

SIMON GOLDENBERG  
 Graduate  
 Physics/Astronomy