

The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

JILL GERBER, Editor
 DEIRDRE FALLON, 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

Don't tread on Shakespeare

Shakespeare may be banned from two-year community college bookstores in Marin County, Calif., not for ethical reasons, but as the result of economic pressure.

board opinion

Last week the county superior court ruled that the California Education Code did not allow the state's 106 community colleges to sell any books not specifically recommended by faculty members for their courses. Now, the decision applies only to the community college in Marin County.

The ruling resulted from a lawsuit filed by two local bookstores, which argued that the college bookstores were violating the state code and taking away their business. The code says community colleges may sell textbooks or books specifically used in a course, and stops there.

Thus, if Faulkner is not being taught during a particular semester, then the bookstore will not be allowed to sell his works. The same goes for Milton, Tolstoy, Nietzsche and on and on.

This policy is contradictory to the nature of education. The college experience is designed to instill an interest in literature in students and encourage them to read a wide range of books. The ruling reinforces the narrow-minded attitude that books are

only to be read for classes, that reading for pleasure is not a valid part of an education.

If a student carries anything from his education into the real world, it should be a love of reading that will continue to expose him to new ideas. A lawyer for the two private bookstores said that the suit fought the college's providing "a full-service bookstore," which would compete with the local stores. But there is no better place for a full-service bookstore than within an educational institution. It is ridiculous for business interests to interfere with a student's access to a variety of books within the college.

In North Carolina, the Umstead Act permits the sale of any book within state university bookstores. The battle in California may seem distant, but as recently as three years ago, N.C. State bookstore customers were asked for university identification before being allowed to purchase books, to ensure that competition between the university and private bookstores was kept to a minimum.

This example of the public vs. private conflict is less drastic than that in California, but the struggle still exists. North Carolina legislators should keep the Umstead Act airtight, protecting the general distribution of literature from the interests of private business.

Almost live from New York

With conservatism pervading nearly all corners of American life in the 1980s, any outburst of irreverence or individuality is a welcome breath of fresh air. For 13 years, "Saturday Night Live" has attracted young audiences to network television with satirical sketches that were often considered too outlandish for prime time.

But many of the sketches aired during SNL's glory days in the 1970s would never get past network censors today. Lorne Michaels, who produced the show for the first five years and the last two, once won arguments with network censors. He now finds that things have changed.

"There isn't a week in which four or five things aren't suggested that we think would be funny and the best thing on that subject and we can't do them," Michaels said. "The network does not want a controversial show."

Although controversial scripts sometimes had been left on the shelf in the past, censors began banning sketches last season that had already aired with network approval. Richard Guttner, NBC's censor-in-residence who prefers to think of himself as an editor, demanded that a sketch about a blind man and a homosexual be removed from a re-run show, despite

having already aired with his consent. He also insisted that a drug-abuse sketch called "What's My Addiction?" be removed from the re-run of a show hosted by Paul Schaffer.

Despite a lack of angry letters after the shows aired in their original form, Guttner said network officials felt they dealt with themes that were "difficult to get across within a humorous context."

But instead of a puritanical approach to network television, NBC officials actually believe that a less controversial SNL will be more marketable and rake in more advertising mega-bucks. By demanding that SNL ignore such difficult themes as drug abuse and homosexuality, censorship threatens to destroy the social satire that made the show a comedy trailblazer in the 1970s.

With viewers that have become accustomed to uncensored comedy on cable television, a watered-down SNL risks fading into a shadow of its earlier years. After 13 years on the air, seemingly pious network censors should realize that offended viewers can take Don Pardo's voice as a warning of vulgarity and switch channels to the late movie — maybe something nice and tame like "Scarface." — Mike Mackay

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Jim Greenhill, Mike Mackay, Brian McCuskey and Jon Rust.

Editorial Assistants: Julia Coon and Sharon Kebschull.

Assistant Managing Editors: Cara Bonnett, Melissa Daniels, Peter Lineberry and Mandy Spence.

News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Lydian Bernhardt, Matt Bivens, Brenda Campbell, Staci Cox, Meg Craddock, Sandy Dimsdale, Carrie Dove, Laurie Duncan, Mark Folk, Gerda Gallop, Alissa Grice, Lindsay Hayes, Kyle Hudson, Michael Jackson, Kelly Johnson, Michael Jordan, Helen Jones, Susan Kauffman, Sharon Kebschull, Hunter Lambeth, Will Lingo, Barbara Linn, Brian Long, Mitra Lotfi, Lynne McClintock, Brian McCollum, Leigh Ann McDonald, Justin McGuire, Stephanie Marshall, Laurie Martin, Myrna Miller, Smithson Mills, Lee Ann Necessary, Rebecca Nesbit, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Amy Powell, Charla Price, Andrea Shaw, Mandy Spence, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Nicki Weisenense and Amy Winslow. Brian Long, assistant business editor. Kimberly Edens and Kristen Gardner, assistant university editors.

Sports: Mike Berardino, Patton McDowell and Chris Spencer, assistant sports editors. Robert D'Arruda, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Brendan Mathews, Jim Muse, Andy Podolsky, and Langston Wertz.

Features: Hannah Drum, Carole Ferguson, Laura Jenkins, Corin Ortlan, Lynn Phillips, Leigh Pressley, Karen Stegman, Kathy Wilson and Julie Woods.

Arts: James Burrus, Scott Cowen, Stephanie Dean, Kim Donehower, David Hester, Julie Olson, Beth Rhea, Kelly Rhodes, Alston Russell and Richard Smith.

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

Copy Editors: Karen Bell, Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Laurie Duncan, Bert Hackney, Lisa Lorentz, Toby Moore, Rachel Stiffler and Kaarin Tissue, assistant news editor.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Bill Cokas and Greg Humphreys.

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 Chobanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovensky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wenger, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary.

Distribution: Tucker Stevens, manager.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon production assistants.

Readers' Forum

Alumni Center to help students in long run

To the editor:

As a member of the Student Alumni Association (SAA), I would like to address the issue of the new Alumni Center site. The Order of the Bell Tower, UNC's chapter of the SAA, functions as a link between the General Alumni Association and the students. We are here to stimulate interest and awareness in UNC's future as students.

The alumni are in the process of building a much-needed center to be used for activities such as homecoming, commencement, reunions, sports and other events. I want to stress that each of you is a future user of this center. It is not to be used only by million-dollar donors; it is for everyone. This will be your home base when you return to UNC.

The Stadium Drive site of the center was offered to the alumni by Chancellor Christopher Fordham and followed the normal approval process by the Faculty

Committee on Buildings and Grounds, the Real Property Committee of the Board of Trustees, the Alumni Steering Committee, the Executive Committee of the alumni association and its officers and directors. This was not done without student participation; student representatives (the student body president, the senior class president, the DTH editor and the SAA President) sit on the association's board, and the student body president sits on the Board of Trustees. Notice was given to the students in a front-page DTH article when the decision was made final. The site was chosen due to its excellent central location, which will provide access by foot to any campus event or facility.

Concerns have been raised by students on the issues of parking and the trees now on the site. The architect's plans are not yet in, so it is impossible to address the specifics of lot assignments at this time. It is also important to note that the parking on this campus belongs to the University,

and therefore the University, not the alumni, will decide how it will be distributed.

Another asset of this site is the natural beauty of the land. Every effort is being made by the architect to nestle the building into the site; the alumni are every bit as concerned with preserving the woods and the walkways as the students. The plans for the site will enhance its beauty and will prevent anything inappropriate from being built there.

As with any issue on campus, it is to be expected that student opinion will be divided. This letter has brought forth several considerations in the hope that you, as a student and as a future alumnus, will be able to take an educated stand.

KARIN WEST
 Junior
 International Studies/
 Economics

Offensive float was mistake

To the editor:

As a whole, I feel the homecoming parade Oct. 9 was a success. The support the residence halls, campus organizations and clubs showed for the football team's efforts through participating in the parade was outstanding and definitely should be commended.

Before the parade, Kelly Clark, Residence Hall Association president, and I emphasized to all participants that floats were to be tasteful and focused on school spirit. I regret, however, that one of the golf carts in the parade was in poor taste and had not been screened out. I am referring to the cart which read, "Deac's have AIDS." While I believe the dormitory's intent was to promote school spirit, its float failed to show appropriate sensitivity to those afflicted with AIDS. As president of the Carolina Athletic Association, it was my responsibility to eliminate floats in poor taste, and in this instance, I failed to do that.

The parade is over now, and we cannot take back or erase what has already happened. I do, however, wish to apologize to the spectators and participants. The CAA recognizes that thousands of people die of AIDS every year, and to make a joke of something that serious is wrong and inappropriate. We respect that there are many people here in Chapel Hill dedicating their lives to AIDS research, and we are sorry for offending them. And finally, most importantly, I'd like to apologize to those watching the parade who have AIDS. We did not mean for this to hurt anyone, and for those that it did, we are sorry.

We can only apologize, learn from our mistakes and hope to do a better, more responsible job in the future.

CAROL GEER
 Junior
 Psychology

Don't stop with ending market

To the editor:

Nominate the DTH staff, especially Sally Pearsall, for the 1988 Nobel Prize in economics. Most students probably never realized you shouldn't invest more in the market that you can afford to lose ("Beware of the Wall Street bear," Oct. 21) or that corporate raiders are



out for profits. Thanks, guys.

Pearsall topped it all off with her cogent analysis of the stock market ("Time to stop stock market madness," Oct. 21). But why stop with just abolishing the market? Let's get rid of the whole free market system. We're sick and tired of paying those huge middlemen profits to ulcer-plagued businessmen in fancy corporate offices. Get back to the good old days when families made or grew everything themselves.

Think about it. No money, no taxes, no budget deficit, no trade imbalance. No cocaine-crazed MBAs with BMWs and Rolaxes, no Ivan Boesky, no business ethics problems, no Medtech scandal. No divestment worries. Just good, honest Americans back to those bedrock values that made this country great. Kinda catchy, huh?

KATE BLACKMON
 Graduate
 Business

Banks are obvious safety

To the editor:

The editorial board has once again shown its deep insight into complex problems facing the world, the nation and the UNC student. In the editorial of Oct. 21 ("Beware of the Wall Street bear"), the board advises students not to invest in the stock market in light of the 508-point drop on Monday. Instead, the board urges students to put their surplus money in a bank. To help support its argument that a bank is the best place for a student's money, the board gives the example of a student who "made \$35 on every share (of Telerate stock) he bought"

CAROL GEER
 Junior
 Psychology

which was "an increase of nearly 200 percent over the original price." A student earns 200 percent on his investment in the stock market, and he's supposed to put his money in the bank? Come on.

The board continues its deep insight with the startling revelation, "The people who really were hurt by Black Monday are those who came into the market as short-term investors and guessed that it would rise." Gee, I never would have figured that. Another interesting and little-known fact that the board brings to light: "The small investor who looks to short-term increases (in the stock market) is taking a gamble." The stock market a gamble? Really? I'm certainly glad that the board brought this fact to my attention, as I had always thought the stock market was the most risk-free place to invest my money. All sarcasm aside, the board should try to avoid its affinity for stating the obvious and concentrate on being journalists, not financial advisers.

JIM HOCK
 Evening College

Bork's sin is trust

To the editor:

They tried to make Robert Bork drink the hemlock but he said, "No, thank you, kind sirs, you'll have to inject me, just for the record." And the record shows, among other things, that the man who led the lynch Bork committee was unfit to tie Bork's shoes. But more importantly, the record shows that Bork was not judged on his character and competence but on his judicial philosophy. This new criteria for judging

Supreme Court nominees exposed him to the influence of public opinion to the point where he was being forced to make campaign promises concerning how he would vote in future cases. When Bork refused to play the politician, he was accused of putting cold, constitutional analysis ahead of sensitivity to the people.

This violation of the independence of the judiciary came about because Bork threatened the social agenda of a political faction that could not enforce its agenda through democratic means. Forced busing, racial quotas and abortion on demand are the main planks in this agenda that has been imposed on the electorate by the most undemocratic branch of government, the judiciary. Now we are supposed to accept these modern social experiments as being mainstream, as if we had a voice in their creation. Bork's terrible sin is his habit of deferring decisions to the people whenever he can't find a clear answer in the Constitution. But this is a sin only in the eyes of those who do not trust the people.

On the eve of the Bork election, I am reminded of a verse from an old Bob Dylan tune, "Come senators, congressmen, please heed the call/ Don't stand in the doorway, don't block up the hall."

ALAN CULTON
 Senior
 Political Science

We goofed

Thursday's editorial "When the safety of home erodes" incorrectly said that Aug. 20 was a Saturday. It was a Thursday. The Daily Tar Heel regrets the error.

Take Econ 10 before playing stockbroker

To the editor:

Wow! It's a good thing we consulted Wednesday's DTH for financial advice before we plunged into the stock market! We didn't know that putting money in a bank was safer than investing in the market. And with such influential thinkers proposing the abolition of the stock market, we might have lost our shirts!

Seriously, the only thing that the board opinion editorial ("Beware of the Wall Street bear") and Sally Pearsall's column ("Time to stop stock market madness") showed readers was a complete lack of understanding as to how the stock market works and its position in the nation's economy.

You don't have to take Stocks and Bonds 101 to realize that investing in the market is a risk. The board lamented that small investors don't have a say in the fluctuation of stocks. That's why they are small investors. Besides, who does have a say in the way stocks move? Stock moves by the overall public perception of each corporation, not by the whims of one individual.

The board also cogently observed that students "would be wiser to put (their

money) in a bank than in the stock market." Why? If they invest wisely, the return on their stocks is likely to be much greater than the interest yielded from a conventional savings account.

Pearsall's column expresses even more inane thoughts on the market. She says, "Analysts offer all kinds of crazy ideas to explain the ups and downs of stock." These analysts are only relaying what they see troubling the public, the investors. It goes back to the bit about public perception.

She goes on to cite the analysts' discussion of Monday's bombing of two Iranian oil drilling platforms as a catalyst for the collapse. This was regarded by most analysts as a secondary factor. But is that so crazy? If a company you invested in has Middle Eastern interests, what will happen to those interests if the United States goes to war with Iran? To say they would be threatened is a grand understatement.

But the most absurd idea of all is the suggestion that the stock market should be abolished. The stock market is the foundation of American business. To abolish the stock market would be to take the backbone out of the capitalist system.

Corporations would lack the necessary capital to grow and invest on an international scale. What about foreign investors with interests in U.S. corporations? Ditching the stock market would have a dire impact on economies around the world.

The corporations wouldn't be the only ones to suffer. To note just one pertinent example, what about our University's endowment? UNC could not experience the tremendous growth it now enjoys.

Even the brokers on Wall Street would admit that the stock market is just a sophisticated crap shoot. But to suggest getting rid of it is tantamount to saying the United States should step back in time. Maybe the DTH staff should step into an economics class before putting its foot in its mouth.

DAVE GAVIN
 Senior
 Accounting

JIM ZOOK
 Senior
 Journalism/Political Science