

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, *Ombuds Editor*

Protest deviates from the norm

While most students sat in class Wednesday morning, about 50 protesters rallied

board opinion

against CIA recruitment on campus. Staging a symbolic protest against alleged terrorist activities by the agency, five students chained themselves together and blocked interview rooms. After refusing to leave, they were arrested and charged with disorderly conduct.

At a time when most students apathetically tunnel their way through college, signs of activism are a welcome deviation from the norm. Instead of blindly chasing the dog biscuit of a college diploma, most student activists show an intellectual independence that is rare on college campuses in the 1980s.

By protesting CIA recruitment, the students questioned the legitimacy of a governmental agency. But whether or not the CIA is actually a terrorist organization, its actions are less likely to offend democratic sensibilities when placed under greater public scrutiny.

The protesters should be commended for raising the issue. Now that students have been made aware of the agency's recruiting on campus, they should examine its record for themselves.

Yet their protest did not show adequate respect for the rights of other students. By blocking the rooms where interviews were being conducted, the chained protesters attempted to prevent any students from being recruited. Others attempted to stop recruitment by banging on a door and chanting slogans.

Although the demonstrators conducted a teach-in and claimed to have evidence of CIA crimes, they left a lasting impression of triviality by chanting, "Hey hey, ho ho, CIA has got to go."

Such appearances threaten the credibility of student activism. Instead of drawing attention to their cause, protesters sometimes appear to be drawing attention to themselves. Although this may be untrue, the perception still exists. When activism comes to resemble a defiant game, the credibility of student opinion is undermined.

In all, the benefits of Wednesday's demonstration outweighed its drawbacks by raising awareness of the value of social activism. Although many questions of social justice are not clearly black or white, a decision not to act is a decision to perpetuate the status quo.

Free lunch carries a price

The great bull market is dying. As the markets crash, analysts and politicians are casting about for villains. Amid the finger-pointing, the budget deficit looms as the greatest harbinger of continued chaos.

In 1980, candidate Ronald Reagan promised lower taxes, increased defense spending and a balanced budget. President Reagan, abetted by Congress and a care-free electorate, delivered lower taxes, increased defense spending and deficit after deficit.

During five years of economic expansion a rampant borrow-and-spend mentality fueled economic growth. After the inflationary 1970s and the 1982 recession, Americans celebrated the prosperous mid-1980s by borrowing and spending. The federal government, never a frugal institution, joined consumers in a mad, mad credit card spending orgy. As long as the nation's credit remained limitless, Americans could whistle "Happy Days Are Here Again."

Black Monday ended the reverie of the economic boom. The public finally is worried about the budget deficit. If creditors refuse to support America's credit card prosperity, the economy will collapse. A dreaded word — recession — is on economists' lips.

Economists warned the government and citizenry that huge deficits packed

a future wallop. The American people, enjoying widespread prosperity, remained oblivious to the deficits. Reagan, once an advocate of balanced budgets, has yet to submit a one to Congress. Congress, in turn, is unable to control spending.

Reagan blames Congress for the deficits; Congress blames the president. If Reagan and Congress are responsible for enacting these deficits, the American people are to blame for electing irresponsible representatives.

While Americans love to say there is no free lunch, the nation has been slow to accept the wisdom of this simple motto. Future generations will long remember the 1980s, but the country's cultural achievements will pale beside its profligacy. This generation's legacy will be its debts; future generations must pay because Americans squandered money to satisfy their immediate desires.

The economy is teetering, but a recession is not imminent. Congress and the president must act to reduce the deficit. The reduction should not be a paltry \$23 billion. A substantial reduction of between \$40 billion and \$50 billion will signal to financial markets that America is seriously addressing its problems. However, if the American people choose not to pay the piper, they deserve whatever economic reality dictates. — Eric Fullagar

Readers' Forum

CIA recruits quality people across nation

To the editor:

The conduct and the language of the CIA protest on Wednesday reminds me of the anti-war events that were so delicately staged during the Vietnam conflict. The problem is that this action, although symbolic, is counterproductive to the cause that the protesters support.

First, the CIA, while not elected, is operated and controlled by the federal government. Congress establishes the CIA's funding and oversees it; the president appoints (with congressional approval) the director and gives him his mission. Congressmen and the president are elected by the people and thus represent the majority. What the protest appears to be about was that some individuals don't care for the current or past political leadership of this country. So be it; see you at the polls in November '88.

Second, there seems to be a completely false belief that if the CIA, or the military, or Standard Oil, etc., is prevented from recruiting at UNC, then those organizations will just dry up and blow away. Give me a break! What keeps this nation strong is the participation of the people in government. The recruitment of the best

and the brightest minds in the country, those who have had the benefit of a liberal education on an open campus, has been part of the preservation of our democracy. If the CIA, or U.S. government, is prevented from getting quality people, such as those at UNC, then they will simply go elsewhere: technical schools, community colleges, military academies, ex-servicemen, beauty school dropouts, undocumented aliens, etc.

When the CIA recruits quality people, it becomes more responsive to the attitudes and will of the American people. The CIA becomes full of enlightened personnel, of which more than 90 percent work at regular jobs such as research, secretarial and management positions. Well-educated personnel are aware of history and care about international politics, diplomacy and world peace. If the CIA is forced to go elsewhere to hire workers, what type of attitude would prevail in the organization?

The protesters need to understand that the world is not a bed of roses. There is now, and it appears that there will be for the rest of the century, a pressing need for the CIA, the Department of Defense and

UNC police. The real world plays hard ball. If you don't think so, consider the three Americans assassinated in the Philippines as a symbolic protest to our support of the Aquino government. In short, by preventing the recruitment of educated UNC students, the CIA protesters are creating the kind of covert organization that they claim to be against.

A little history lesson will help illustrate the point. After this country became involved in Vietnam, protesters decided to run the ROTC off campus. They succeeded in shutting down many programs for the training and recruitment of young officers. Did the U.S. Army cease to function? Did the military fail to find people to commission? The answer was a deadly no. People were found and commissioned, such as First Lt. William Calley, from a two-year technical school. When he was pressed to make some critical decisions in the field, he did not concern himself with any liberal values. The solution to his problem was called the My Lai massacre.

SANKEY BLANTON
 Graduate
 Marine Science

Men should not bow to women

To the editor:

Once again the DTH has provided its readers with more examples of maniacal rantings from some half-sane letter writers. Your latest offering came from Patricia Hurst and Jaye Sitton ("Reporting rape takes courage," Oct. 26). They show much deserved support for a rape victim and her desire to pursue a conviction of her accused attackers.

Rape is undoubtedly the most emotionally devastating crime that a man or woman can endure. The physical act of rape leaves tremendous psychological scars in its wake, scars which often never heal. I, too, applaud the rape victim's effort to bring her alleged attackers to justice. It certainly is an awesome task that she is undertaking.

I don't, however, agree with what Hurst and Sitton feel is the message of this incident. The connection that they make between a rape case and some half-baked idea of man's subservience to women is like jumping from rationality into the abyss of insanity. To say that men "must act upon the wishes of women or face serious repercussions" is to say that regardless of whether this woman was indeed raped, her accusation of the crime is sufficient to jeopardize the lives of her accused assailants.

Rape is not a rational act, but in dealing with it we must maintain rationality so that more victims are not created. Just as a woman's emotional and psychological well-being should never be compromised by any man, no man's emotional and psychological well-being should ever be threatened by the whims of any woman. Hurst and Sitton should make an attempt to recognize this fact.

RICH BRENTS
 Freshman
 English

Most students against CGLA

To the editor:

An editorial appeared Oct. 28 about a petition being circulated in an attempt to defund the CGLA ("CGLA gets what it deserves"). It said: "Students can either choose not to sign the petition, or they can vote against defunding the organi-



zation in February. Either way, it is an excellent example of how a democracy, and the congress, work." This leaves out the option that the students may sign the petition and vote against CGLA funding in February. If the DTH is going to give an example of a democracy at work, it should include both sides of the issue.

I am one of those who is circulating the petition. I am new at UNC, but one doesn't have to be here long to realize that this is a very liberal university. When I started collecting signatures on the petition, I expected to have more than a few doors slammed in my face by open-minded liberals who are pro-CGLA. To my surprise, I received very enthusiastic reactions. On my hall alone I asked 50 people to sign the petition and of those 50, only three would not sign. And of those who did sign, only three said they were not anti-CGLA but did not think it should get student funds. Although this is a small sample, 94 percent of the people asked to sign the petition did so. It would be unrealistic to project these results to the student body and assume that 94 percent of the student body would sign, but it is not at all unreasonable to assume that the majority of the student body does not support CGLA funding. The students do not see the CGLA as providing necessary services to the University. The services that the CGLA claims to provide, such as AIDS information, would be better provided by a group that does not condone activities such as anal and oral sex that spread the virus. And it is outrageous that a group

that supports partaking in a felony is funded by mandatory student fees.

JON VAN DE RIET
 Junior
 Mathematics

Education is obvious need

To the editor:

We are writing about the article in Tuesday's DTH, "Petition proposes referendum to question CGLA funding." We are shocked and saddened that two such prejudiced students hold office in Student Government. The article states that David McNeill and H.F. Watts are not homophobes, but Watts says, "It (homosexuality) is immoral to all religious beliefs, and it's disgusting." If that's not homophobia, what is? This is a university. We are here to be educated. Such ignorance on the part of student leaders cannot be tolerated. We feel sorry for Watts, having made such a fool of himself by saying that the majority of CGLA members "promote the spreading of AIDS." How stupid! Do you think anyone wants to die willingly?

At any rate, the problem with holding a referendum for students to vote on CGLA funding would mean, in all fairness, that a referendum would need to be held for every other student-funded organization. It is wrong to think that the CGLA is the only organization on campus that is opposed by a faction of students. Is Student Congress

willing to go through the hassle of having us vote on every penny it spends? It defeats the whole purpose of having student organizations. In the article, McNeill says that gays are not a legitimate minority at UNC: legally, maybe not; physically, definitely so. Last year, CGLA was second only to the Black Student Movement of all student-funded organizations in membership; yet, this year, the BSM was allocated six times the amount of money that the CGLA was given.

Mark Donahue of the CGLA lays out in the article some of the services the organization provides to the community. Obviously, when we have students as uninformed as Watts and McNeill, these services are desperately needed. We can only hope they are not the ones trying to get students to sign the petition — seeing what they have said about gays in the media, who knows what they'll say when their poor, unsuspecting constituents aren't listening.

ROSS NANTZ
 Freshman
 Journalism

RHONDA THISSEN
 Senior
 Sociology

Make headlines

Live in a bag? Don't get out much? Tired of watching Oprah? Here's your chance. The Daily Tar Heel needs a few good editorial assistants to edit and paste up copy. If you're interested, come to a meeting Monday, Nov. 9 at 5 p.m. at the DTH office in the Union.

Students muddled in cliches and apathy

To the editor:

The quote on the front page of the Oct. 27 Daily Tar Heel was "I am my world" — Ludwig Wittgenstein. What in the world could he have meant? It seems to be an egocentric declaration of power and a confession of absolute detachment from all others who might make up a part of his world. But, if I were familiar with Wittgenstein's greatest creation, "The Philosophical Investigations," my hasty judgment would seem to be an obvious misrepresentation. In this work, Wittgenstein has investigated the most common and binding activity of mankind, the use of language, and the work reiterates our communal dependence through the most basic uses of language.

My misrepresentation sheds light on a great failing of modern education (though the problem is as old as language itself) that has invaded our whole culture. We lack curiosity and the desire to challenge our limits to knowledge. We are lazy, we look for the easy way out, and, worst of

all, we act as though we have challenged and educated ourselves: We carry around a bag of intellectual and moral cliches, i.e., "It's all relative," "I'm OK. You're OK" and "I am my world," without ever investigating them. The accusing evidence is everywhere: in the classroom, in the Pit, on Franklin Street and in the White House. Just look!

In the classroom, students rarely dare to reveal their opinion or fail to acquire an opinion by never adequately involving themselves in the course material. Why? Are we afraid our cherished opinion might be attacked? Yet, it may be confirmed by dialogue, or we may realize that we aren't so sure of our opinion, and thus we have paved the way for re-education. If we don't have an opinion, then the classroom is the place to develop one, for an attempt to articulate an opinion is the first step toward developing one.

In daily conversation, how often do we challenge ourselves, assert what we know and listen carefully with the intent to learn something new? More often than not, we

consent to the limp cliches that pervade our society, and hardly ever do we ask ourselves how the original author might have created the line and what he or she meant.

The implications of our submissive acceptance, our lack of curiosity, vary from how we respect or fail to respect the homeless in our town, to how we view the strategic arms race, to what we plan to do after we leave college, for most often our decisions are in some way based on unchecked opinion or misinterpreted cliches.

"Something that we know when no one asks us, but no longer know when we are supposed to give an account of it, is something we need to 'remind' ourselves of. (And it is obviously something of which for some reason it is difficult to remind oneself.)" — Ludwig Wittgenstein

PAUL HIGGINS
 Senior
 Interdisciplinary Studies

The Daily Tar Heel

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

Editorial Assistants: Julia Coon and Sharon Keschull.

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

News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Lydian Bernhardt, Matt Bivens, Brenda Campbell, Staci Co., Meg Craddock, Sandy Dimsdale, Carrie Dove, Mark Folk, Alissa Grice, Lindsay Hayes, Kyle Hudson, Kelly Johnson, Michael Jordan, Helen Jones, Susan Kauffman, Sharon Keschull, 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, Sheila Simmons, Mandy Spence, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Nicki Weissen, Amy Winslow and Lisa Wynne. Kati Irons, Angela Joines and Helle Nielsen, wire editors. Laurie Duncan, assistant state and national editor. Brian Long, assistant business editor. Kimberly Edens and Kristen Gardner, assistant university editor.

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

Features: Hannah Drum, Carole Ferguson, Laura Jenkins, Corin Ortlam, 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 Tisse, 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 Choremian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhaney, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovansky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, 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, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon production assistants.

Printing: The Chapel Hill Newspaper