

The Daily Tar Heel

96th year of editorial freedom

JEAN LUTES, Editor

KAREN BELL, News Editor
 MATT BIVENS, Associate Editor
 KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor
 JON K. RUST, Managing Editor
 WILL LINGO, City Editor
 KELLY RHODES, Arts Editor
 CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor

KAARIN TISUE, News Editor
 LAURA PEARLMAN, Associate Editor
 KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor
 SHARON KEBSCHULL, State and National Editor
 MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor
 LEIGH ANN McDONALD, Features Editor
 KIM DONEHOWER, Design Editor

DAVID MINTON, Photography Editor

Plenty of room in the back

When it comes time to apply for next year's parking permits, students who live off-campus will anxiously calculate the distance between the campus and their prospective homes.

Those who find that their homes lie outside a two-mile radius from the Bell Tower will groan or sigh; as in the past, such students won't be eligible for parking permits.

But faculty and staff don't have to worry about where they live. They can live 10 feet or 10 light years from the campus and still be eligible for a permit.

Making faculty and staff ineligible for parking permits if they live within the infamous two-mile radius was one of several options suggested by a Cary engineering firm, DeLeuw, Cather & Company, in a study on parking policy conducted over the summer.

On Sept. 8, UNC's Traffic and Parking Advisory Committee — a group of students, faculty and staff that makes recommendations to the chancellor on University parking — will consider several parking proposals, including the elimination of resident sophomore parking. But no proposal has been made to enforce the two-mile radius rule on faculty and staff, and the suggestion is not on the agenda for discussion.

Gene Swecker, associate vice chancellor of facilities management, said the committee must have a formal proposal before it can discuss such an option. Such a proposal should be made at the Sept. 8 meeting, perhaps by one of the four students on the committee. It would hardly be fair to eliminate sophomore parking while

not even discussing eliminating faculty/staff parking within a two-mile radius.

Making nearby faculty and staff follow the same rules as students seems just. Some students need parking permits even more than faculty and staff do.

Many staff members at the University, and some faculty, work regular hours. Thus, car pooling could be much easier for them: they can travel with fellow staff members in the mornings and evenings, since they usually leave and arrive together.

But students have difficulty car pooling because their class hours differ from day to day, and often don't coincide with the schedules of their roommates or friends.

That's not to say students shouldn't car pool or use mass transit. Students living within two miles are already taking these and similar measures. But why shouldn't faculty have to do the same?

Of course, as Student Body President Kevin Martin has noted, if faculty who live within two miles are denied permits, some form of hardship appeal process should be made available to them. It could be similar to the one students now use.

Riding the bus with the unwashed masses may be unpleasant for some secretaries or tenured professors, but that's no reason to throw the idea out without discussion. True, it's an imperfect and half-formed option. But it's up to the parking committee to hammer it in to shape, or at least toss it around before dismissing it. — Matt Bivens

Ignore the KKK next time

This weekend the infamous Ku Klux Klan marched in three area cities as part of its annual membership drive. Unfortunately, spectators and hecklers outnumbering the Klansmen showed up to feed their fire.

The marches, thankfully, were non-violent. In Wilson, 220 law enforcement officers were on hand to prevent a repeat of the raucous behavior which led to two arrests at a June 26 rally. Police officers outnumbered spectators, who booed Klansmen until Mother Nature dumped rain on their parade.

In Raleigh, 65 to 70 Klansmen were met by seven or eight protesters, who were separated from the rally for their own safety.

In Hillsborough, about 50 members of the Klan traded insults with a crowd of about 140 during a 15-minute march through downtown and a 90-minute shouting match/rally that followed on the steps of the Orange County Courthouse. A contingent of UNC students participated in the heckling, answering cries of "KKK" with their own shouts of "MLK" as they played a tape of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech.

The unfortunate part of the events

is that they took place at all. Not that the "parades" should have been vetoed — any group of people, no matter how offensive or abhorrent their agenda, should have the right to gather or demonstrate peaceably.

But nowhere in the Constitution does it say anyone has to watch them.

Hillsborough Mayor Fred Cates had the right idea. He avoided a Saturday press conference on the courthouse steps because he said it would give the Klan undeserved attention. "It's doing nothing but lending credence to their appearance here in town," Cates told the Chapel Hill Herald.

Perhaps the way to discourage the Klan from marching in area communities in the future is to make it a waste of their time. If no one shows up, and if they get minimal publicity, maybe they'll quit coming around altogether.

They don't seem to like the people here, anyway. When in Hillsborough, they directed several of their hateful remarks to the "Commies from Chapel Hill." Why don't they leave the Triangle to those who like it?

The next time Klansmen march here, let them do so on deserted streets. — Sandy Dimsdale

Dating in college 'til death do us part

It's starting to happen. A Chapel Hill friend called me this summer and asked, "Do you remember Jason and Barbara?"

"Sure," I said. "They both graduated, right? They were sort of dating last semester."

"Sort of. They're getting married."

Married? The last time I saw them was in Molly's. Jason was a tall guy with stooped shoulders and a grating laugh. Barbara was a quiet girl with a soft pale face. They were sitting side by side and smiling at each other a lot. They seemed happy to be together.

But married? Then, over the weekend I heard that another just-graduated friend of mine was marrying his girlfriend in June.

And I began to panic. I've always lagged behind the social development of my peers. In fourth grade, when my friends played spin the bottle in the alley during recess, I wandered around the playground wondering why no one wanted to play kickball. In sixth grade my pals all had girlfriends, but I was the guy the girls pretended to like to make their boyfriends jealous. I lost my emotional innocence early.

In junior high, I sat against the lockers behind the gym while everyone else danced the night away inside. In high school, when I had finally gotten the courage up to go to a dance, suddenly dances weren't cool anymore.

By senior year I had perfected this stance of apathetic cool, scorning dances and other such kid stuff. I laughed with my

Brian McCuskey In the Funhouse

friends when they ridiculed the tenth grade dances, and nodded knowingly when condoms were alluded to. Then the senior prom rolled around, and while all my friends rushed to the dance with their dates, I stayed at home, having played it so cool that I couldn't get a date to save my life.

In Chapel Hill, I thought I'd finally caught up. At last I too had dates and went to parties and even the concept of having a steady girlfriend was not unthinkable. I was comfortable with terms like "going out" and "just friends" and "date function" and "scrogging."

But now there's a new word. Marriage. And once again, I feel left out.

Not that I've never heard the word before. Freshman year, a girl I was starting to date had a theological problem with our relationship. She said she could never marry anyone who didn't believe in her God. Which I didn't.

"So, if we can't marry, then we'll have to break up eventually."

"Yeah," I agreed reluctantly.

"And someone will get hurt."

"Probably," I said.

"So maybe we shouldn't start anything."

I was stunned by the force of this logic. "So, do you still want to see this movie tonight, or what?"

I've got nothing against marriage itself. I've been lucky to grow up in a family of good matches. My parents, for example,

vote each year on whether or not to continue. It's an efficient system, as long as there isn't a tie vote. And my grandparents just celebrated their inconceivable 50th wedding anniversary.

But those are my parents and grandparents; they're supposed to be married. Now, people my age are getting married, friends of mine, which means that I could just as easily be doing the same thing.

Pretty frightening for a guy who still gets the occasional pimple on his forehead. Married? A whole new option has suddenly yawned open in front of me, as if I'd been driving through fog, flipped up the brights and seen the edge of a chasm I'd been moving toward all along.

Maybe that's too ominous a metaphor, but the feeling of sudden shock is the same. I have enough trouble asking someone if they want to go out for dinner and a movie. Asking someone, "Do you wanna go out for life?" seems a touch surreal.

My mother has pointed out that "chances are pretty good you'll meet the person you'll marry in college." That always seemed like a light-hearted comment; now the words carry a bit more weight.

So, folks, look around the classroom, scope out the Pit, think about that girl or boy you've had a crush on this week. Might they be the one? Don't fool yourself — marriage isn't such a vague and distant idea anymore.

Because it's starting to happen.

Brian McCuskey is a senior English major from Los Angeles.

Readers' Forum

Looking homeward

To the editor:

As a UNC journalism alumnus of three decades, and one whose interest in Thomas Wolfe existed before I ever saw Chapel Hill, I respectfully call to your attention that Sept. 15, 1988, marks the 50th anniversary of the death of Thomas Wolfe.

The Voice of America, at the behest of Sen. Strom Thurmond, will present two broadcasts on its Worldwide English short-wave service for that anniversary. Two dates that weekend bracket Wolfe's history: Sept. 15, when Wolfe died at Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1938, and Sept. 18, which I believe is the anniversary of Wolfe's funeral and burial in Asheville.

Also, Oct. 3 will be the 88th anniversary of Thomas Wolfe's birth, and a ceremony and Oktoberfest in Wolfe's honor is scheduled at UNC-CH that day.

I hope that WUNC radio and television will follow the lead of The Voice of America and broadcast tributes to Wolfe for this anniversary. An excellent television documentary about Wolfe is readily available in a PBS video done by N.C. State University. Dr. James W. Clark in the English department at

N.C. State and Kay Reibold, the producer of the splendid program, could surely make it available for rebroadcast.

Wolfe has always been honored in Chapel Hill, in contrast with the early response his writings received in his hometown of Asheville. It will indeed be appropriate this year if the Wolfe anniversary is not forgotten in Chapel Hill.

PAUL BAILEY MASON
Charleston, S.C.

Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. When writing letters to the editor, please follow these guidelines:

- All letters must be signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter.
- Students should include name, year in school, major, phone number and home town. Other members of the

University community should include similar information.

■ All letters must be typed and double-spaced, for ease of editing.

■ Place letters in the box marked "Letters to the Editor" outside the DTH office in the Student Union.

■ The DTH reserves the right to edit letters for space, clarity and vulgarity. Remember, brevity is the soul of wit.



Christians wrong to protest 'Temptation'

Jon K. Rust Managing Editor

is not the son of God, but a husband and father who heads a family like a good carpenter should. The realism that has offended many Christians is the scene of Jesus in bed with his wife. Remember, this is all taking place in Jesus's mind as he suffers on the cross. And much of the criticism leveled against the film has stemmed from this portrayal of the son of God being tempted by the flesh.

The blasphemy seems obvious. Not only are events shown in the film which have no basis in historical or Biblical fact, but they are shown in a realistic style, cleverly interspersed with events that have Biblical foundations. It is a style that, while lending validity to the invalid, also cheapens what is biblically accurate. Indeed, the image of Christ loses its monumentality when Jesus is shown doing very ordinary things and having very otherwise ordinary thoughts.

And that is the point upon which Scorsese wants to focus the debate. Let me call this a question that most Christians must face sometime in developing their faith: How much man was the son of God? Did he face all the temptations that man faces? Or were his temptations, although trying, more symbolic?

Was Jesus Christ, the man, tempted by the physical love of a woman? Scorsese has answered this with a yes.

I can't stop a man from making a movie. And I wouldn't want to stop anyone from expressing their beliefs, no matter what the interpretation, as long as their means of expression did not include bashing me on the head with a mallet or stepping into my room and refusing to leave. Since Scorsese has done neither of the two, I can find no reason to condemn him without seeing the film. Then, does this mean that I must condemn those who have done just that?

Not really. But I can point out what they did wrong.

If it were not for the cries of condem-

nation, "The Last Temptation of Christ" would not have been a movie I would have waited an hour and a half to see. I waited in line because I was curious, and, in a modest way, I wanted to make a statement that freedom of expression is imperative in our country. That is why I view the clamor raised by many to ban the movie to be self-defeating.

If religious groups had only called for a boycott, then maybe I would have paid less attention to them and the movie. Instead there were vicious denunciations and threats, and in one case, a group even went into a theater and shredded the film and the movie screen.

I wonder if all the attention had been premeditated. Did Scorsese choose to make this movie because he knew he would get attention — positive attention, for that matter, because he knew most newswriters would be quick to defend his rights under the First Amendment? I tend to believe that he did. In this case, was there anything religious groups could have done to protest the movie successfully? Probably not. The only hope would have been to remain quiet and pray that nobody notices the film. It's tough to be quiet when you believe in something, even when it may be to your advantage.

Christian groups have faced a lot of adversity in this country in the past year. Yet this is a democracy with certain rights reserved for all. And by trying to deny Americans the right to see the movie, radical Christian protesters are wrong, just as Dale McKinley was wrong last year to deny Carolina law students the right to interview with the CIA.

"The Last Temptation of Christ" opened in Raleigh on Friday. I'll probably be there next weekend. Join me if you want. Or don't. It's your choice, and that's how it should be. But I bet it'll make you think, and that's something "Cocktail" sure didn't call for.

Jon K. Rust is a junior English and Russian Studies major from Cape Girardeau, Mo.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Sandy Dimsdale, Dave Hall and Bill Yelverton.

Assistant Editors: Jenny Cloninger and Justin McGuire, university. Staci Cox and Amy Winslow, state and national. Andrew Podolsky and Chris Spencer, sports. Barbara Linn, Felisa Neuringer and Clay Thorp, managing.

News: Lynn Ainsworth, Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Crystal Bell, James Benton, Tammy Blackard, Brenda Campbell, Lacy Churchill, Daniel Conover, Karen Dunn, Laura Francis, Eric Gribbin, Susan Holdscaw, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Chris Landgraf, Bethany Litton, Brian McCollum, Samantha Newman, Helle Nielsen, Susan Odenkirchen, Laura Peay, Beth Rhea, Codric Ricks, Michael Spirtas and William Taggart. Peter Lineberry, wire typist.

Sports: Robert D'Arruda, John Bland, Dave Glenn, Brendan Mathews, Jay Reed, Dave Surowiecki and Langston Wertz.

Features: Jo Lee Credle, Hart Miles, Myrna Miller, Leigh Pressley and Ellen Thornton.

Arts: Cara Bonnett, Beth Buffington, Elizabeth Ellen and Julie Olson.

Photography: Brian Foley, David Foster and Belinda Morris.

Copy Editors: Cara Bonnett, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Toni Creech, Bert Hackney and Anne Isenhower.

Cartoonists: Bill Brown, Jeff Christian, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Trey Entwistle, Luis Hernandez and Greg Humphreys.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Chrissy Mennitt, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Sarah Hoskins, Amy McGuire, Maureen McIntyre, Stacy Montford, Tina Perry, Lesley Renwick, Amanda Tilley and Joye Wiley, display advertising representatives; Leisa Hawley, creative director; Dan Raasch, marketing director; Diane Quatreceas, Michelle Harris and Denise Neely, sales assistants; Diane Check and Stephanie Chesson classified advertising representatives; and Jeff Carlson, secretary.

Subscriptions: Tucker Stevens, manager; Cody McKinney, assistant.

Distribution: David Eeonopouly, manager; Lindsey Cowan and Billy Owens, assistants.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Cindy Humphrey, production assistant.

Printing: The Village Companies.