

perspective

Mildred and Alexander

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has been hopping from headline to headline as he blasts U.S. policies of detente, is snubbed by the White House and in turn snubs the White House by rejecting a reluctant invitation to drop by any time. Around Boone his name slides in and out of conversations as a new rumor entertains the town.

It seems that local developer Hugh Morton and Sen. Jesse Helms are trying to convince the Russian author to abandon his home in Switzerland for a cozy residence on Grandfather Mountain.

That's the talk anyway.

Whether or not there is much fact in the mountain grapevine, the picture of Solzhenitsyn cozy in his Blue Ridge chalet is a curious one. Jesse Helms would be happy to have another prominent personage in the state who shares his extremist views on Communism. Hugh Morton would be happy because he would have an internationally known figure connected with his tourist attraction at Grandfather Mountain.

And tourists would be happy. In addition to being able to cross Grandfather Mountain's "Mile High Swinging Bridge" and to chat with Mildred the Bear in her "Natural Black Bear Habitat," they could take pictures of the kids with that elfish looking foreign fellow with the funny name. And all for the price of admission.

Parking in the dust bowl

While you're watching the plays in the Playmaker's Theatre this week, maybe you can find a parking space in the Union parking lot.

After all, construction on the new Paul Green Theatre hasn't started yet, and there's plenty of space.

Heaven only knows when the first plans for the new theatre were made. History has it (and has had it for several years at least) that the Union Dust Bowl would be cleared of all vehicles one miraculous morning, and countless hard-hatted workers would swarm over the area, like the slaves that once swarmed over the pyramids: till lo and behold a new theatre would arise, unlike any theatre previously seen in the western hemisphere, wherein such plays would be performed as might grace any stage in New York or London.

Then came a minor detail called a construction estimate, which just happened to run a few million dollars over the General Assembly's appropriation.

So now, the plans are being revised cheaper, the dust still swirls over your parked car and ours, and the poor Playmakers (who probably park their cars in the Union Lot too) are sweating three plays in a crackerbox never meant to seat twenty thousand students.

Get your tickets while they're hot.

Backwoods justice

Nostalgic longings for the Old West are still thriving in the hearts of North Carolina lawmakers. Priding itself on its Southern progressivism, North Carolina remains the only state in the Union that can declare any lawbreaker an outlaw and thus allow any state citizen to shoot it on sight.

The solons in the General Assembly in Raleigh introduced last session a bill to repeal this obsolete rite, but that bill itself was shot down substantively.

Perhaps the decision was in the interest of democracy—power to the people. But it's a pretty primitive use of power when anyone in the state can use any power as he thinks fit to apprehend any person declared fleeing from justice even if that fugitive's name is unknown.

Of course, the General Assembly has seen fit to update itself somewhat. It used to be that either two justices of the peace or any district, superior or appellate judge could issue an outlaw proclamation. In 1973, however, the marriage makers were divested of that power.

Welcome to the 19th century, pardnuh.

The Tar Heel

83rd year of editorial freedom.

Cole Campbell
Editor

Elliott Warnock
Managing Editor

Jim Grimsley
Associate Editor

Harriet Sugar
Associate Editor

Ralph Irace
Contributing Editor

Lynn Medford
News Editor

Greg Porter
Features Editor

Jim Thomas
Sports Editor

A handshake instead of a kiss

Richard Whittle

The United States has pursued detente thus far.

In almost every agreement concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union within the past few years the Soviets have received tangible benefits in exchange for little more than their agreement on paper to lofty principles. This fact, of which the space mission is a pointed reminder, has resulted because the United States has been far too trusting in its dealings with the USSR.

The root of the problem is the inability of the American people in general and the refusal of U.S. policymakers in particular to

take into account that the Soviets, unlike ourselves, see detente as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. The folly of detente lies not in the worthy aim of relaxing tensions so as to lessen the threat of nuclear war. But the particular policies by which that aim has been pursued by the United States could well have the effect of eventually eroding the precarious balance that today exists between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Herein lies the error, for if the course of detente is not changed, the end result might well be a situation in which the nuclear confrontation detente seeks to avoid would be more likely than it was even during the Kennedy years.

It is a basic assumption of Marxist-Leninist ideology that the capitalist system will one day collapse of its own volition. A related tenet holds that a push here or a shove there that might help capitalism along the way to its "predetermined" fate, without

endangering the position of the Soviet state, is a very sensible move.

Detente, then, signals no change in Soviet strategy, just a change in tactics. It does not mean that the Soviets have decided to peacefully coexist with the U.S. on an eternal basis; they will do so until it seems advantageous to do otherwise. The Soviet Union's present acceptance of detente merely indicates that its leaders feel nothing more can be gained by a policy of confrontation for the time being.

The danger for the United States lies in the possibility that American leaders, blinded by their intense desire to trust our adversary for the sake of peace and pressured by an American public which has always ignored the realities of world politics, will allow the already eroding military and economic balance to shift too far in favor of the Soviets. If this were to happen, and if the American desire for peace were misconstrued as weak-willed appeasement, the temptation to speed the demise of capitalism through the use of force might take precedence over the will to wait and watch as it crumbles all on its own. It is not being alarmist to say that, were the Soviet Union to yield to such a temptation, a nuclear confrontation could be the result.

There is no reason to abandon detente—especially if the only alternative is a resumption of the Cold War. But there is a compelling reason to modify the course it has taken during its brief history.

The United States should continue to talk with the Soviet Union and attempt to conclude mutually beneficial agreements over the broad range of economic, cultural, political and military matters which will further the aim of peaceful coexistence. But we should ever keep in mind that: 1) while detente will never be viewed by the Soviets as a permanent arrangement, it may in fact become one, as long as the balance does not decidedly shift their way; and 2) that the only way to prevent such a shift from occurring is to insure that the U.S. gives no more than it gets from any particular economic, political, or military agreements concluded.

The Apollo-Soyuz space flight is over by now, and the particular goals set for it have been achieved. If the current course of detente can be changed to a more rational tack in the future, perhaps the same can be said, as the years go by, of this most crucial element of U.S. foreign policy.

Richard Whittle is a graduate journalism student.



—IN SEARCH OF THE IMPARTIAL JUROR—

A new conservative manifesto

Ralph Irace

If the founding fathers and authors of our Constitution could witness the present state of bureaucratic disarray their enterprise has created, they'd be nothing less than dumbfounded.

The number of abusive acts committed by faceless, avaricious federal agencies and a lordly federal judiciary are legion. Court edicts tear children apart from parental supervision; entire state legislatures sit helplessly by in astonishment as federal judges who hold office during "good behavior" nullify with the stroke of a pen laws enacted by the peoples' general assemblies. Institutions of higher learning, after recovery from the upheaval caused by the imposition of earlier federal doctrines "explaining how it should be done," are convulsed anew with more spasms as Washington ideologues continue with their pronouncements.

Our Constitution, notwithstanding the above developments, has not failed us. It was never intended to sanction the overreach of the federal government and the travesties of law by which both liberal theorists and practitioners alike

have sought to control every aspect of our lives. Big government does big things, but for the ultimate ascent of what highest purpose?

Most liberals can be expected to continue displaying their arts and sciences. They up to now have captured the preponderant share of the more preeminent social issues of the day. They closed their phalanx in the sixties with measurable success; today many of their own champions are fleeing the front line as they come to grasp the substantive order of our external realities.

Today, the people are searching, or more appropriately, waiting for the arrival of an effective political force that has both the tenacity and realism to honestly confront the myriad of confusing dilemmas that trouble America.

The sentiment of the citizenry and

polity today is moving in the direction of taking government off our backs, giving us peace of mind and privacy, leaving our schools and representative assemblies alone, and reducing federal bureaucratic interference in private enterprise. These governmental subversions, thankfully, are now being seen for what they really represent. Of particular significance is the belated and disquieting realization that the federal courts, especially the Supreme Court, have for intolerably too long a time usurped the powers of the legislative domain, especially in the fields of criminal law, education and taxation. Federal judges appointed for life and accountable to no one have effortlessly seized the prerogatives and power of our elected representatives, not only interpreting law but in effect making law as if the courts were a second legislature of our central government.

The liberal intelligentsia swears by big government and believes that all human and social infirmities are capable of solution by "government power," that behavior and individual conscience can be legislated, poverty eradicated from the face of the nation through a new "cure-all" government program and so on.

With the capacity of self-delusion that

many of the more ultra-liberals have, it becomes understandable why "experience" for them involves not the reversal of earlier mistakes but simply a recognition of the same mistakes time and time again. When one of their projects displays its inadequacy and ultimate failure, we are presented with yet another project that, if nothing else, will serve to nurture an already ravenous federal bureaucracy.

The people have painfully learned that the national bureaucracy never adjourns, that power is safest in their hands, that decision and policy making is wisest in their own neighborhoods and not a judge's chambers and that laws are most responsible in their own communities.

If the more lofty character of our country is to be maintained and the political system reformed, we must invert and cleanse the entire system, so that Americans of noble intent and high purpose will rally our cause against the espousal of staggeringly expensive, disruptive, and vain liberal programs and policies, and re-examine our methodology for producing change.

Ralph Irace, contributing editor of the 'Tar Heel' is a graduate student in journalism.

Speaking out on SHS plans

UNC's Student Health Service (SHS) hopes to be located in a new building within the next three or four years. Because the proposed facility could significantly alter the delivery of health care to students, student opinion should be a significant factor in the decisions affecting the new building.

The SHS, the UNC Facilities Planning Office, and an architectural firm have been working for the past four years designing a new building that would house the SHS exclusively.

As planned, the three-story building would be arranged in a modular fashion, with expanded space for all present sections of the SHS. Separate space is set aside for services that previously have not had their own areas within the SHS; for example, specialty clinics. Whereas the current facility contains a total of 17,000 square feet, the new facility would contain approximately 58,000 square feet, over three times as much space as the present facility. The new facility would be connected with North Carolina Memorial Hospital (NCMH) by corridor. That connection is necessary for NCMH to provide the SHS with food, supplementary radiological services and other services.

The plans for the new SHS building have run into some snags. In April 1974 the Board of Trustees approved a site between the old Nurses' Dorm and Kenan Stadium for the proposed building. However, architectural plans for the new building would extend the occupied area beyond the approved site into an area designated as a park.

The park area, called "Meeting of the Waters," currently exists as a wooded area of approximately 5.27 acres between the stadium and the medical complex. "Meeting of the Waters" was set aside as a park in the 1950's to insure that trees would be left in the hospital complex area.

Some members of the Board of Trustees and several UNC professors are concerned that an intrusion into the "Meeting of the Waters" area would be harmful. They fear

Katie Newsome Campbell

that cutting down trees in the portion of the park that the SHS would occupy would be a dangerous precedent for intrusion into the remainder of the park.

Because of this intrusion, the Board of Trustees recommended in their June 1975 meeting that the Chancellor consider alternative sites and/or alternative architectural plans for the building.

The SHS and the Facilities Planning Office firmly believe that the site initially approved with the encroachment into the park is the best possible site for the new building because the building could be connected easily to NCMH by corridor and would have two access routes. The most important advantage to the site, however, is that the architectural plan considered to be the best by the SHS, the Planning Office and the architects, would fit there. The architectural plans would have to be significantly altered for that building to fit in another site.

The alternative to finding another site for the preferred building is to adopt another architectural plan to fit into the initially approved site without intruding into the park area. A high-rise building would be the only option, and a high-rise would, for all practical purposes, destroy the particular health care concept for which the modular design is perfect. Because of increased fire safety measures and other safety factors, a high-rise would cost considerably more than the preferred three-story building.

One important aspect of the proposed

facility is the expansion of services offered. There would be a pharmacy which would supply all prescriptions and manufactured stock drugs for both outpatients and inpatients. The presently cramped facilities for Mental Health and Health Education would be greatly expanded. Clinics for such specialties as gynecology and dermatology would be located in their own modules.

There are some questions which should be raised concerning the allocation of space within the new facility. Space allotted for inpatients would house forty beds (sixty-five beds in an epidemic). This space seems extravagant, considering that the largest number of inpatients in the SHS at one time in 1974 was 27, and that inpatient admissions to the SHS have been declining from year to year. The space allotted for gynecology may be insufficient if the demand for gynecological services increases.

However, the overall plans for the new facility seem efficient and progressive when compared to the present facility. It would be a shame if an excellent building (the plans for which have been applauded by other universities) could not be built on the only site which is perfect for the structure. Steps could be taken to insure that the SHS building would not be a precedent for further encroachment into "Meeting of the Waters" park in the future.

Bill Bates, Student Body president, is a member of the SHS Committee of the Board of Trustees. If you have an opinion concerning the new facility, let him know before the Board of Trustees reconvenes in early August. If you would like to know more about the proposed facility, please come see me in Suite C of the Union from 2-4 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Make your voice heard in a decision which definitely involves student welfare.

Katie Newsome Campbell, student health advocate, is a senior psychology major from Winston-Salem.

We need revolution, not rap lines

Ron Molinkiewicz

other words, therapy serves the status quo by bolstering the power of those who run this country. This is done by insisting that people's problems originate from people's own heads. This passes the blame from societies' sick, oppressive, political realities to the individual whose discomfort is probably a result of the lack of power and control over his or her environment and life, plus the mystification process which is forced upon people by societies' oppressive institutions such as schools, churches, hospitals, clinics, etc. This combination of oppression plus mystification alienates people from their environment and lives, causing them to retreat into their own "sick" selves and relationships rather than to deal with their overall oppressive living situation.

Switchboard, and rap centers alike, spend an incredible amount of time and energy in social welfare and patch-up type work that established institutions (hospitals, clinics) do not want to deal with. By providing alternative services, these established institutions are relieved of the obligation of dealing with socially caused problems. Rap centers, rather than being programs set up by young people to meet their own needs, are set up and financed by adults to treat, counsel, or contain rebellious "kids" whose sexual/social/aggressive/drug behavior totally threatens and embarrasses the adult world. These young people are labeled as "sick" and "dependent", and their behavior

is explained to be a result of personal problems. Then they are encouraged to grow up, to become independent, to accept their parents' values, to return to their schools, families, and communities, and to be like the others.

If such an approach is not adhered to, government grants and subsidies from private foundations are cut, forcing the rap center to choose between selling out or collapsing. Selling out would make rap centers like all other institutions, oppressing and mystifying people, and winding up with a staff with the desire to grow and perpetuate themselves.

I feel that the business of a rap or crisis center should be to put itself out of business by helping to transform society so that people won't need such centers. What most people really need is not therapy, counseling, or brain-numbing drugs, but a good dose of revolution. SUPPORT JOAN LITTLE!

Ron Molinkiewicz is a pharmacy/psychology double major from Detroit, Mich.

reaction

The Tar Heel welcomes dissenting opinion to its editorial stance. This column by Ron Molinkiewicz represents a response to "Switchboard: a broken connection" in the July 25 issue. Anyone interested in offering reasoned dissent in a reaction column is invited to contact the associate editors of the Tar Heel.