

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROGHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor JOHN CONWAY, City Editor
CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor KAREN FISHER, Features Editor
MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
BILL RIEDY, News Editor CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Decreasing defense

In a 17-4 vote last week, members of the Republican-controlled Senate Budget Committee rejected President Reagan's proposed defense plan that called for a 10 percent increase in defense spending. It was Reagan's second defeat on the proposed defense budget and represents a long-awaited attempt by Congress to question U.S. defense strategies and evaluate those strategies against the amount of money available.

With the current rate of spending, the Congressional Budget Office has projected the federal deficit to near \$1.2 trillion in five years. It was to help ease this deficit that the Senate committee substituted a 5 percent increase in defense spending, cutting it by \$20 billion. The House Budget Committee earlier had proposed a 4 percent increase, which would cut the deficit by \$50 billion.

Both budget resolutions fall short of the \$400 billion minimum deficit reduction the CBO has called for. The committees' reductions are based on new figures for fuel costs and lower inflation rates. However, neither addressed the central problem with the defense budget, the category for procurement of new weapons. Already this category has increased from \$35 billion to \$80 billion since 1980. Furthermore, under the Reagan budget the amount of money slotted for new weapons will increase from 33 percent to 43 percent of the total defense budget. The money for operations and maintenance will decline from 64 percent to 50 percent of the budget.

It's a known fact that buying the new while not taking care of the old does not make for good business. As William W. Kaufmann, former Pentagon defense planner, says, the Reagan budget will only increase the excess and redundancy found in the U.S. defense system. As it now stands, the U.S. strategic offense, even after a Soviet attack could still sent 3,000 nuclear warheads to the U.S.S.R. Because of the strength of this force, Kaufmann questions the need for new devices such as the proposed modernized air defenses. Instead, he argues that the Reagan administration should concentrate on the gradual modernization of the already existing forces.

Congress has taken the first step in questioning the need for increased defense spending. However, both the House and Senate resolutions fail to address the future U.S. defense program. What is needed now is a close scrutiny of the procurement budget. Before approving money for the development of new weapons they must begin studying what the United States already has.

The Deep

Like Dr. Frankenstein and his monster, man has been forced to reckon with the hazards of intensely radioactive wastes ever since he learned to split the atom. An offshoot problem of his nuclear creation concerns safe disposal of the reactors of decommissioned and defueled U.S. Navy nuclear submarines. Navy officials have proposed sinking 100 nuclear submarines off the N.C. coast, about 220 miles off Cape Hatteras. They reason that the deep ocean is an environmentally safe and economical permanent resting ground.

The other solution still being considered is to remove the midull section containing the massive nuclear power reactor, and bury it in radioactive waste landfills in South Carolina or Washington state. However, such a solution is anathema to politicians. Deep-ocean dumping is least likely to create strong public opposition, being the epitome of the out of sight, out of mind, disposal mentality. Besides that, the cost of sea disposal is about \$2 million less expensive per vessel than land disposal.

The Navy states it would take 400 years for radiation to leak from the ocean-dumped submarines. At that time, the radiation emitted would be small and have little impact on individuals or the population.

But critics charge that the Navy is understating the potential radioactive dangers to the ocean and man. They have called the Navy's analysis "fatally flawed." They point out that the Navy assessment fails to address the cumulative effects of the ongoing radioactive emissions, an issue Navy officials have only recently conceded.

Even if the Navy's plan is safe, it will probably damage the reputation of N.C. coastal tourism and fisheries. And ocean dumping could pave the way for other types of radioactive waste dumping off the N.C. coast. Also, the logistics of sea disposal are questionable. The need and cost of long-term monitoring should be considered, as should the potential costs associated with program failure if any or all of the dumped submarines are accidentally lost in transport or have to be retrieved.

An estimated 100 submarines are to be decommissioned over the next 30 years either as obsolete or to meet arms-control agreements. But depositing nuclear reactors on an ocean floor 2.5 miles beneath the waves appears a risky venture at best. Before approving any such plan, Navy officials should recognize the long-term physical and psychological effects of ocean disposal and carefully evaluate any possible complications.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Desk: Frank Bruni and Kelly Simmons, writers; Jonathan Talcott, staff columnist

Assistant Managing Editors: Pete Felkner, Lisbeth Levine, Melissa Moore and Eddie Wooten
Special Projects: Mark Ancona and Keith Bradsher

News: Tracy Adams, Cheryl Anderson, Pete Austin, Joseph Berryhill, Ashley Blackwelder, J. Bonasia, Joel Broadway, Hope Buffington, Paul Coker, Tom Conlon, Kate Cooper, Ashley Dimmette, Lisa Dows, Charles Ellmaker, Suzanne Evans, Katherine Farley, Bonnie Foust, Sherri Goodson, Julie Haack, John Hackney, Ivy Hillard, Kevin Johnston, Bob Kimpleton, Kim Klemm, Rita Kostecke, Susan Kuhn, Stuart Long, Eugene Marx, Gary Meek, Karen Moore, Kim Morrison, Ellen Orahod, Rosemary Osborn, Heidi Owen, David Poole, Sarah Raper, Sharon Rawlins, Mike O'Reilly, Mont Rogers, Lynsley Rollins, Cindi Ross, Mike Sharsky, Lori Schantz, Sharon Sheridan, Jodi Smith, Don Solomon, James Stephens, Mark Stinford, Susan Sullivan, Carrie Szymczek, Amy Tanner, Keith Taylor, Lynda Thompson, Stuart Tomkinson, Michael Toole, Perry Twisdale, Beth Walters, Mickey Weaver, Scott Wharton and Lynda Wolf. Liz Lucas, assistant University editor, Hope Buffington, assistant state and national editor.

Sports: Frank Kennedy and Kurt Rosenberg, assistant sports editors. Glenna Burrell, Paul Gardner, Lonnie McCullough, Draggan Mihailovich, Kathy Norcross, Robyn Norwood, Michael Peninger, Lew Price, S.L. Price, Lee Roberts, Allen Dean Steele, Mike Waters and Tracy Young.

Features: Debbie August, Dan Bishop, Dawn Brazell, Toni Carter, Michelle Christenbury, Tom Camacho, Tom Grey, Cindy Haga, Kathy Hopper, Dana Jackson, Warren Miller, Mizi Morris, Jane Osment, Stevie Roe, Debbi Sykes, Randy Walker, Clinton Weaver and Edith Wooten, Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: David Schmidt, assistant arts editor; John Altschuler, Steve Carr, Jim Clardy, Todd Davis, David McHugh, Jo Ellen Meekins, Karen Rosen, Gigi Sonner and D.F. Wilson.
Graphic Arts: Jamie Francis, Jeff Neuville, Zane Saunders, Scott Sharpe, Al Steele and Lori Thomas photographers. Dick Anderson, Greg Calaby, Cabell Finch, Doug Hilburn, Anthony Moses and Janice Murphy, artists.

Business: Rejeanne V. Caron, business manager; Anne Sink, assistant business manager. Linda A. Cooper, secretary/receptionist; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman and Angie Wolfe, classifieds.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Sharon Duckworth, Keith Lee, Terry Lee, Jeff McElhane, Doug Robinson, Deana Setzer and Marla Zablocki ad representatives.

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department
Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

Students, police — a strained relationship

By SARAH RAPER

Relationships between students and local police are not up to par, according to an attorney for UNC Student Legal Services. David Kirkman says SLS has received numerous complaints from students who claim they were not treated with respect by area police officers.

"Most of the complaints are from students who say the police came down on them with a sledgehammer," Kirkman said.

Problems with Chapel Hill police appeared to be greater than problems with Carrboro police, he said.

"We've had this nebulous feeling based on the past couple of years of students' complaints," Kirkman said. "We've gotten more complaints about the Chapel Hill police than about the Carrboro police."

The following questions and answers are a result of interviews with Chief Sid Herge of the Carrboro police and Chief Herman Stone of the Chapel Hill police and Maj. Arnold Gold, who handles public relations for that department.

The questions are an attempt to pinpoint differences between the two departments that would explain Kirkman's claim that he receives more complaints about the Chapel Hill police than the Carrboro police.

The population of Carrboro is 7,517; Chapel Hill's population is 32,421. The Carrboro force includes 20 patrol officers and the Chapel Hill department includes 76 officers, 49 of whom are on patrol. Because the University police jurisdiction includes campus housing, more students live in the Carrboro police jurisdiction than in the Chapel Hill police jurisdiction.

Have you received complaints from students recently about the way they have been treated by your officers?

Herge: No. I'd hear about them if we got them, and I'd better not hear about any.

Stone: We routinely receive complaints.

Gold: We have as many or more contacts with permanent residents. Students don't complain any more than permanent residents. We can go for weeks with none, and then we'll have a few. It's determined a lot by the type of contacts. Our arrests for DUI have gone up 300 percent recently, mostly townspeople, not students, by the way. That could cause complaints to go up.

With what violation by students do your officers deal most frequently?

Herge: Noisy parties after games. When neighbors don't call in, we don't worry about it. As a result of these parties we have parking problems. We also deal with traffic violations, and we operate off complaints in DUIs from neighbors and storeowners.

Stone: Parking, the use and abuse of alcohol, noise. On the increase are DUIs. Also we deal with speeding.

Do you ever discuss student-officer relations with the officers?

Herge: My policy is clear. I give every officer a printout on community relations. They know I demote and dismiss any officer who acts improperly to any citizen including students. We talk about community relations a lot because we're a service organization.

Stone: There is no difference in our policy between students and other citizens.

Gold: What we're looking for in an officer is the ability to deal with stress well. This is a unique and festive community... there's a lot of pressure.

If the officers knew there was a party going on in their area, would they go and sit at the site of the party to wait for possible violators?

Herge: Probably not, although there may be exceptions. I don't think it could occur. We're spread so thin we don't have time to sit in any one place.

Gold: They'll definitely be in the area. They won't watch the door to see who staggers out, but they'll pay

close attention to the site of the party.

Do students respect police authority?

Herge: Yes.

Stone: Some do, some don't. Usually the only time we have problems with respect is when students have been drinking.

What percentage of students in your opinion are troublemakers?

Herge: One percent, and I don't include periodical violators as a problem.

Gold: A very small percentage of UNC students are troublemakers. We have problems with people coming from other places more.

Do you have trouble with any particular groups of students?

Herge: At one time we had problems with members of the lacrosse team who were all living together in the same house.

Stone: I don't know of any groups. We've had problems with certain locations from time to time.

Is there pressure to make a certain number of stops or arrests each week?

Herge: No. We have no quota system.

Stone: We have no quotas. Our goal is to get rid of a problem entirely, not to get a certain number each week.

Do you feel that there are enough policemen in your department to handle the problems?

Herge: Yes.

Stone: We have an adequate number but we could always use more.

What do the officers perceive as their primary duty when they're on patrol?

Herge: They want to prevent crime and render whatever service they can to the community.

Stone: The main thing is to protect citizens' lives and property.

Sarah Raper, a sophomore journalism major from Fayetteville, is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Affirmative action product of bureaucracy

To the editor:

The editorial "Lax labor laws" (DTH, April 5) presented a highly distorted view of the affirmative action concept in the area of employment discrimination. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 issued by President Johnson in 1965, the DTH would have us believe, were the impetus for "affirmative action" and therefore the securing of minority rights in America. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (the section dealing with employment) does not in any way mandate affirmative action. Even measures that include the concept of affirmative action (such as Executive Order 11246) were not intended to lead to what we confront today. It was only in 1968, with the issuing of guidelines by the Department of Labor ("government specifications" as the DTH deceptively labeled it), that the term affirmative action was made to include preferential treatment.

This inclusion of preferential treatment was not the intent of either Executive Order 11246 or of the Civil Rights Act. In fact, both measures prohibit affirmative

action in its current form. Johnson's order requires hiring "without regard to race." Preferential treatment (today's affirmative action), of course, requires hiring specifically and exclusively because of race. Further, it is abundantly clear from an examination of the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act that Congress intended to prohibit affirmative action as it is currently practiced. During the 1964 debate, congressional supporters of the Act repeatedly assured skeptics that this legislation would in no way result in preferential hiring on the basis of race or sex. Yet, this is exactly what has happened.

Affirmative action is therefore not a wonderful plan envisioned by Congress and the President to guarantee equal employment opportunity. It is instead an invention by a bureaucracy intent on guaranteeing equal employment results.

In this context, the DTH's criticism of new rules to be issued on the subject of affirmative action is fatally flawed. By requiring that only identifiable victims of discrimination receive preferential treat-

ment, a large step is made toward making affirmative action more just. Each individual employee has the right to equal employment opportunity and to compensation if he is discriminated against. An employee does not, however, deserve such compensation solely on the basis of sex or skin color. The Constitution guarantees rights to individuals, not groups.

One of the most important of our constitutional rights is the guarantee of due process of law. But how can due process be ensured if laws against discrimination apply differently to different groups or races of people? Under the new rules,

those people that have been injured will receive just compensation. Preference is not, however, given indiscriminately regardless of how deserving a person may be.

As it exists, affirmative action makes a mockery of the ideals it purports to defend. Discrimination is dehumanizing when practiced against anyone (black, white, male, or female). The new rules return to the original spirit of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 11246 — equal opportunity for all.

Charles Burke Granville West

Be on the bus

To the editor:

According to a report submitted to the joint committees on education in the N.C. General Assembly, \$36.6 million may be cut from the University system's budget over the next two years. If these cuts go through, it could mean a reduction of over 400 teaching positions in the University system. Given the fact that UNC already has a deficient number of women and black faculty, these budget cuts could, and probably would, lead to an exacerbation of the current ratio of minority to majority faculty. And since we, as a University, have addressed, discussed and protested this particular issue (minority and women faculty) since November 1982, it would be ignorant for us not to participate with the Coalition for Education and rally against education budget cuts.

On Thursday, April 12, at 2 p.m. there will be six buses in front of Carmichael Auditorium impatiently waiting for people to board them. They are going to Raleigh. In Raleigh, there will be a rally at 3 p.m. in front

of the Legislative Building where teachers, administrators and students from universities across the state will speak. The rally will last for one hour, and students should be back at UNC by 5 p.m.

Three hours of your time is all that is necessary. However, this time is quality time, for the rally will let your state representatives and senators know that you care about your education and the future of education in the state.

For those of us who marched from the Pit to South Building through heat and cold, sunshine and no shine, protesting insufficient numbers of black and women faculty, a free ride to Raleigh is not an extraordinary task. But make no mistake, it is a vital extension of those rallies which we have begun. Therefore, I urge you to participate. I will be on one of those buses, and I respect you in advance for being there with me.

Sherrod Banks BSM President

A summer with 'the other half'

By JIM WRINN

ATTENTION STUDENTS: Plenty of summer jobs are available this year. Pay is terrible. Hours are long. Conditions are poor. No experience necessary. Apply now.

What if you saw a classified in this paper advertising such a job? Would you give up your usual summer job to take a job doing what's commonly known as "dirt labor"?

The summer of my freshman year at college I did. I worked at the local golf course as a laborer. I got minimum wage pay, a lot of backaches and one of the best learning experiences of my life: a lesson in how "the other half" lives.

Most of us at UNC, I'd wager, are from middle- or upper-class families. We've heard about the have-nots. They live in the run-down neighborhood across town, drive beat-up, old cars and buy their food at the store where you bag your own groceries. Occasionally, one of them comes into your home — probably to fix the gutters, mow the grass or something like that.

Otherwise, most of us have little contact with the people at the bottom ends of the social and economic scales. We see them, for example, when they're dirty and cursing their old, junk-box car that's broken down beside the highway. Then most of us cruise on by. Maybe some of us have stopped to help and found ourselves talking to a member of "the other half." That's a start, but the way to learn about their life is to work with them, as I did with my friend "Easy-Go" three summers ago.

He was at the golf course that May when I began work. The men I worked with the next three months had already dubbed him Easy-Go because of his abilities to drive a golf cart by the same name. Easy-Go, my age (then 19), had a wife who was two months pregnant, a blue AMC Javlin and a mouthful of broken teeth — the result of a bar room scuffle. Easy-Go, whose real name is Danny, wasn't the most polished fellow I've ever met, but after working with him day after day, I learned much about his life; I came to know him well enough to respect him just as much as or more than anyone with straight, afebraces teeth and a new car for his 16th birthday.



Easy-Go, I learned, is just like the rest of us. He was hopeful that summer that his garden would be productive, that he would have enough of his paycheck left on Fridays to buy a six-pack, and that the child his wife was carrying would be born healthy. He got a fine crop of corn that year and usually managed to pick up some weekend Budweisers. But when his wife miscarried, Easy-Go was crushed, and so were the rest of us at work.

I was nicknamed "college boy" by my co-workers, a group of eight men who tended the golf course. About half of them, including Easy-Go, worked year-round. Each of the permanent men, except Easy-Go, was over 40 and aware that, in all likelihood, he would be pushing a green's mower or tending a sandtrap for the rest of his days. Life for them would be a minimum wage existence until retirement or death.

From my first day of the golf course, when we collected and hauled dirt and rock for eight hours in the sun, I learned not how different these people were from me, but how similar I was to them. As I noticed with Easy-Go,

they had many of the same hopes, fears and loves as I did. The difference was that through birth or their own doing they were on the bottom end of the ladder, as many of us safely entrenched in the middle- and upper-classes often view it. That class distinction was the factor that had kept me separated from my associates before that summer. I thought, possibly as you have, that I had nothing in common with people like them. Together that summer we cursed worn-out lawn mowers that wouldn't crank, praised the cooling early morning fog when it lingered past 10 a.m. and gulped clear, cold spring water from a dirty plastic cup we passed around. We had a lot in common.

There was something else about working with Easy-Go and the golf course crew: the realization that there are many people who work for a bare existence living.

Many people work hard, long hard hours for little pay — a lesson driven home the summer I worked stacking crates of tomatoes at a packing plant. Working most days from 11 a.m. until 2 a.m., six days a week, the people there had a rough life, washing, grading and crating tomatoes. For a summer I could handle 65-hour work weeks, but can you imagine crating tomatoes for a lifetime? Worse, still, the pay the people there received barely kept them alive. One man I worked with, George, had a mobile home. At 56, wrinkled and worn from years of hard work, George was sleeping in the back seat of his Chevy.

I know of no one at UNC or any other university who is planning on a life of weeding sandtraps in the heat of the day or stacking bushel crates of tomatoes in the night.

But for one summer, at least, you should experience the lifestyle many people live 365 days each year. Give up the camp counselor's job, lifeguarding at the pool, pushing burgers for McDonald's, or bagging groceries, if that's what you had planned. And don't fool yourself into thinking that you'll not only meet these people but also associate with them after you get your degree, your air-conditioned job and night club membership. You probably won't.

Get a real job in the real world this summer. Then you can appreciate Easy-Go, George, their cohorts and the hard life they live.

Jim Wrinn is a senior journalism and political science major from Franklin.