

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, 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

Unfriendly fire

With the recent deaths of two U.S. Marines and a French soldier in Beirut — all killed while serving a four-nation multinational peace-keeping force in the war-torn Lebanese city — the Reagan administration faces a tough military and political dilemma. It can either strengthen the Marine contingent in Lebanon or pull out altogether. For the present, unfortunately, the administration has opted for no change in the size, mission or patrol area of the 1,200-member U.S. force.

Predictably, the Reagan administration called Monday's attack an "isolated incident," saying the Marines were accidentally hit by fire intended for nearby Lebanese forces. Such a response is designed to reduce pressure on the administration to respond to calls to invoke a provision of the War Powers Act that theoretically would give Congress a veto over the Marines' continued deployment. The Act requires the president to inform Congress when American forces abroad are involved in or facing imminent hostilities. Congress then has 60 days to decide whether to order the president to withdraw the troops.

But Vice President George Bush reiterates that the administration isn't planning any changes. White House spokesman Larry Speakes calls the Marines' presence "an essential ingredient of U.S. policy." He has affirmed the intention of the United States to stay in Lebanon to perform a peace-keeping role. However, the Reagan administration has been thinking for several weeks about expanding the size of its contingent in the peace-keeping force, *The Wall Street Journal* reported Tuesday. A U.S. aircraft carrier, the nuclear-powered USS Eisenhower, has been ordered to the coast of Lebanon in a show of force. "We want to bring it out so everyone can see it," a Marine spokesman said.

Again, such actions are typical of the shoot-from-the-hip Reagan administration. And, as usual, it's got people scared, including presidential contender Sen. John Glenn, who was one of the first to call for removal of troops from Lebanon. But Sen. Barry Goldwater, normally a supporter of Reagan administration policy, went further and called for immediate withdrawal of the Marines. "The U.S. hasn't any business playing policeman with a handful of Marines," he said. Such vocal displeasure from a senator sitting on Reagan's side of the political fence might, hopefully, cause the president's head to turn.

However, legislative outcry may be for nothing. Despite the War Powers Act's provision, a Supreme Court decision earlier this year apparently has stripped Congress of the power to "veto" continued U.S. military involvement in Lebanon.

But it doesn't matter who complains. It is inevitable that more Marines in the multinational peace-keeping force will be killed if they remain in Lebanon. So let's get them out.

Careful consumption

University students know that it's fun to go out for a night on the town to drink. But they also need to realize the dangers involved and the responsibilities of a smart drinker. If not, they can expect to encounter some tough, and costly, learning experiences.

Last weekend the Chapel Hill police arrested 19 students in alcohol-related incidents — 15 for public consumption and four for driving under the influence. The police maintain that no special task forces were out looking for offenders; instead, they attribute the arrests to the large number of students celebrating the first weekend back in town. But even during parties this week it has not been uncommon to see watchful police hovering about fraternity houses or walking up and down Franklin Street. Easy prey for them are party-goers who step off private ground onto a sidewalk and sip a beer. The fine: \$35.

For those unaware, rules are:

- Once off fraternity or restaurant property it's public land. The beer can be held, but not sipped.
- Because restaurants, bars and convenience stores are carding much more strictly this fall, students need to be prepared to show proper identification. Employees are checking the faces and dates closely. An underage student might gamble and borrow an older friend's ID, but if he is caught, chances are the management will call the police and confiscate the identification. That's bound to happen more and more frequently after Oct. 1, when the legal drinking age becomes 19, and about one-fourth of the undergraduate population will still be 18.

But about the worst thing a student can do is drink and drive. In October, all of the DUI violations will be combined into a single Driving-While-Impaired offense. Under the new law, there will be no plea bargaining, and local lawyers predict a landslide of DWI court cases. They also predict that cases will not be handled for less than \$1,000.

Responsible behavior is expected of students who plan to drink. For the student, careful consideration of the matter and the risks involved, could save face, and money. It could also save his life.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Desk: Frank Bruni and Kelly Simmons, writers
 Assistant Managing Editor: Melissa Moore

News: Pete Austin, Joseph Berryhill, Ashley Blackwelder, Keith Bradsher, J. Bonasia, Joel Broadway, Hope Buffington, Cathy Collins, Tom Conlon, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Charles Eilmaker, Kathy Farley, Genie French, Kim Gilley, Sherri Goodson, Sue Kuhn, Kyle Marshall, Thad Ogburn, Ellen Orahoad, Rosemary Osborne, Heidi Owen, Beth Ownley, Tracy Proctor, Sarah Raper, Mont Rogers, Cindi Ross, Sharon Sheridan, Jodi Smith, Mark Stinnerford, Amy Tanner, Liz Taylor, Stuart Tonkinson, Michael Toole, Perry Twisdale, Beth Walters, Scott Wharton, Lynda Wolf, Jim Zook and Liz Lucas, assistant university editor.

Sports: Frank Kennedy and Kurt Rosenberg, assistant sports editors. Glenna Burress, John Hackney, Lonnie McCullough, Kathy Norcross, Robyn Norwood, Michael Persinger, Julie Peters, Lee Roberts and Mike Waters.

Features: Dan Bishop, Dawn Brazell, Tom Camacho, Toni Carter, Karen Cotten, Tom Grey, Kathy Hopper, Dana Jackson, Joel Katzenstein, Warren Miller, Jane Osmont, Clinton Weaver and Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: Steve Carr, Ivy Hilliard, Jo Ellen Meekins, Gigi Sonner and David Schmidt, assistant arts editor.

Graphic Arts: Jamie Francis, Jeff Neuville, Zane Saunders, and Lori Thomas, photographers.

Business: Anne Fulcher, interim business manager; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pitman, classifies.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Laura Austin, Patricia Gorry and Terry Lee, ad representatives.

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Watch out for the long shot

To the editor:

I agree with Christine Manuel's assessment in the first fall *DTH* that the 1984 Democratic gubernatorial primary race is "congested," but this will work to the advantage of the so-called "longshot" candidates like former Department of Human Resources Deputy Secretary and former state legislator Tom Gilmore of Guilford County.

As in most crowded races, all of the candidates will sound the same. Gilmore will be elected because his actions will make him stand out in the crowd. In an unusual election year, Gilmore is running an unusual grass-roots campaign. He thinks people are tired of negative campaigns and empty promises.

Gilmore is working in 84 different occupations across North Carolina between now and the May 7, 1984, Democratic primary. He spends an entire shift (whether it is 8, 10, or 12 hours long) working by the side of an elementary school teacher, a brick mason,

seafood market worker, produce worker, a tobacco farmer, a cafeteria worker and many, many others. He has done 24 already and, by the time he has done 60 more, he will know better than anyone what the real problems and opportunities are that face this state.

If you combine this experience with the fact that Gilmore has extensive day-to-day experience in North Carolina's executive and legislative branches of government, you have the most qualified candidate for governor.

It is true that the best person does not always win, but Gilmore's record as a progressive businessman and politician has already received wide notice. When election day arrives this "long shot" will be in the driver's seat.

Harrison J. Kaplan
 Chapel Hill

More for the spiritually inclined

To the editor:

I found the article "Chapel Hill offers variety of community churches," (*DTH*, Aug. 29) to give an especially limited perspective of the "variety" of religious activities in the area. The spiritually inclined might also find some of the following groups of interest: Muslim Student Association of UNC, Carolina Tibetan Buddhist Society, Buddhist Studies Association, Campus Pagan Fellowship of the An-

tichrist and Other Holy Gods, Student International Meditation Society, UNC American Atheists and UNC Eckankar. Perhaps in the future your paper will not unintentionally omit the names of these campus organizations from its list.

William Bronner
 Chapel Hill

Letters?

The *Daily Tar Heel* welcomes letters to the editor and contributions of columns for the editorial page.

Such contributions should be typed, triple spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing.

Contributions must be submitted by noon each Monday.

Column writers should include their majors and hometown; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.



Same dreams, new showcase

By HOPE BUFFINGTON

This past Saturday, a quarter of a million people crowded the streets of downtown Washington to commemorate the 1963 Civil Rights Peace March.

The demonstrators came from various places to either honor Martin Luther King Jr., protest still-existing racial disunity, or protest Reaganomics. Others came for spiritual pilgrimages or to be able to tell their grandchildren that they marched in 1963. Still others came to Washington to see what was going to happen.

I could not help but wonder what the original marchers came to Washington for in 1963.

They came to demand an urgent change in this nation's attitude toward minorities. Their march was in desperation. As one speaker noted on Saturday, they (the marchers) thought that the Civil Rights movement was over that August in 1963.

They came in fear of their lives, wondering if someone would hose them down with firehoses, terrify them with police dogs or shoot them with "stray" bullets and teargas.

In 1963, the marchers found hope in the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who emerged that historical day as the leader of black America. A constructive and positive attitude about future minority relations arose from that 1963 rally.

This march was different. People filled the hotels in Washington. The street vendors were out in full force selling Martin Luther King Jr. paraphernalia. Families and spectators brought picnics and radios to lounge with in the grass.

The speakers repeated the same sentiments and ideas — all anti-Reagan. Sometimes one would forget if the rally was to honor the 1963 march or to protest the entire American government.

Maybe the crowd was as disappointed as I was. The speakers were barely audible because the crowd was continually shuffling and talking. People left the rally in search of drinks and lunch. Some demonstrators left the Lincoln Memorial, the site of the rally, in order to visit the nearby Vietnam Memorial and the Washington Monument. Others played in the water from hoses that the city turned on to relieve the soaring temperatures.

The only memorable silence was during Rev. Jesse Jackson's speech. Possibly, he could be considered a leader of black America; however, the same eloquent and commanding attributes that King possessed in 1963 were not apparent in Jackson at the rally.

Maybe I wanted to see a new "dream" develop from the rally.

Maybe I wanted to feel a little of what happened in 1963. Maybe all that I wanted was impossible.

I did feel some of the excitement and hopefulness I was looking for during the actual march. Walking down Constitution Avenue, listening to groups around me sing "We shall overcome," I felt like I do when I visit the battlegrounds of Gettysburg — a feeling of awed admiration for the past and the individuals who struggled and died to create the present.

I could visualize those marchers in 1963 walking through the street, making history, sweating in the hot August sun.

I could hear the immortal words of King echoing "I have a dream that one day..."

Then I came back to reality and listened to the fifty-odd speakers reiterate the same themes and saw the apathetic spectators ruin what could have been another great day in history.

Hope Buffington, a junior English major from Cary, is a staff writer for *The Daily Tar Heel*.

On Democrats and modern history

By WINSTON GILCHRIST

This is not simply an essay on the proud tradition of the American Democratic Party, as the headline would seem to indicate. It is also an article about the future — not only of the Democratic Party, but also of this country and, indeed, of the world.

The past and the future are inextricably intertwined. It is from the past that humanity creates the future. But philosophical concepts of past and future do not concern us here; rather, we turn our attention to the more concrete matters of history and progress, of practical problems and opportunities, of how the history of the Democratic Party relates to those problems and opportunities and to the future of our nation and world.

The modern world is a dangerous one, rendered so by the forces of science and technology. Science's greatest achievement in this century, the splitting of the atom, has enabled a few world leaders to obliterate hundreds of millions of their fellow men in a matter of hours.

But nuclear warfare is not the only danger threatening the modern world. Twentieth-century medicine, in the process of spreading its benefits to so many parts of the Earth, has also succeeded in allowing our species to proliferate at such a rate that a virtual flood of human bodies threatens to inundate the earth, straining starvation, disease and even war in its path.

Over the past two centuries, the gray forces of technology have also created another double-edged sword, the Industrial Revolution. The advent of modern industry has benefitted humanity enormously, allowing vast quantities of wealth to be amassed and the standards of living for entire societies to be greatly improved. But it has also depleted the Earth's resources to such an extent that within the next century further industrial growth may become virtually impossible because the raw materials necessary for such expansion simply will not be available. Pollution of the air and water, as well as man-induced changes in the earth's atmospheric temperature, have compounded problems by poisoning and altering the natural environment.

All of these problems threaten humanity's survival. More immediately, they threaten the prosperity of our own country. We as a nation also face long difficulties which are hampering our well-being even at the present time and which will confront us with more and more

serious dilemmas as we approach the year 2000.

One such problem involves having enough reasonably priced energy to keep the American economy functioning at a high level of output and employment. As has already been pointed out, resource deficiencies pose a serious threat to our economic health. Our national oil reserves have already dwindled to such a low level that we must depend on exorbitantly priced foreign petroleum to meet our enormous needs. As we become increasingly addicted to foreign oil, we leave ourselves more vulnerable to the economic shock that must inevitably follow declining oil supplies and rising prices. Thus, our failing to wean ourselves from petroleum as the chief source of energy for our society threatens to plunge our country into an unprecedented economic crisis in the very near future.

No less challenging is the shifting nature of the world economy and its effects on the United States. As Third World nations, with their cheap labor, continue to industrialize, their products may eventually supplant the Western manufacturers in fields of production which the United States has long dominated. If this trend continues,

foreign industries will undermine the industrial economy upon which the prosperity and security of our nation has long been based.

An enormity of problems face our nation. We as a people desperately need strong and farsighted leadership to weather these dangers safely. Only the Democratic Party, with its great heritage, can lead this nation as it must be led in the years to come. The problems enumerated above demand vision in order to be solved; they demand flexibility; they require that we look forward without entirely losing sight of the past and its lessons. If we examine the history of the Democratic Party, we will find that more often than not, it has exhibited these qualities and has shaped this country into the great nation which it has become.

In the early days of this country, Jefferson and Jackson, two great Democrats, determined that America should be a true democracy, a society in which political power rested not in the hands of the wealthy but with the great mass of people. After many struggles, the U.S. became the nation that Jefferson and Jackson had envisioned. In seeing that the American people could not forever be suppressed, Jefferson, Jackson

and their supporters showed the foresight and progressive attitude that the leaders of our own generation must exhibit.

Democrats showed those same qualities in the 1930s when the Great Depression inflicted so much suffering on so many Americans. Under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party overcame the opposition of those elements that sought to resist change at all costs and instituted a series of reforms that may very well have saved the American political and economic system. After World War II, the Democratic Party led the United States into the role of a world power. In doing so, it charted a new course in American foreign policy and history, facing the future and its exigencies without flinching, yet also learning from the mistakes of the past, from the failure of isolationism.

In all of these instances, as well as many others, the Democratic Party has shown a progressive spirit and has changed the American nation for the better. It is no less able to show that same spirit and to lead America today than it was in the past. The Democratic Party still possesses the diversity of membership, support and ideology to be flexible in policy-making decisions. Among its adherents still reside individuals who remain vitally interested in the problems of the future: environmentalists, economists, politicians and everyday citizens able to shape great events.

All of this is not to say that only the Democratic Party has contributed to the greatness of the American nation. The Republicans and their predecessors have produced a number of fine statesmen and have at times led the nation quite competently. Yet any thinking person must admit that the Democratic Party has been the preeminent American political party throughout most of our history and that the Republicans, whatever their past achievements, are too regressive to lead this country. If Republicans desire to continue contributing to our nation's greatness, let them adopt something of the principles and philosophies which have made the Democratic Party so eminent. Let them abandon the narrow-mindedness to which they have clung through so much of their history and replace it with the Democratic qualities of farsightedness, flexibility and progressiveness, qualities which Americans will need in abundance in the coming years.

Winston Gilchrist is a junior history and political science major from Sanford.

