

JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor
MICHAEL TOOLE, Associate Editor
MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor
WAYNE THOMPSON, State and National Editor
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor
VANCE TREFETHEN, Business Editor
STUART TONKINSON, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
SHARON SHERIDAN, Features Editor
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

Vote with conscience, not with wallet

By DALE MCKINLEY

Nov. 6 is right around the corner, and, judging by recent surveys, it would seem that the American public is about to make a very serious mistake, namely re-electing Ronald Reagan. What makes this situation even more deserving of attention is the fact that the youth of this country form a major determinant in realizing that mistake. It is not my aim to provide an exhaustive list of reasons as to why Reagan's re-election would be a major mistake, but rather to focus on the reasons for support for Reagan among the youth of this country.

Needless to say, there has been a major shift in the thinking of America's youth since the Vietnam era. In the '60s and early '70s the majority of college-age citizens revolted against the "establishment" and sought changes that expressed anti-militaristic, socially aware and individualistic goals. Their individualism, however, was one that stressed freedom of choice in all spheres of society, and sought to strive forward toward a new sense of realism. Indeed, it was the activism of these youth that created much of the domestic resistance to the involvement in Vietnam. They forced change!

Although the situation has dramatically changed since that time, the force for change has not. The youth of today's America also have a goal of individualism, but it is an entirely different individualism than our predecessors. It is one that seems centered around pure self-interest, of what is good only for oneself combined with a purely monetary motive.

"THERE, THERE, DADDY WON'T LET MONDALE'S POLICIES HURT YOU!"



Reagan's overt embracement of hyper-extended capitalism provides the ideal environment for this type of individualism to flourish. The change that this approach brings is more change in the participants' pockets.

What is most disturbing about this development is that the desire for more money in one's bank account seems to have obscured what are surely far more important issues. America's youth have consistently voiced a concern about

the arms race and its impact on their future, yet they consistently place it on the back burner as a low-priority issue. The youth pay lip service to the increasing deficit, choosing instead to focus on short-term benefits. Yes, it looks as though Reagan has succeeded in lulling the young into sitting beside the fireplace and gladly accepting his fairy tale of prolonged economic prosperity and assured security through a massive arms build-up.

If we would just take a minute to think about what really counts for our future, it becomes alarmingly clear that support for Reagan and his policies can contribute nothing. What good is it to spend \$1 billion on a single B-1 bomber that will be obsolete in a few years when that money could contribute to America's educational system? How can we live in peace and security when there is a continual reliance on massive nuclear destruction as its foundation? Wake up youth of America, you can make a change and take this country on a new path of domestic and global realism.

Nov. 6 offers that chance for change. It is time that the real issues come to the surface and not be obscured by Ronnie's rhetoric. I urge those of you who side with Reagan to re-evaluate his policies, putting aside their short-term benefits and looking to what they provide for your future and those of your children. Don't mortgage your future! Let us look beyond our own selfish interests and concentrate on those issues that incorporate all of mankind.

Dale McKinley is a first-year graduate student in international relations from Gweru, Zimbabwe.

Don't take The Pill

We noticed on The Cube yesterday that STAND (Students Taking Action for Nuclear Disarmament) is on the move again. Are its members aware of what another, somewhat similar group at Brown University is up to?

Students there, through democratic vote, have passed a proposal to ask their university health service to stock "suicidal pills," perhaps cyanide, for use in the event of a nuclear war. The obvious intent is that, upon holocaust, all those unable to stomach the mess could easily leave it.

Of course, there's more to the proposal. Those who drafted the referendum, a group called Students Against Nuclear Suicide, hope to illustrate to the country that nuclear war is akin to suicide.

This, however, is an absurd, if noble, cause. Stockpiling "suicide pills" illustrates an attitude not of responsibility or rationality, but of narrow, maniacal paranoia. With this temper-tantrum tactic, Brown students may as well have threatened to hold their breath until nuclear weapons go away.

And besides offering only a simplistic solution to a complex situation, they are defeatist in attitude as well. Although

we're not planning to climb into a cement cell for the rest of our lives, we would try to maintain some kind of existence before committing suicide.

Some have called the cyanide solution a "clean moral and political message" that the Brown students care about the future. If so, their voice squeaks with immaturity.

Most people have at least a passing interest in the nuclear arms issue, and the taboo nature of suicide itself is enough to arouse attention. We suppose the brains of the Brown students cannot be too severely faulted for their creativity, nor even for their political pragmatism, as media coverage of the event has surely aroused some public awareness.

But the exhibitionism and sensationalism apparent in Brown's SANS is something all student groups should recognize and avoid. Ironically, it employs an emotion identical to the defense spending policy it condemns, which also is based on fear. As students we should at least demonstrate the ability to reason with logic, and not replicate the often ill-fated methods of our leaders.

Leaning the right way

The State Department's get-tough statement to Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos Tuesday is potentially the best move the Reagan administration has made concerning the island nation in some time. In expectation of a report released yesterday that implicated the Philippines' armed forces Chief of Staff in the assassination of opposition leader Benigno Aquino, the administration said it expected Marcos to prosecute all those found to be involved in the plot, "no matter who they may be." The statement, of course, is just that: a statement — mere words — but if it is followed up with the economic sanctions that have been threatened should Marcos fail to meet the demand, it will send a long-awaited message to an authoritarian government that has abused the United States' friendship by ignoring requests that it make its system more democratic.

Still, the questions linger. Is it all a political smokescreen? Has the report, released by a 5-member board appointed by Marcos himself, gotten to rotten core of the plot or is it just sacrificing the armed forces chief, Fabian Ver, and other high-level military officials to head off a calls for further investigations that might implicate Marcos? Perhaps more importantly, will the U.S. demand for even-handedness wither after the officials are prosecuted and the problem is safely under the rug?

Regarding the first question, there seems to be some hope. The investigation panel not unexpectedly lacked credibility in the early going. But after it broadcast hearings daily and took testimony from almost 200 witnesses, the

board won the support of many.

While there is some reason to believe that the true culprits have been identified, there is little reason so far to expect a positive answer to the second question. The administration distanced itself from Marcos last fall after Aquino was assassinated, but a \$355 million aid package continued, partly because the administration wanted to do nothing to encourage what was seen as a growing communist threat.

Reagan echoed the philosophy in the presidential debate Sunday night when he said he knew that things happened there that "do not look good to us right now" but asked, "What is the alternative?" The answer was what aides admitted was an overstatement, "It is a large communist movement to take over the Philippines."

It is just this knee-jerk reaction that has the U.S. government too often kowtowing to undemocratic regimes. This behavior, of course, is not unique to the Reagan administration. The same philosophy had the United States supporting the Shah of Iran and fomenting rebellion. Foreign policymakers seem unable to overcome this short-sightedness. The reasons for that are the stuff of lengthy political science debates: the need to maintain military bases, to protect U.S. business interests, etc. The critical question that must be answered now is whether the administration plans to continue pressuring Marcos after the election. The assassination, which has brought the worst crisis to the Philippines, ironically has given the United States a chance to do what is right. Let's hope the administration doesn't blow it.

piece. "Everybody loves to see that thing," he said.

Southern Bell thinks the culprits may have overheard the credit card number when it was used by Divorky's former roommate in a Chicago or New York airport telephone booth. Think about that the next time you want to get huffy with your roommate when he or she eats all your Captain Crunch.

That's not healthy!

So, how's your love life? (Don't answer that; even the *DTH* knows its limits.) But have you had any cavities lately?

Oral bacteria associated with gum disease and tooth decay can be transmitted by kissing and touching, according to an Emory University dental researcher who gets paid to discover such things. Fourteen married couples consented to the study, which revealed that a "high percentage" of the mates shared the same types of oral bacteria.

Steven Offenbacher, mouthpiece for the American Dental Association, told group members that many of these organisms die rapidly when exposed to air — reducing the possibility they were transferred through communal use of a drinking glass or toothbrush. Though study findings are "by no means conclusive," he said, they "suggest the possibility that bacteria linked to gum disease can be transferred by mouth-to-mouth contact."

Ahem. And that's the bottom line.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Former president's speech deserved bigger hall

To the editor:

The decision to relegate former President Jimmy Carter's Weil Lecture to the small confines of Memorial Hall was shameful and insensitive to students and the community alike, especially in view of the express theme of the lecture which was American citizenship.

As Carter emphasized in his talk, American citizenship is a right and a privilege extended to us all, not

just to a select group of individuals. His talk should have likewise been opened to all who wished to hear him.

The explanation provided by the *Daily Tar Heel* for the decision to hold the lecture in Memorial Hall rather than Carmichael Auditorium was the difference in cost between the two halls. Are we then to conclude that a former president of the United States does not merit the

respect to the Carolina basketball team?

I was among the foresighted who arrived at 6:00 p.m. to hear the 8:00 talk, knowing full well — as did many others — what the community response would be. I also remembered last year when the entire congregation for Kurt Waldheim's Weil Lecture had to be transferred from one inadequate-sized hall to another still-inadequate

hall. Those responsible for these decisions of location must be either dreadfully naive or totally insensitive to the wishes of the university. I urge the *DTH* to make known to us those responsible, and I urged all those who were "locked out," estimated at more than 1,000, to protest.

Joan Lenowitz
Carrboro

Abusive edit

To the editor:

We are shocked that the *DTH* would print an editorial as senseless, sarcastic and just plain derogatory as "First daughter from Plains..." (*DTH*, Oct. 23). Is this the way we should treat a high school senior who is simply considering attending Carolina? Dubbing Amy a "celeb deb" and repeatedly using her name in a demeaning manner, the editorial pokes fun at her interest in astronomy, and labels the Carter family as "ol' down home Southerners."

The editorial heaps further abuse on Amy and her father by encouraging her to share her "opinions on U.S. defense policy" in the Pit. References are made to Uncle Billy's urges to party and "how welcome" the Carters were last time they lived up North. "Daddy" is supposed to appreciate North Carolina's "own Mondale liberal."

The editorial next turns on our own university. Granted, in any large-scale university, problems such as many curriculum requirements and limited parking spaces will arise, but the attack on our football team, whose players practice their butts off every afternoon, is despicable.

If you are so unhappy here, dear editor, we will gladly trade you for Amy Carter, or even for her dog, Grits!

Jenni Kilborn
Donna Lindsay
McIver



Editorial mean-spirited, arrogant

To the editor:

The editor of a major college newspaper is responsible for a publication that reaches thousands of people every day. The *Daily Tar Heel* editorials should serve to challenge or affirm student perspective. So what was the meaning of that "editorial" on Amy Carter on Tuesday's back page ("First daughter from Plains..." *DTH*, Oct. 23)? Not only was it a poor representation of UNC and a misuse of

editorial space, it was ugly and arrogant. The *DTH* proudly proclaims under its banner that it has been "serving the students and the University community since 1893." Who does it serve by insulting the guests of the University and offending large numbers of the student population as well?

Perhaps you would be willing to write a defense of this editorial, so that the University will have some insight into your editorial philo-

sophy. We're waiting.

Carol Mulholland
Jonathan Williams
Chapel Hill

Letters and editorial columns should be typed 60-character line and triple-spaced. Deadline for contributions is 2 p.m. the working day before publication.

Arms race needs a dose of nuclear sense

To the editor:

The nuclear arms race is by far the most important issue facing mankind. Overpopulation, environmental degradation, and the national deficit are comparatively trivial problems. Chapel Hill and the UNC campus comprise an area teeming with educated people, yet it seems that many are as yet uninformed or have not taken the time to reflect on our nuclear predicament.

During the National Annual Week of Nuclear Education, Oct. 15-22, I was able to attend a Fr. Drinan lecture, and a Dr. Helen Caldicott film. On each occasion I expected the auditorium to be full, but only 160 people came to hear Fr. Drinan, and fewer than 75 attended the Caldicott film. Hope-

fully, the poor attendance at these events was due to lack of publicity and does not reflect the attitudes of UNC students and residents of Chapel Hill.

Something must be done to halt the nuclear arms race. We are adding at least five missiles per day to our arsenal. Why? One of our Trident subs possesses enough firepower (24 megatons) to destroy every major city in the northern hemisphere. Do we need more? Military spending has increased dramatically since President Reagan took office, and millions have suffered due to cutbacks in social programs. Stockpiling of nuclear weapons is both costly and irrational. Technological advances have made the policy of deterrence obsolete. The development of new

tactical weapons has given rise to talk of a "winnable nuclear war" and "limited nuclear war." Is this the direction in which America should be headed?

People, not nuclear weapons, are the strength of America. We begun the arms race. We can bring it to an end. Public involvement is the key! Begin by educating yourself; read available literature, attend seminars, etc. Next, spread the

message. Talk to friends and relatives, write to local newspapers, and call or write to your congressman.

Most importantly, vote on Nov. 6 for a new administration with more "nuclear sense." We must remind our government officials that they work for us, and inform them that we do not support the nuclear arms build up.

Lawrence W. Canton III
Carrboro

Referendum vote not valid

To the editor:

If you happen to know a Residence Hall Association Governing Board member, or if you happened to note the article on the RHA referendum in the *DTH* Tuesday ("Dorms to vote on higher rent," Oct. 23), or if you happened to catch a glimpse of the flyer in your dorm on Tuesday, you might have realized that there was an election on that very day. Well, I do know a member of the RHA Governing Board, so I read the *DTH* article and saw the flyer — but only because I was looking for them. Apparently not too many dorm residents were that fortunate because when I went to vote at 5 p.m., only about 80 residents from the nine dorms in Olde Campus had voted. Two people from my dorm had voted, and the other person is my roommate. Most notably, out of those nine dorms, only three dorm presidents had voted.

A referendum which affects student's fees and could make RHA

independent of the Campus Governing Council is a pretty significant act. Residents have a right to know what the people who represent them and allocate their money are doing. So why weren't the dorm residents properly informed of the RHA actions before the day of the election? Surely RHA has direct communication with the *DTH*. Perhaps RHA President Mark Stafford did not want to deal with any arguments from the CGC. Perhaps the *DTH* is not fairly covering news we have the right to hear. Whatever the reason, something is wrong.

This election (if you happened to be aware of it) was certainly not representative of the opinions of the dorm residents. I encourage Wayne Kuncil, director of University Housing, not to accept the results of this RHA referendum vote.

Karen Rindge
Ruffin

The Bottom Line

Next time your parents balk about paying your \$100 phone bill, tell them things could be much worse. They could have Robert Divorky for a son. Divorky was recently socked with a phone bill of \$64,335.03. The 640-page bill had to be delivered in a packing carton.

No, it's not that Divorky is a compulsive dialer; nor has he been swept off his feet by AT&T's suave pitchman, Cliff Robertson. It seems that Divorky was the victim of yackety desperados who used his credit card number to test AT&T's claim: "Calling anywhere, anytime. That's long distance."

Displaying its eternal mercy, the phone company decided that Divorky won't have to pay for most of the calls, which were made to faraway lands including Switzerland, Kuwait, India, Pakistan and the Netherlands.

Within five days, dozens of people placed more than 3,600 calls using Divorky's credit card number. The phone company apparently figured that all the calls could not have been made by Divorky. Within a span of three minutes on Sept. 29, calls were placed from Orange, N.J., Staten Island, N.Y., and Fargo, N.D. All were billed to Divorky's account.

Still, the incident may have helped to improve Divorky's social life. The 5-inch-thick bill has become quite a conversation

