

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor EditorSTUART TONKINSON
BEN PERKOWSKI
DICK ANDERSON
JANET OLSON
JAMI WHITE
ANDY TRINCIAManaging Editor
Associate Editor
Associate Editor
University Editor
News Editor
State and National EditorLORETTA GRANTHAM
MARK POWELL
LEE ROBERTS
ELIZABETH ELLEN
SHARON SHERIDAN
LARRY CHILDRESSCity Editor
Business Editor
Sports Editor
Arts Editor
Features Editor
Photo Editor

A square deal?

Henry Whitfield was visibly upset at Tuesday night's Chapel Hill Planning Board session. He and close to 100 others jammed the meeting room of the Municipal Building well above its 80-person maximum for fire safety. A resident of Chapel Hill practically all his life, the 60ish Whitfield had come to voice his disdain for Rosemary Square, the parking deck/hotel/shopping center complex proposed for the corner of Rosemary and Henderson behind the 100 block of East Franklin Street — "the business district."

Whitfield's not the only one talking. Costing \$19 million, the joint venture between the town and a private developer would literally change the face of downtown Chapel Hill. Whitfield, like nine other speakers before the board, had three minutes to speak his peace (although ex-board member Lightning Brown rambled on for the better part of 10 minutes). Whitfield walked away from the podium in protest, concerned that his "downtown" would be forever worsened by change.

We disagree. Rosemary Square represents a visionary approach as to how Chapel Hill's future could be.

To be sure, change does not come without some concessions. Increased traffic is likely, but a specially-commissioned survey indicates that its effect will be minimal, and hardly detrimental. Stylistically, none can discredit the project's beauty. The underground parking will not detract one bit from the Chapel Hill skyline,

while the complex has been designed to be compatible with existing downtown architecture.

Those who argue that the construction of such a complex will destroy Chapel Hill's "village" aura must remember all the growth that the town has weathered over the last 20 years — including a doubling of the student population.

Outgoing Mayor Joe Nassif, an avid supporter of the proposal, gave perhaps the evening's most impassioned plea for the project. He spoke of growing up in eastern N.C. small towns, and how upon returning to those towns today they were "donuts" in appearance — with nothing in the middle, or downtown.

While downtown Chapel Hill isn't likely to roll over and die anytime soon, things could be better. Malls have eaten away at the town's adult consumer base, and downtown parking is near-impossible to find. Rosemary Square represents a long-needed attempt to lessen the dependence of downtown businesses on their student clientele. By providing additional parking and attempting to diversify downtown business, the project addresses both problems.

After listening to debators, the Planning Board voted unanimously to issue a zoning compliance permit to Rosemary Square, joining Nassif and a near-unanimous town council in its support of the project. We add our support. Rosemary Square is a vision for tomorrow, the revitalizing cornerstone of a future that Chapel Hill cannot ignore.

Where's everybody going?

There's a silent war going on at UNC and, we suspect, most other universities as well, yet there is precious little debate over it. It's a war, of sorts, between professors and students.

It's a war many on both sides have tried to stop, though there seems no cease-fire in sight. People know about it, talk about it, some are truly concerned about it, others joke about it, and most simply don't care about it.

So, it's not as though nobody makes any noise about it. In fact, "silent" probably isn't the right word for this war at all. Indeed, when you think about it, it isn't a bit quiet — one could even call it a "loud" war and not be too far off the mark. "Undeclared" seems more suitable; it certainly isn't "official."

This war, like almost all wars, is fought in battles. In this instance, however, it's not easy to determine the winner of the individual battles (For instance, who really knows how much more the professor wanted to say and couldn't because of students' battle maneuvers?). Nevertheless, in our own objective analysis, we would have to give the overall edge to the students. After all, in some of the worst conflicts the student/professor ratio can get as bad as 250 to one.

Anyway, you can also add the word

"predictable" to the list of descriptions for this war. For every conflict occurs at the same time — the last minute or so of class — is fought with the same weapons — books, notebooks, bookbags, desk arms, etc. — and involves the same tactics — students prepare to leave class early, usually while the professor is still lecturing, in order to realize two main objectives: 1) give the teacher the less-than-subtle hint that class is over, and 2) make way for a fast get-away as soon as class really is over.

What are the consequences of this war? First, professors get frustrated that students don't display more patience and interest. Second, students are able to get wherever they're going next faster. Third, students make a strong symbolic statement that class shall never be allowed to go into overtime. And last, and probably least important, a few students who have witnessed this well-known phenomenon for several years actually feel sorry for the outnumbered professors and stay perfectly still each class until he or she is thoroughly finished, or drowned out as is more often the case.

What can we do about it?

Hey, where are you going? Wait, this editorial isn't finished yet!

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Keith Bradsher and Jim Cook

Assistant Managing Editors: Anjetta McQueen and Cathy Cowan

News: Crystal Baity, Lisa Brantley, Loch Carnes, Kerstin Coyle, Randy Farmer, Charles Fernandez, Katy Fridl, Jill Gerber, Edward Mark Gilgor, Todd Gossett, Mike Gunzenhauser, Kenneth Harris, Sharon Hodges, Denise Johnson, Robert Keefe, Scott Larsen, Donna Leinwand, Lana Lewin, Mitra Lotfi, Dora McAlpin, David McCullough, Anjetta McQueen, Yvette Denise Moultrie, Linda Montanari, Kathy Nanne, Beth Ownley, Rachel Orr, Grant Parsons, Gordon Rankin, Rachel Stiffler, Rachel Stroud, Joy Thompson, Jennifer Trotter, Elisa Turner, Laura Van Sant, Devi Sen, Rhesa Versola, Kim Weaver, Lorry Williams, Laurie Willis, Katherine Wood and Karen Youngblood. Guy Lucas, assistant University editor.

Sports: Scott Fowler and Tim Crothers, assistant sports editors. Rick Beasley, Mike Bernardino, Phyllis Fair, Paris Goodnight, James Suroweicki, Buffie Velliquette and Bob Young.

Features: Marymelda Hall, assistant features editor. Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Louis Corrigan, Kara V. Donaldson, Heather Frey, Matthew Fury, Keith Griffler, Wayne Grimley, Jane Mintz, Mary Mulvihill, Peggie Porter, Tara Reinhart, Laurie Rodgers, Liz Saylor, Denise Smitherman and Martha Wallace.

Arts: Mark Davis, Jim Giles, Aniket Majumdar, Alexandra Mann, Alan Mason, Sally Pont, Deanna Ruddock, Garret Weyr and Ian Williams.

Photography: Charlotte Cannon, Dan Charlson, Janet Jarman and Charles Ledford.

Copy Editors: Kim Craig, Lisa Fratturo, Brian Gates, Roy Greene, Tracey Hill, Gina Little, Cindy Parker, Kelli Slaughter and Vince Vargas.

Artists: Adam Cohen, Bill Cokas and David Sumner.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Angela Booze, student business manager; Angela Ostwalt, accounts receivable clerk; Doug Robinson, student advertising manager; Alicia Brady, Keith Childers, Alicia Susan D'Anna, Staci Ferguson, Kellie McElhoney, Melanie Parlier, Stacey Ramirez and Scott Whitaker, advertising representatives; Staci Ferguson and Kelly Johnson, classified assistants; Johnnie Parker, advertising coordinator, and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager; Tucker Stevens, circulation assistant.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway and Rose Lee, production assistants.

Printing: Hinton Press Inc. of Mebane

READER FORUM

ARA dishing out hard-to-swallow service, prices

To the editors:

"Let's go eat!"
"Where?"
"I guess we'll go to Lenoir."
"I believe I'll skip lunch today."
How many times have you had conversations similar to this one? I know I have had plenty. What is it about Lenoir Hall that ruins people's appetites? I will address these questions, and propose some solutions to the problem that confronts us.

The problem is probably different for every individual. Many different reasons exist for avoiding Lenoir Hall and ARA food. The service bothers me the most. Although a vast array of other complaints remain, this letter focuses mainly on service and, to some extent, price. What is the solution? I would be content if the service would improve and/or the quantity of food would

increase. One morning I paid 99 cents for one small slice of sausage! I believe most students on campus would agree that this is too high a price for the amount of food received.

Nevertheless, UNC students are lucky to have a pleasant dining hall to eat in. The quality of the food is better than that offered at most universities. I believe the type of food system at UNC is the reason for the quality. Most "all-you-can-eat" cafeterias cannot compare with the quality of food at Lenoir Hall. I have eaten at Texas A&M and N.C. State University, both of which serve all you can eat for one set price, and neither of these schools can compare with UNC. I am not angered with the quality. And because of the recent renovation at Lenoir, I can understand the reason for the high price and the

\$100 minimum for most on-campus residents. But to put it as simply as possible, the service leaves something to be desired. Or should I say, it leaves "nothing" to be desired.

On a recent trip to K&W cafeteria in Chapel Hill, I decided to compare its service with ARA service. As I went through the line, the differences I noted were a larger variety in selection and a friendlier attitude of the workers. This selection and service pleased me. Then I realized the quality of the food was comparable to ARA; however, the quantity left ARA behind. When I paid my bill, I noticed that it cost less than a comparable meal at ARA. Thus, I came to the ultimate conclusion that ARA, to say the least, needs work. They are in the restaurant business just like K&W, and I cannot see why their service

should not be the same. I am sure that if K&W were closer to campus, it would destroy ARA's business.

It seems to me that most ARA workers are apathetic towards students. This could be the result of working on a university campus, or insufficient wages, or maybe even the student attitude. Whatever the reason, ARA needs to improve their service.

Most people that I've spoken with agree that ARA is less than desirable. The quality of service is the main reason. This service must improve or the on-campus residents may be forced to take action in the form of protests or whatever else it will take to replace ARA with another food plan that has quality service at a good price.

Joseph Daniel Cox
Chapel Hill

What's so wrong with SFA upholding morality?

To the editors:

I am writing in response to Rick Robinson's column "Anger and fear — is this the New Right?" (Sept. 26). Robinson claims to be open-minded, but fails to recognize that millions of people are conservative, fundamental Christians with the right to voice their opinions. When Robinson implies that these people are ignorant and close-minded, he is cutting off a large portion of society. Robinson, does your "open-mindedness" lead you to believe that it is wrong to protect the sanctity of the family in a country that is overrun with unwanted pregnancies, a record number of divorces, teen suicides on the rise and sexually transmitted diseases at epidemic proportions? Is it wrong to uphold morality?

Your statement that "blacks, women, homosexuals and non-Christians" are shown too little respect is ludicrous. Conservatives — and I speak on behalf of Students For America — believe that no group should have special rights

over another, regardless of color, sex or religion. We do believe in equal opportunity for everyone. We support a "color-blind" society, one in which the most qualified person — male or female — should be hired, regardless of race. We believe that everyone has the right to choose his or her religion. We understand that everyone has his or her own system of morals and that you can't single out or separate that system from politics, be it moral or immoral. We also recognize that there is a higher law than the law of the United States.

We believe in the Judeo-Christian value system, which promotes a non-compromising order of morality. This includes the upholding of the family unit, the sanctity of human life, and liberty granted by the creator. This is not just "our truth," but a value system that is proven to work. While we may disagree with people opposing these issues, we do not hate these people.

Robinson, when you say "A woman ought to be able to make

very personal decisions about her body," do you mean that she is entitled to destroy the living person inside of her? Do you question that child's right to exist? As for questioning a homosexual's "right to exist," you are mistaken. We question their role in our group, SFA, and we question their right to impose their lifestyle on others by allowing special rights legislation. There are many reasons we do not support such a lifestyle. It conflicts with the family unit; AIDS is on the increase in both the homosexual and heterosexual populations; and the bottom line: It contradicts God's laws.

Robinson, you seem to perceive us as being an "angry and afraid"

organization. But it appears to me that you are the one who is angry at the conservative movement, afraid to let us express our values. "The goal of instruction is love" (1 Timothy 1:5). This is a quote from what you admitted to be "a very important and good book: the Bible." Contrary to your column, we are not motivated by anger and fear, but out of love and a desire to please God. I believe that the gospel of Jesus Christ will make this world a better place, and I am neither angry nor afraid to proclaim this good news.

Lori Taylor
Co-Chairman
Students For America

Remember our global family

To the editors:

Have the lessons of our past increased our sense of global responsibility? Let us go back in time to last semester. An extensive and devastating famine crippled and still is crippling portions of central and eastern Africa. The majority of us realized the magnitude of their crisis in early October, three months after signs of famine were evident. Our response was admirable, but late. Now Mexico has suffered an equally devastating crisis — an earthquake. This time, the proximity and accessibility of the Mexican disaster warrants a prompt and collective response that expresses our sense of global responsibility towards our southern neighbors.

Just how does the global responsibility of a seemingly distant college community fit into the reconstruction of Mexico City? We must first try to understand the magnitude of the disaster in Mexico. We should not disassociate ourselves from their crisis because we have not experienced similar trauma. Instead, we should try to understand the plight of the citizens of the world's largest metropolitan area. The death toll currently stands at about 3,500; the U.S. Ambassador predicts up to 10,000 fatalities. The earthquake, measuring 7.8 on the Richter scale, occurred at 7:18 a.m., the beginning of rush hour. In four minutes, the quake destroyed 250 centrally located buildings. Even a week later, Mexican citizens still stand by the ruins of a 16-story hospital, waiting for rescuers to pull out the bodies of their relatives.

The true test of Mexico's ability to recover from the earthquake can be measured in economic terms. The Mexican economy has been operating on an austerity budget for the

last two years. Government food subsidies have been shrinking while unemployment has risen; the value of the peso has sunk to record lows. Outside the domestic arena, Mexico's foreign debt is \$96 trillion, second only to Brazil's.

But these are only statistics; what concerns us is human need. As UNC students, we are part of a global community and have a responsibility to respond to that human need. Perhaps this is best illustrated by a young Cuban in Los Angeles who collected \$400 from his worksite and said, "It doesn't matter what part of the world you live in. We're all human."

UNC's common bond to Mexico and to the Mexican people brings tragedy of the earthquake even closer to home. For the past 50 years, a joint fellowship program between UNC and Escuela Normal Superior De Mexico in Mexico City, a teacher's college, has sponsored more than 500 M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. candidates and professors at Chapel Hill. In 1955, these students expressed their appreciation of UNC by planting a friendship tree in front of Peabody Hall. We should promptly and collectively return this gesture of friendship by supporting the rebuilding fund for the Escuela Normal Superior de Mexico, which was devastated by the earthquake. Funds are being accepted by the Campus Y for this rebuilding program.

Let us learn from the frustration and helplessness we all felt at the climax of the African famine. Now we can once again act to aid a member of our international family, so please think globally.

Campus Y
Executive Committee

Disinvestment would only be a hindrance

By ROBERT R. MEDFORD

Recently there has been dispute on campus on the issue of disinvestment in South Africa. Many reasons have been put forward supporting disinvestment, but, to date, I have not heard any reasons about why we should not disinvest. I would like to offer some reasons why disinvestment is not justifiable:

- The end result of disinvestment will not be reform in the South African system. The sanctions will not induce the government to move any faster with its reform policies. South Africa has a resilient economy and could withstand disinvestment or boycotts for a long period of time. Considerable outside pressure, such as disinvestment, will only radicalize the Afrikaans leadership and destroy many of the reforms that have already been achieved.

- The economies of the neighboring black states will be destroyed before South Africa's is. These neighboring states rely heavily on South Africa for economic support. About 1.5 million blacks from neighboring states are employed in South Africa. The money these people send home is a major economic support for the region. Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland obtain all of their petroleum supplies from South Africa. South Africa supplies 100 percent of Lesotho's electrical energy, 79 percent of Swaziland's, 52 percent of Botswana's and 60 percent of the energy used in the capital of Mozambique, Maputo. If disinvestment occurs these South African resources will not longer be available to the neighboring states since South Africa will obviously put its own needs first. With foreign capital denied to the Electricity Supply Com-

'Considerable outside pressure, such as disinvestment, will only . . . destroy many of the reforms that have already been achieved'

mission, it will have to refuse to sell energy to these states since it will not be able to continue development to meet increasing energy demands. South Africa will deport foreign workers so that its own people can fill their jobs. South Africa would also have to stop supplying these nations with petroleum products since its own needs will come first. Also, disinvestment would devalue the SA Rand, the national currency of South Africa as well as Lesotho and Swaziland. The resulting devaluation could paralyze these nations' fragile economies. Subsequently, they would probably have to default on their loans from Western sources.

- Disinvestment will cause unemployment among the black population in particular. This would bolster support for the African National Congress. The ANC could then increase its guerrilla war against the government. The government would then be forced to retaliate through repressive action. The result of these events would be similar to those in Rhodesia between 1964 and 1979. The South Africans would be able to fight much longer due to better morale and a much more stable economy that could withstand a protracted guerrilla war. The end result would be many deaths and a pro-communist dictatorship that would have control over many of the free world's mineral supplies.

By choosing not to disinvest, we are making a statement to the government of South Africa.

We are saying that we do not support the principle of apartheid, in any form, but that we agree with efforts to bring about a peaceable change in the system. Reforms are now underway. They are due in a large part to pressure from the United States and American business firms. If we disinvest as these reforms are taking place, we will be saying that we will only accept an immediate relinquishment of power to the blacks. However much we'd like to see this happen, we must understand that it is simply not possible. The South African government is in the process of reform. If we apply too much pressure, they will end reform and fight to the death for what they see as their nation's survival.

We must remember that we, too, had a form of apartheid in this nation. It wasn't until 1954 that apartheid began its peaceable and gradual demise in the United States (in general terms, lasting until 1968). We can see the benefits of this gradual reform now. There is general acceptance of the system and most citizens are happy. The South Africans must be allowed to do the same thing — in their own time, in their own way. Apartheid will end in time, but until then, the South Africans need our support for their reform, not our hindrance. Disinvestment will be a hindrance.

Robert R. Medford is a freshman political science major from Asheville.