

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor EditorCATHERINE COWAN Associate Editor
ANJETTA McQUEEN Production Editor
JANET OLSON University Editor
JAMI WHITE News Editor
JILL GERBER State and National EditorLORETTA GRANTHAM City Editor
LORRY WILLIAMS Business Editor
LEE ROBERTS Sports Editor
ELIZABETH ELLEN Arts Editor
MARYMELDA HALL Features Editor

LARRY CHILDRESS Photography Editor

No SACrificial Rams

Read our lips:
Dumb, dumb, D-
U-M-B.

No matter how you spell it, the parking situation that Carolina basketball fans are going to encounter for the first time Saturday afternoon is, as our copy of *Webster's* says, "slow-witted."

A total of 656 parking spaces surround the much-vaunted Student Activities Center. But 21,426 fans will be "parking" themselves inside the building come tip-off time Saturday. Lots at the UNC medical complex will be open to fans — as will other lots that are scattered here and about on South Campus — but some Duke fans might be better off walking from Durham than taking a chance on finding a parking spot within a half-mile of the SAC.

You'd think that with all the talk about dollars and cents, someone could have stopped for a moment to think about people and cars. Chapel Hill zoning laws require at least one parking space per every four occupants of a building, only spaces within 2,500 feet of the building being counted. But even

board opinion

with the horrific honeycomb of distant lots prepared to accept cars this Saturday, the number of spaces available will only be 4,500, far less than the zoning standard. Something doesn't add up.

Gordon Rutherford, director of the UNC planning office, said that the high ratio of on-campus students expected to attend SAC events allowed his office to modify the zoning restrictions. But he declined to comment further on why his office's original plans — which called for several hundred more accessible spaces — had been scrapped. He did say that having a "sea of asphalt" was unacceptable for this campus. But we humbly submit that three or four hundred *cobblestone* spaces could have been added without detracting from the... um, er, "beauty" of South Campus.

At any rate, no one knows how bad Saturday's parking problem will be. But the "wait-and-see" attitude that has come to typify campus planning in recent years makes us wish that something had been done to forestall what is bound to be a mess — that is, unless you paid your \$10,000 for a guaranteed Rams Club spot.

—Editorialists' columns

Posters worth the pest

History having a tendency to repeat, candidates for campus elections are once again finding their posters removed from the walls of classroom buildings.

There is both an official and an unofficial explanation for this practice. The official is a 1980 memo from the UNC Physical Plant that directs house-keeping staff to remove any posters not affixed to bulletin boards, on the grounds that the adhesives damage the surfaces.

The unofficial reason is that many deans and professors dislike the posters. Either they claim that the posters present classroom distractions, or, having taught in a particular room for so long, they have become possessive and dislike wall art not of their own choosing.

Neither justification holds water. In the case of causing damage to walls, the elections laws contain two provisions aimed against that. Posters must come down within four days of elections, so they should not remain up long enough to cause damage. Failure to remove them is a campaign violation and punishable by fine.

In the event that posters do cause damage, the candidate is liable for the cost of repairs and also may be fined. Failure to pay either fine is an Honor Code offense and grounds for disqualification from election or removal from office.

As for the other argument, well, perhaps the University should remember its much ballyhooed encouragement of

a well-rounded education and support of student self-governance. There is much more to the college experience than is to be found in a lecture hall, and the inconvenience of having posters on classroom walls one month out of the year is a small sacrifice for the benefits of student government.

Candidates waste much effort and money in putting up posters that immediately come down. Of course, nothing says they cannot come up with campaign methods other than plastering their mugs all over campus. But neither can it be denied that posters are the most effective way of raising student consciousness. That consciousness is vital if the elections and, by extension, Student Government are to have any validity.

Elections Board Chairman Bruce Lillie will meet with Provost Samuel Williamson next week to discuss solutions to this problem. There is no reason that students, faculty and the housekeeping staff cannot come to terms on this issue, for campaign posters are destructive to neither the physical or academic environment; they are at worst an endurable nuisance.

After years of complaints from candidates and Student Government officials, it is high time that the University administration took the lead in arranging those terms.

— EDWIN FOUNTAIN

Collarful memories

"He wears such beautiful shirts," my girlfriend says when someone asks her to describe me.

Part of this undoubtedly traces back to the scene in *The Great Gatsby*, a book she admires, when Gatsby displays his shirts for Daisy — "shirts with stripes and scrolls and plaids in coral and apple-green and lavender and faint orange, with monograms of Indian blue."

There's something about shirts; something of ourselves, something of our past, something of our dreams. One critic even described Gatsby's shirts as "sacramental," as communicating concrete signs of his inner vision. Shirts tell us much about the man. Here are some shirts and some stories.

Yellow, blue and white Oxford cloths. These last remains of 12 years of uniform-dress Catholic education refuse to be pressed again after years under my mother's iron.

A blue, patterned Indian shirt bought in one of those cheesy shops at Daytona Beach when I was still young enough to drink beer illegally with friends. A friend named Beth wore it to a Hawaiian party last spring, and I haven't seen it since.

A short-sleeve yellow with blue polka dots that I bought in a vintage clothing store in Atlanta and once wore to

Springfest, convincing my date that I must be pretty cool.

A once bright yellow, long-sleeve Hawaiian Tropic shirt bought in St. Petersburg Spring Break of my senior year of high school. We were visiting 10 girls staying in someone's grandmother's house (where I learned how to eat spaghetti), and after a day of sunglasses, my red-haired friend passed out in the Howard Johnson's restaurant while waiting for a takeout cheeseburger — sunstroke.

A Chaps green cotton plaid which is the last shirt my mother bought for me that I liked. She's nearly stopped trying.

A black-striped shirt I bought at a thrift shop for a dollar to go dance at a Jason and the (Nashville) Scorchers concert at a cheap bar on a backstreet in Marietta, Ga. It's still a good dance shirt because of the long, floppy sleeves.

Two bright blue-ish plaid flannel shirts from Britches, Christmas '84 — a vintage year for Britches flannels.

A lightweight yellow short-sleeve cotton I stole from my girlfriend, who had bought it from a fellow on the street at Cooper Square near St. Mark's Place in Greenwich Village.

And every shirt tells a story, don't it.

— LOUIS CORRIGAN

Mid East Beat: A call for retaliation?

By ADAM LEFSTEIN

This is the first in a series of columns by Adam Lefstein on the Middle East.

It is human nature to try to strike back at that which hurts us. Thus it is no surprise that the immediate American reaction to the Dec. 27 terrorist attacks on the Rome and Vienna airports was to want to retaliate. This emotional response may make us feel better, it may help to avenge the deaths of the 19 who fell to the terrorists' bullets, but it is unwise.

The first problem with retaliation is the lack of an object for our anger, a target for our aircraft. The Reagan administration blames Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi as instigator of the atrocities. This is a very convenient excuse for Reagan to strike at the man whom he considers to be "the most dangerous man in the world." The facts, however, show this blame to be somewhat misdirected.

The eight men who committed the attacks are members of Abu Nidal's Fatah Revolutionary Council. According to Austrian Interior Minister Karl Blech, who is involved in the investigation, the men were trained in Palestinian camps in the Syrian-controlled Bekaa Valley in Lebanon. From there they went to Damascus and split into two groups, one group flying to Belgrade,

Yugoslavia and then travelling by train to Rome, the other Budapest, Hungary and then to Vienna. The only apparent connection between the terrorists and Libya is that three of the terrorists carried passports which Libyan officials had confiscated from expelled Tunisian workers.

So it would appear that the blame lies primarily with Abu Nidal, then with Syria, and finally with Libya. Abu Nidal is too elusive a target. Syria is considered vital to the Middle East peace process. Therefore, the United States vents its anger at Libya.

Retaliating against Libya also has its problems. Were the United States to risk striking at Libya militarily, innocent people might be killed, the 1500 Americans presently in Libya would become prime hostage targets, and we might be forced into an unnecessary confrontation with the Soviet Union.

It is on account of these risks that Reagan has opted to retaliate with international economic sanctions against Libya. With the complete support of Western Europe international sanctions might work; however, without this support they are useless if not counterproductive. For the United States, whose total trade with Libya is worth only 229 million dollars a year, it is easy to sever economic relations; for our European allies, who import 6.4 billion dollars of Libyan oil each year, it is much more costly. Thus, Europe has chosen not

to cooperate with our ill-fated sanctions, and Qaddafi has not been weakened. Indeed, it appears that our feeble attempts at retaliation have strengthened him, bolstering his popular image as an active fighter against Western imperialism in the Middle East.

The real problem with our search for a response to the attacks is that it comes too late. The pitiful actions of Italian Special Prosecutor Domernico Sica are a perfect example of our poor timing: *Time* reports this week that "after sifting all the evidence, Sica was reportedly ready at week's end to seek an international arrest warrant for Abu Nidal." Abu Nidal has been speaking terror throughout the world for 12 years. Seeking a warrant is a good start, but it is much too late.

We need to build up our security in preparation for attacks. Eyewitnesses in Vienna reported that the ineffective Austrian security reacted slowly and that if it had not been for the two Israeli security men working for El Al, "the slaughter would have been much worse."

There is a war going on. The terrorists know it, Israel knows it, and it is time for us to realize it also. Vengeful retaliation won't stop the terror; only improved security will.

Adam Lefstein is a freshman Mid-Eastern studies major from Chapel Hill who lived in Israel for 1 1/2 years.

READER FORUM

The weakness of metric

To the editors:

I got home from class today and felt like writing an editorial for the *DTH* and imagine my dismay when I turned to the back page and found the only articles of late concerned vandalism and euthanasia, two topics for too lofty my limited mental capacities. I was hoping maybe we'd be talking about Captain Crunch again. So, I was ready to forget the whole thing when I remembered that there was something I had wanted to speak out about. The subject to which I am referring is the "metric week." The metric week is long overdue and I

am surprised no other college student has thought about it. It works like its name implies, that is, every week would have ten days. "What is the advantage of a ten day week?" you might ask. Well, you see, in a metric week we keep the same number of weekdays, therefore gain an extra number of weekend days. The new week would consist of Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Saturday, Saturday, Saturday, and Sunday. Each year would consist of 36.5 metric weeks. I know what you are saying: "But what about that half of a week at the end

of each year?" Simple. The final week of each year would start on a Saturday and end on a Sunday. For those of you who are real astute (i.e., grad students) you will notice that when we couple this week with the previous week we get ten weekend days in a row. I know there are other advantages to backing up my argument for the metric week, but because I am a Republican, I often have trouble supporting my arguments with anything substantial. Thank you.

Dave Shaw
Ehringhaus

MAYHEW



Conservatives distort Robinson's image

By MARGUERITE ARNOLD

I couldn't believe my eyes when I saw the latest editorial that Allen Taylor has spewed forth. When I first became aware of Taylor last semester, I was amazed that anyone could be that naive. At least he has consistency.

The article questioned not only Robinson's right to speak at UNC, but the appropriateness of his speech in honoring Martin Luther King. The gall of that question still rankles. Robinson is fighting for human rights now just as surely as King did in the sixties.

I think that what Taylor finds so questionable about Robinson is that he is a member of TransAfrica, which is probably just as left wing as Taylor is to the right. Who says opposites attract? TransAfrica is concerned with the freedom of the South African people, as surely Taylor must be; however, what they propose to do is far more indicative of what the South African people want than what Taylor proposes. The people themselves have called for complete divestment and sanctions against the South African government.

It is people like Taylor who tend to confuse the issue by completely disregarding facts which don't agree with what they believe in. The result is a policy like constructive engagement which only hurts the blacks. Taylor himself believes that constructive engagement should be stopped — to send more companies to South Africa.

In this instance what is happening is that not only are people like Taylor blatantly ignoring facts, but are doing so for capitalistic gain. Constructive engagement is a rationalization, coupled too often with the argument that through it, the United States is helping the South African blacks (about one percent are employed by American companies) while at the same time stopping the Communist threat. Besides, if we weren't there exploiting cheap labor, some other country would be. Makes me proud to be American, let me tell you.

To further show how Taylor ignores facts, let me reiterate the list of the people and groups that TransAfrica has invited to speak that Taylor has shown dislike of. Perhaps an alternative view of these people and organizations would show why Taylor favors such an unsavory opinion of these people.

Maurice Bishop, Oh dear, Grenada. If I were in Taylor's shoes, I wouldn't want that country mentioned too loudly. We are still finding out how much Reagan's "rescue plan" turned out to be snafu.

Ron Dellums — gun sales. This is another prime example of Taylor ignoring the facts. The

The South Africans will get help from whatever quarter they can. They want to be free, to live and work, and do not want to be satellite of any country.

United States is not only the primary gunrunning nation in the world (but we can still hold our noses in the air over Khadafy's tactics), but is also a nation with a severe problem with gun control internally, caused by the lenient, or perhaps nonexistent is more apt, gun control laws. But if one goes on Taylor's surmise, one can assume that if you ignore the problem it will go away, or, as in the case of guns, one can ignore it until you get shot in the back. Everyone has the right to shoot their own man, even here, right? You might also add John Hinkley, Don Johnson and Sylvester Stallone.

SWAPO, ANC and Oliver Tambo. These are organizations (Oliver Tambo is the president of ANC) which are fighting for the end of apartheid. The ANC in particular was founded as a peaceful group in 1912, and for years tried to deal with the South African government in a reasonable non-violent way. I might also add that Ghandi tried to do the same thing in South Africa and it didn't work. What are they supposed to do? Keep trying and hopefully Botha will wake up one morning on the right side of the bed for once? Yeah right, my granny wears combat boots. Are we supposed to believe that the South Africans should just continue their peace marches and act as target practice for the police? It sounds logical to me.

This brings me back to the appropriateness of Robinson's address. Martin Luther King was an advocate of peace. That's what Robinson also wants, but America is not South Africa, although there are a few similarities. You must remember that by the time King spoke, the Civil War had been over for a hundred years. Blacks here had a few more rights. We are still feeling the repercussions of our own racist tendencies, though we still have such peace-loving groups as the Klan and the Order. The government here also gave in a little more quickly, and by the

Bring back our logo to us

To the editors:

If any of you seniors have noticed this year's senior class logo, you have seen one of the most decorative, creative, and unique senior class logos in UNC history. The qualities which make this year's logo so special are a reflection of the thought, time and effort put into the logo's development. That is why it is just too bad that someone took the banner from the Pit for his own personal pleasure. The logo symbolizes senior unity for some 3500 seniors on UNC's campus. It is the only true identifying feature which every senior can take heart in and be proud of. If one person captures all this symbolism for his own selfish enjoyment, then a major part of UNC senior tradition is lost and the efforts of those dedicated seniors who developed the logo are lost.

So please, please, if you are the person who solely possesses the Senior '86 logo banner, return it to the Union information desk or to the Senior Class office. You will be a better person for it, and 3500 seniors, especially Kenneth Whitted, would greatly appreciate it!

Kenneth Whitted
Hinton James

Marguerite Arnold is a freshman anthropology major from Blowing Rock.