

There is a 50 percent chance of rain today with the high in the upper 60s and the low near 40.

The Daily Tar Heel

Serving the students and the University community since 1893

The 1978-79 campus directories are still available at the Carolina Union information desk.

Jogging

Traffic, dogs, potholes among ironies that make running hazardous to health

By DEBBIE DANIEL
Special to the Daily Tar Heel

You're jogging along the shoulder of a dark road. A car approaches, breaking the silence and blinding you with its bright headlights. It stops in your path and two men step out. You're female and alone.

Women are likely targets of most assaults on joggers in the area, according to Capt. Arnold Gold of the Chapel Hill Police Department. Women must be overly cautious, he said.

"Never run alone and avoid running at night if you're female," Gold advised. Make sure you know well the course you jog and where houses are on your route. In case of a threat to your safety, you could run to one of these homes and call 911 for a police officer, Gold explained.

Nearly all joggers, not just women, face dangers when running. Gold, who runs 50 miles a week, said, "Every time a jogger of either sex hits the road he's taking lots of responsibility on his shoulders." Unless the jogger sticks to running at a local track, he must contend with traffic.

Cars tend to drift toward a jogger on the roadside as the driver watches him, Gold said. The jogger should run facing traffic to avoid being hit by a car he could not see coming, he suggested.

"Watch yourself, too, because after a certain distance a runner tends to disassociate himself with his surroundings," he warned. In such a state, a jogger may run through an intersection or step into a car's path, he explained.

Given the dangers of drifting cars and "disassociated" runners, the greater the distance between the jogger and the automobile, the smaller the risk, Gold said. Try to steer away from streets lacking sidewalks or clear paths because the jogger's chances of being injured are greater in such areas, Gold said. Laurel Hill, for example, is a dangerous course in Chapel Hill

because it is narrow and two-laned with no sidewalks, he said.

Sidewalks, such as those around campus, and paths free of stone, limbs and other debris, are good jogging courses, he said. Still, when you reach an intersection, run defensively. Gold warned. Cars may fail to yield the right-of-way.

Unlike bicycles, which are considered vehicles, "Runners don't actually have a legal right to the road," Gold said. That's why drivers often feel no obligation to be courteous to runners, he explained.

"As a runner, I try to show motorists every courtesy in hope that with time, joggers may be shown the same courtesies," Gold said.

Cars may be dangerous, but they don't usually chase a runner up on the sidewalk. Dogs do. Just as a person running down the road is in a car's territory, the sidewalk runner may be invading a dog's territory, Gold said.

When a snarling, barking dog is clipping at your heels, slow down and think fast, Gold said. Is the dog playful or angry? If playful, fast-moving feet may be his hang-up. In that case, walk. If he's angry and ready to attack, don't hesitate to use self-defense, Gold said.

For defense, Gold used to carry an old car antenna to scare away dangerous dogs. The antenna is light and compact enough to hold in your hand and unfold when you need it, he explained. If you poke at the dog with it, he'll probably leave immediately, Gold said.

In addition to scaring dogs away, a compact antenna carried by the female jogger may be a deterrent to a would-be attacker or rapist, Gold added.

Yet, the most effective way to avoid such encounters is to plan your course well in advance of your run, Gold said. Know the conditions of the Road or path, know what to expect and what to do in case problems arise, he said.



Mary Carroll Smith, former UNC prof, will seek an appeal

Smith plans to appeal discrimination ruling

By JACI HUGHES
Staff Writer

Mary Carroll Smith, former assistant professor of religion at UNC, plans to appeal last week's ruling by U.S. Middle District Court Judge Eugene A. Gordon that she was not discriminated against in the University's 1974 refusal to rehire her.

"We are planning to file an appeal on the basis that the ruling disregards evidence placed in the record," Elisabeth Peterson, Smith's attorney, said Wednesday.

Peterson would not say what evidence she thought Gordon disregarded in his decision.

In the Nov. 9 decision, Gordon ruled that Smith, a Catholic, was not discriminated against on the basis of sex or religion.

In the 26-page ruling, filed in Greensboro, Gordon said Smith failed to prove her claim that the University's stated reasons for not rehiring her were merely a pretext for actual reasons of sex, age and religious discrimination as outlined in Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

A jury previously had ruled in August that UNC did not violate Smith's 14th Amendment rights or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act by refusing to rehire her.

In his decision, Gordon said, "On the basis of the evidence, however, the court cannot conclude that Dr. (John) Schutz (then chairperson of the religion department) was using the stated reasons (for not rehiring Smith) as a pretext for religious or sex discrimination."

"The conclusion that Dr. Schutz was honestly mistaken about Dr. Smith's competence is equally, if not more, compelling."

The University claimed Smith was not promoted or rehired because she did not have sufficient knowledge of her scholarly discipline Indian and Sanskrit religions. The University also claimed Smith was not rehired because she was unable to relate her special field of study to more general issues of religion.

"The court cannot find that the first reason articulated by the defendant University was a pretext for sex or religion discrimination. No member of the department had any developing knowledge of Indian religions, Dr. Smith's field of special competence," Gordon said in his decision.

"He (Gordon) finds my client was qualified for reappointment too, but the people in the department did not know enough about her field to know that. He

See SMITH on page 4

Wilmington 10: deliberate delay of justice brief?

RALEIGH (AP)—The U.S. Justice Department's friend-of-the-court filing for the Wilmington 10 produced no new evidence and may have more public-relations impact than legal significance.

There was also private speculation Wednesday that filing of the rare federal brief was deliberately delayed until after the national off-year elections, for political reasons.

In Washington, Justice Department spokesperson Terry Adamson said the government originally considered possible criminal violations of the defendants' civil rights. He said lawyers began preparing the brief early last summer, and dropped consideration of any new charges.

The Justice Department asked U.S. District Judge Franklin Dupree Jr. to overturn the 1972 convictions, which stemmed from the firebombing of a grocery store during racial unrest in Wilmington.

In announcing the brief, Drew S. Days III, head of the department's civil rights division, called it a precedent-shattering move and was the result of new evidence uncovered by its investigation. On Wednesday, however, the department softened its position and acknowledged there was little new information in the 89-page legal document.

"The importance of it is primarily in its newsworthiness. Strictly on a legal basis, it's just another piece of evidence," Richard N. League, an assistant North Carolina attorney general who has argued the case on appeal, said of the brief.

"It's another point of view on something that's already been hashed out," he added. "It's a boost to supporters, of course."

Supporters of the 10 defendants in the civil rights case praised the ruling, and James Fuller, a Charlotte lawyer who has represented them, predicted it would have substantial impact.

"An independent review by an independent agency whose job it is to protect justice reached the same conclusions as we have, that basically the trial was not fair," Fuller said.

"I am absolutely delighted and think it will help from a psychological point of view because it is so unusual and because the Department of Justice is an independent group, not somebody from the United Church of Christ or our office."

But Fuller also said the Justice Department discovered no new evidence. "I don't think so," he said. "I don't think there is anything left new to be discovered."

The brief refers to an "amended statement" by key prosecution witness Allen Hall, which the Justice Department contends reveals several inconsistencies in Hall's original statements and his testimony.

Defense lawyers have sought to see the statement but have never been given a copy. A sealed version has been part of the court record during appeals, lawyers said, and the Justice Department apparently received a copy during its investigation.

The timing of the filing was questioned by some in the state attorney general's office who noted that the federal probe began early last year and that the Justice Department convened a special grand jury in the case in March 1977.

"Obviously it was viewed that this would be an unpopular thing for President Carter in the South," said one source. "Surely one week to the day after the election does look like Drew Days and U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell were pawns in some political process."

The brief also came after nine of the 10 were already free on parole. In January, Gov. Jim Hunt reduced by about one-third the sentences of the nine black men in the case. The sentences originally ranged up to 29 years in prison. The 10th defendant, a white woman, was already free on parole.

Only the leader, Ben Chavis, is still in prison. He is currently attending divinity school at Duke University on study release, and a Correction Department spokesman said Wednesday Chavis would not be permitted to talk to reporters.

James "Jay" Stroud, the prosecutor at the original trial, said Wednesday he believed the federal brief was totally misconceived. He has denied contentions by the defense that deals were made with prosecution witnesses in exchange for their testimony.

He discounted the value of the "amended statement," saying it contained only his personal notations on an already-public transcript of his interview with Hall.

"I don't really know what type of impact it will have," he said of the brief.



DTH/Will Owens

Special jogging shoes can make a difference

By LIZ HUSKEY
Special to the Daily Tar Heel

You decide to take up jogging after reading on your bathroom scale the astronomical figure that represents your weight. You have shorts and a T-shirt, but you wonder if your old Converse basketball shoes will be good enough to jog in.

James Fixx in *The Book of Running* says: "You can cover just as much territory in old shorts and a sweatshirt as you can in an expensive designer outfit, but a good pair of shoes means the difference between success and failure." In an effort to protect your feet while running on roads, you may have to spend \$20 or more on a pair of shoes.

Why aren't inexpensive discount store specials adequate? "In most inexpensive shoes there is a cardboard heel counter," said Chip Stone, manager of Phidippides Running Shoes. The heel counter piece which wraps snugly around the heel can cause a lot of injuries if it is not constructed properly. Stone said. "A cardboard heel counter, when it gets wet from perspiration, softens up, then allows the heel to move up and

down, back and forth, and it causes injuries."

Another difference between expensive and inexpensive shoes, said Steve Grathwohl, a salesperson at the Athletic Attic, is that the materials in the midsole material of cheaper shoes tend to bottom out, compress and then transmit shock rather than absorb it. "If you run on asphalt, you can injure your tendons and joints."

"There are some people who can get by on these shoes," said Sally Bondurant, a salesperson at Phidippides. "For example, lighter people can get by on less cushion, but the chances of injuries are lessened with a good shoe."

Getting a good fit in a shoe also lessens the chance of blisters, tendonitis or shin splints, representatives of both stores emphasize. "Particularly in the hills of Chapel Hill, you don't want a lot of toe room, or there will be slippage toward the front of the shoe," said Bondurant. "Also you don't want a lot of slippage in the heel counter." She recommends shoppers try shoes on wearing the type of sock they plan to

See SHOES on page 3

History class relives scenes from Civil War

By GEORGE JETER
Staff Writer

The troops were scared. We had been marching since morning, and now, as the ragged line formed up for one last assault, we could see the enemy's guns standing out on the crest of the distant ridge. Our commander nodded to us wordlessly, and with a blood-curdling yell that echoed across the fields, we charged into oblivion.

This ended not some ancient, foreign conflict, but the last day of James Leutze's History 76 field trip. History 76 deals with the American military from the Revolutionary War through, as most students on the trip phrased it, the War Between the States. The accompanying four-day tour of Civil War battle grounds has, for many students over the last few years, become the highlight of the course.

The trip began harmlessly enough just a week ago as the various car loads of pilgrims on the trip straggled into Fredericksburg, Va., after having left independently from Chapel Hill. Some of the more educationally minded members of the group quickly decided to do a little private research on Virginia's mixed-drink laws (expensive, but worth it) while others merely contented themselves with testing the tensile strength of the motel.

After a leisurely five hours of sleep (this

was to be the last long night's rest on the trip) the little caravan began a "friendly" rivalry of seeing who could get to the next battleground first and zoomed off into the misty morning in search of Chancellorsville at a respectable 70 mph.

Chancellorsville was an ironic battle in what was an ironic war. As we drove through the back roads following the route of Stonewall Jackson's "foot cavalry" at Chancellorsville, the textbook brilliance of his flanking movements came to life.

The group, which already had begun acting more like some time-warped Civil War regiment than a group of modern college students, cheered as a local expert explained how "Jackson's Way" beat a Union army twice the size of the Confederate forces. And as the guide spoke of that same long ago night when, as the battle was being won, a misdirected Southern bullet took Jackson's life, many students looked off into those woods, known as the Wilderness, as if seeking some higher referee to whom they could appeal his death.

Friday evening found the group at Harper's Ferry, an incredibly beautiful part of West Virginia that has the dubious distinction of being the site of the second largest surrender of U.S. forces in history. And then came Antietam. For the first

time on the trip, students winced as a park ranger described the effect of a .58-caliber mini-ball hitting a human body, and how 23,000 men could die of its power in a single day.

And then we are dying. Stuck in a mud-filled, sunken road and running low on ammo, a frightened colonel orders a retreat into an open field where the enemy shoots us to pieces.

The re-enactment ends; one student bitterly asks the colonel's name and how he could have been so stupid.

The trip ends Sunday, appropriately enough, at the North Carolina Memorial in a little one-horse town where Robert E. Lee had hoped to get his troops some new shoes: Gettysburg.

We are back in formation. Fifteen thousand men, the majority of us from North Carolina, look over the freshly plowed field. Up on Seminary Ridge we can see a few enemy guns. But it must be alright. The Old Man would not send us all out on a clear field if there were many troops behind the ridge. We charge. Pickett's charge.

A new green field of winter seedlings has been planted. It now holds indisputable dominion over the land that others died to gain control of more than 120 years ago. The group stands huddled on the hill in silent, awe-struck respect.



DTH/Allen Jernigan

UNC student re-enacts charge ...at Gettysburg Park

Friday says government backs research

By MARK MURRELL
Staff Writer

A prominent administrator at MIT attracted national attention last week when he said relations between the federal government and the academic community have deteriorated to the point that many research programs are threatened. UNC officials, however, say the picture is not that grim.

"In the past, the federal government has not acted as if the university community is a great national resource," said UNC President William C. Friday.

"But that is changing with the Carter administration. There has been much progress in the last 10 months indicating that the administration is interested in seeing the university community continue strongly." Friday cited such efforts by the Carter administration as renewed funding for basic science research activity.

Jerome B. Weisner, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was critical of bureaucratic interference in research in a speech at a meeting of the National Council of University Research Administrators.

"The current administration doesn't meet the university community with hostility, as has been done in some past administrations, but is sincerely interested," Friday said.

Weisner blamed a barrage of government regulations and bookkeeping requirements for bogging down the universities and diverting time and money that could be spent on research. University Provost J. Charles Morrow said, "Sometimes a research effort is divided among agencies and you have to deal separately to get the job done. Oftentimes we wish the agencies could pull themselves together better because duplication of reports is such a problem, but I don't think it's going to cause us to collapse."

"One of the major problems," said Chancellor N. Ferebee Taylor, "is not having much lead time. One never knows from one year to the next, the quantity of funding that will be available, but this is something that institutions have lived with for a long time."

Morrow said the major problem does not lie with the government, but with inflation. "If we keep the amount of money level and keep the government's administrative demands level, then research productivity is diminishing," Morrow says. "It is research that is absorbing all the punch from inflation."

Weisner said in his speech that the technical supremacy of the United States is being challenged by several other countries, and that if it is to stay competitive, the nation needs a revitalized research and development effort, which the universities can play a pivotal role in achieving. "What we need, and what the country now needs, is regulation of regulation," Weisner said.