

GEORGE SHADROU, Editor

DINITA JAMES, Managing Editor
BRAD KUTROW, Associate Editor
THOMAS JESSIMAN, Associate Editor

KAREN ROWLEY, News Editor
PAM KELLEY, University Editor
MARTHA WAGGONER, City Editor
JIM HUMMEL, State and National Editor

BILL FIELDS, Sports Editor
MARK MURRELL, Features Editor
LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor
MELANIE SILL, Weekender Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

Two Chinas

Ronald Reagan made a number of questionable assumptions during the past week. He assumed no one cares what he says. He assumed that what he means is more important than how he says it. He assumed that Americans can continue to overlook his confusing statements on issues while he lambasts President Jimmy Carter's capricious policies.

These are reckless assumptions for a man who cherishes conservatism. The recent furor surrounding his remarks about Taiwan and China should alarm even those people who support Reagan's bid for the presidency.

After all, was it not a Republican conservative president, Richard Nixon, who finally realized that ignoring a country of China's stature was both short-sighted and unrealistic? Has not this country's short relationship with Communist China been fruitful, both politically and culturally?

What, then, would motivate Reagan to endanger this relationship unnecessarily by making an issue of Taiwan-U.S. relations. The controversy came when Reagan said at a press conference he wanted to make this country's relationship with Taiwan official. The Carter administration maintains "unofficial" relations by using a private American institute established by Congress, funded by the State Department and run by retired Foreign Service officers. Reagan believed that calling such a relationship unofficial was to cover fear of ridicule. But the Chinese believe Reagan is willing to subjugate U.S.-China relations to the interests of Taiwan.

While Reagan's loyalty to Taiwan might be admired, one cannot help but wonder just what was behind the confusion on the Reagan staff as it tried to clarify, again, one of Reagan's "semantic" blunders.

Reagan's respect for Taiwan is not at question here. Taiwan has proved itself a loyal friend to this country and has given its citizenry a healthy, free and improving economy. For the United States to ignore this fact would be to discourage such occurrences in other nations. What is frightening is that Reagan and his running mate George Bush obviously were unsure of each other's position. Even more surprising was Reagan's careless use of the word "official," which was bound to alienate China.

Reagan's supporters continually ask the press and the public not to concern themselves with what Reagan says, but what he does. What is "doing" in politics if it is not speaking out on issues? And if Reagan cannot be held accountable for what he says, who can?

Essentially, Reagan, in his enthusiasm to express support for Taiwan, lost sight of a bigger and more important issue. Reagan would not change markedly this country's relationship with Taiwan; Reagan himself admits this. But he has cast into doubt, at least momentarily, his ability to implement an effective policy with regard to the "Two Chinas" question.

Avoiding Anderson

As soon as the decision putting John Anderson back on the North Carolina presidential ballot was handed down Thursday, the Democratic National Committee announced plans to appeal it. The Democrats have no real hope for reversal, but they seem bound and determined to block Anderson's candidacy at every turn. In doing so, they exaggerate the threat he presents to President Carter and weaken their own campaign.

The DNC based its case on a clause in state election law that prohibits candidates who participate in primaries from running as independents in the subsequent general election. U.S. District Court Judge Franklin Dupree ruled, reasonably enough, that Anderson—who had opened no state campaign headquarters, spent only \$2,400 and withdrew from the race a week before Election Day—had not participated in the Republican primary.

Although the federal appeals court in Richmond is not likely to overturn Dupree's ruling, the Democrats plan to appeal, figuring that they can divert Anderson's staff and money from the campaign into court. That tactic is part of a larger Carter strategy: avoiding Anderson instead of challenging him on the electoral middle ground the two men seem to share.

Carter dodged Anderson again Tuesday when he agreed to a one-on-one debate with Republican Ronald Reagan sponsored by the National Press Club. He thus reduced the impact of any later debate that might include Anderson.

By working to keep Anderson off state ballots and attempting to ignore his candidacy, Carter magnifies the independent threat. The president is an impressive campaigner and could scuttle the sinking Anderson candidacy quickly. With an aggressive campaign, he could answer those who question his ability to lead—and regain the nation's confidence. Instead of trying to take Anderson off the ballot, Carter would do well to simply take him on.

Budget cuts cripple exchange programs

By BUDDY BURNISKE

The night before the academic year ended last spring, the Campus Governing Council's 21 representatives gathered for the annual Finance Committee budget hearings. From that night-long vigil came a sudden end to funding of University exchange programs—namely Gottingen, Dusseldorf and Toronto—and a realization that the council's yearly shifting of priorities raises serious doubts about the future of small organizations at UNC.

"CGC's aim is to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people, in a tangible way," Student Body President Bob Saunders said when questioned about the final cuts made last April. "CGC had to be fair and consistent. Cuts had to be made in order to distribute the money, of which there was only half as much as requested. In any kind of budget tightening scheme, the exchange programs, or any relatively exclusive organizations, usually feel the impact first."

The problem here seems one of long-range hindsight and foresight, things which the CGC lacked last year. What was missing in the decision to cut exchange programs completely from the budget was a perspective beyond the academic year 1980-81, a perspective that may have slowed the hasty decision in light of these programs' respective longevity.

The Gottingen Exchange, a yearly exchange of two UNC students for two students from the German university, has existed for 27 years, and has been funded entirely by the CGC for at least the past 10 years. According to Peter Topping, programs director of the International Center and head lobbyist for Gottingen last spring, the program was considered a top priority by the CGC Student Affairs committee, and was received similarly by the CGC Finance Committee before the final appropriations were made.

However, after the Finance Committee drew up a Budget Bill which denied funds for the Dusseldorf and Toronto programs the Gottingen Exchange was faced with a similar fate. It succumbed quickly.



"...If CGC decides to make a change like this, it should gradually phase out funding..."

—Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Donald Boulton

"I was stunned at first," Topping said. "I can't remember the final count, but it seemed like half the people on CGC abstained in our vote. How could they do that? The fact that so many were timid enough to abstain says something right there. I think they knew they were wrong, but they were voting on precedents—set in that particular hearing—that they felt were binding."

The final vote results for Gottingen indeed were mystifying. In response to the Gottingen funding appeal nine CGC members were opposed, four were in favor, and six abstained. A few hours later the Toronto Exchange, which celebrated its 20th year in 1980—during which it was financed each year by student fees—was denied funding by a 9-8-1 vote. The Dusseldorf Exchange, which was created in 1978 because of increased interest in the Gottingen program, never appeared at the final hearing.

The reasons for the Campus Governing Council to cease funding the exchange programs are all legitimate. The basic problem is that there isn't enough money to allow funding of programs that affect relatively few people at the University. But reasons and rationalizations don't ease the plight of people who have developed solid ties with other schools and must now find funds on short notice or else watch their plans and programs fall apart. No one has said that the programs are unimportant; nor has anyone made a commitment to the permanent financial backing of the programs in the future.

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Donald Boulton had mixed emotions over the CGC decisions of last April. "I can understand the CGC's reasoning that these programs benefit too few people to merit finances from student fees in general," he said. "However, if CGC decides to make a change like this it should gradually phase out funding, not chop them off without advance warning. These programs, Gottingen and Toronto in particular, are long-term, good-will programs that involve commitment. A sudden drop of funding after years of financing by one source just doesn't seem fair to the people involved on either side and certainly doesn't do much for our relationship with other schools."

Yet, Saunders and most members of the Campus Governing Council contend that such a "phase-out" of program funds is impossible given the structure of the council. "Phase-outs and permanent funding are the kinds of things the administration or department-like the Romance languages—in the case of exchanges—should handle," Saunders said.

Diane Hubbard, the chairman of CGC's Finance Committee last year, concurred. "The problem is that any legislation passed by one CGC can be repealed by the next. I can't see any way that a phase-out could occur. Things done by this CGC don't establish anything more than a precedent, which serves as a rough guideline for the next group."

But what of precedents? Shouldn't 27 years' existence and at least a decade of CGC endorsements for one exchange, and 20 consecutive years of assistance for another, mean a little more than "rough guidelines"? Apparently, long histories are inconsequential, as each year brings a clean slate on which only the past year and coming year will decide the fate of any specific organization. As Hubbard says, "Precedent is always a factor, but not a binding factor."

As of now the Gottingen Exchange has been rescued—temporarily—by a special grant from the College of Arts and Sciences, under the auspices of Dean Samuel R. Williamson. A full backing of \$5,000 was obtained by the Gottingen organizers. The Dusseldorf Exchange was granted one-half of its needs,

receiving \$2,500 from the same source, while \$1,250 was paid by each of the families of the participating UNC students to make up the difference. The Toronto Exchange, which received \$1,200 in 1978, \$1,500 in 1979, and had little warning of a near-sighted CGC cutting them abruptly from appropriations in 1980, has yet to receive assistance, but is attempting to secure funds through a special chancellor's grant.

"Phase-out and permanent funding are the kinds of things the administration... should handle."

—Student Body President Bob Saunders



"Next year is very much in doubt," International Center programs director Topping said. "There's a concern that the same things will happen to these programs as happened to the exchanges once maintained in Puerto Rico and Ghana—which were dropped in the mid-70s. Right now, we're just hanging."

What were hasty, if not harsh, moves to end financing of exchange programs have now led to a question of withdrawn backing from other small organizations in future belt-tightening of the CGC. Socially oriented programs—like Toronto Exchange and Senior Class—have fallen by the wayside. Other small-range programs, which require closer scrutiny than the CGC may have time and desire to expend, could be terminated or absorbed by larger organizations, which increase their appropriation demands annually.

What's important now is that the CGC set its priorities straight and establish more than just "rough guidelines" for programs dependent on financial assistance to develop their own specific guidelines. The CGC must look beyond the effect of one year's finance—or work more closely with those that are able to do so—as they think of what direction organizations and the University are to take.

Essentially, the Campus Governing Council has created a ping pong game, paddling programs in the direction of administrators who they believe should provide permanent funding of programs, only to see the administrators bounce the same programs back in search of emergency funds. Supposedly, work is under way to end this game, but we're still a long way away from seeing the paddles set aside and the game put to an end.

That's a turn which, if the University is to preserve the programs its students deserve, must be taken.

Buddy Burniske, a junior English major from Hatfield, Mass., is editorial assistant for The Daily Tar Heel.

letters to the editor

Strickland 'eliminated,' did not resign

To the editor:

In the interest of accuracy, I am writing to clarify misinformation presented in your Aug. 25 article concerning the reorganization of the Office of Student Affairs at the University.

Rather than having resigned my position as asserted in your article, on May 20 I was informed to my surprise by Vice Chancellor Donald Boulton that my position as associate vice chancellor for Student Development was being eliminated effective Aug. 31, with the month of August constituting annual leave. Other than his desire to reorganize, no rational explanation was offered by Boulton for his decision. According to my instructions I fulfilled my responsibilities in the Office of Student Affairs through July 31.

During the past five years I have thoroughly enjoyed my association with the University and have found working with students, faculty and staff most stimulating and rewarding. I shall miss those relationships.

In September it will be my pleasure to assume the responsibilities of vice president for Student Affairs at Maryville College in Maryville, Tenn., where I look forward to continuing my professional career in the development of opportunities for liberal education.

More than 13 years of living in Chapel Hill has included so many rich personal and professional associations and such rich experience to our family that leaving Chapel Hill will be possible only in the physical sense. Part of our spirit will



always be with Chapel Hill and our many friends who call it home.

William R. Strickland
Chapel Hill

Sigma Delta Chi

To the editor:

The Society of Professional Journalists, Sigma Delta Chi, is currently accepting new members. Everyone majoring in journalism and RTVMP is eligible and is invited to join. SPJ,SDX is a national organization with professional and student chapters. At UNC, our organization plans forums, special speakers and other educational programs for student journalists.

To give you a chance to learn more

about SPJ, SDX we are holding an open house from 4-6:30 p.m. Thursday, in 204 Howell Hall. All those eligible for membership, as well as current members, are invited to attend.

If you are interested in joining but cannot drop by our open house, fill out a card with your name, local address, phone number and class in school, and put the card in the undergraduate box in the office in Howell Hall.

Laura Alexander
President, SPJ, SDX

City developing transportation alternatives

By GERRY COHEN

After all these years, alternatives to the private automobile—including improved bus service, new bicycle paths and sidewalks—are multiplying quickly in Chapel Hill.

The town's bus system began in 1974 after it was approved in a referendum, and transit service in Carrboro began in 1977. Both ridership and service levels have been rising steadily. This fall, several new routes are in operation: a new "J" route serving many Carrboro apartment complexes to relieve the overcrowding on the "C" route, an evening "FL" route to give service until 9:45 p.m. to Kingswood Apartments, campus, East Franklin Street, University Mall and Ephesus Road and a new "A" route serving Airport Road.

Ridership is up dramatically, with an increase of 43 percent from July 1979 to July 1980. Even with fare increases that became effective July 1, Chapel Hill's bus pass at \$72 per year compares favorably with Raleigh's \$150 pass and \$216 in Charlotte.

The biggest improvement will come around Oct. 1, when 16 new buses will be delivered. These buses, at a total cost of \$2 million, finally will end the headache of broken-down buses as the 16 old models are retired. To get Chapel Hill through the final five-week stretch until the new buses arrive, the City of Charlotte has loaned Chapel Hill two buses to meet the expected heavy ridership.

The probable reasons for the ridership increases include the high cost of operating a private car, a more convenient transit service and greater public consciousness about energy use and traffic congestion. Many predicted that the recent fare increase would cause ridership to fall off, but July's 43 percent increase—the largest monthly increase in the history of the system—seems to indicate riders' need for better service.

Much of the revenue from increased fares has been used to increase service. Weekday bus service has been expanded by 11 percent since last fall.

Other alternatives to the private car are sprouting as well. Chapel Hill voters approved a bikeways system in a 1976 referendum, and several miles of bike paths have been built in the last 18 months. Carrboro voters

approved bikeways in 1978, and construction on a system to connect Jones Ferry Road with Cameron Avenue and the campus should begin in October.

Federal officials ranked the Chapel Hill-Carrboro bikeways system so highly that Carrboro received one-fourth of all the federal bikeways construction money allocated to five southeastern states for this year. New sidewalks are also under construction in Carrboro, and North Greensboro Street is finally being made safe for bicyclists.

Trying to discourage private automobile use is a difficult task. Reversing 30 years of increasing car use hasn't been easy, but steadily increasing support from University, state and local officials and commitment from Chapel Hill and Carrboro leaders has been gratifying for proponents of public transportation. It's good to see so many people on bicycles, on buses, carpooling and walking nowadays, and it's good to see big trees still standing on Chapel Hill's two-lane roads instead of acres of ugly parking decks.

Gerry Cohen is a member of the Chapel Hill Transportation Board.

The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant Managing Editors: Edwina Ralston, John Royster, Amy Sharpe
Distribution Manager: Terry Cameron

Editorial Assistants: Buddy Burniske, Lynn Casey, William Durham
News Desk: Ted Avery, Lucy Hood, Lou Ann Jones, Katherine Long, Ann Peters, Rochelle Riley and Betsy Simmons; James Alexander, assistant Weekender editor.
News: Mark Ancona, Harry Archer, Ted Avery, Stephanie Bircher, RoAnn Bishop, Jeff Bowers, Elizabeth Daniel, Kelly DeRochi, Angie Dorman, Lee Dunbar, Natalie Eason, Debbie Goodson, Karen Hayward, Charles Herndon, Deborah Hirsch, David Jarrett, Dale Jenkins, Karen Komegay, Susan Mauney, Mike McFarland, Rachel Perry, Bill Paschel, Jonathan Rich, Rochelle Riley, Betsy Simmons, Ann Smallwood, Lindsey Taylor, David Teague and Frank Wells; Claire Wilson, Campus Calendar editor.
Sports: David Poole, assistant editor; Clifton Barnes, Norman Cannada, John Drescher, John Fish, Chip Karnes, Gary Mangum, Geoffrey Mock, Scott Peterson, Linda Robertson and Mark Taylor.
Features: Susan Pruitt Luce, Mary McKenna, Joe Morris, Lori Morrison, Ann Peters and Diane Veto.
Arts: Tom Moore, assistant editor; Jordan Hawley, Tim Pope and Bob Royalty.
Graphic Arts: Dan Brady, Greg Calibey, Bob Fulghum and Danny Harrell, artists; Matt Cooper, Jay Hyman and Charles Vernon, photographers.
Business: Mark Kadine, business manager; Linda A. Cooper, secretary/receptionist; Karen Howell, classifieds manager, Sally Cook, accountant.
Advertising: Jeff Glance, Steve Jolly, Julia Kim, David Parker and Joey Holliman.
Composition: UNC Printing Department.
Printing: Hinton Press Inc. of Mebane.