

GEORGE SHADROUT, Editor

DIMITA JAMES, Managing Editor
BRAD KUTROW, Associate Editor
THOMAS JESSIMAN, Associate EditorKAREN ROWLEY, News Editor
PAM KELLEY, University Editor
MARSHA WAGGONER, City Editor
JIM HUMMEL, State and National EditorBILL 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

Bad—and good news

Discouraged and rudely surprised perhaps sum up the reaction of various administrators and faculty within the UNC school system when they learned this year's results of the nursing licensing exam. While Carolina, UNC-Greensboro and other schools maintained their traditionally strong showings, three black schools did not fare as well.

Winston-Salem State University, North Carolina Central University in Durham and North Carolina A & T in Greensboro not only did not improve their percentage of passing students, which historically has been low, but they actually showed a decrease that dropped two of the schools below a 20 percent passing rate. This is bad news for all concerned. With UNC wrapped up in a dispute with the federal government, such figures are not likely to sit well with Washington officials who frown at UNC's state's-rights claim. And with the UNC Board of Governors threatening to shut down the black nursing schools should scores not increase substantially and soon, faculty and administrators of the black schools probably feel their chairs warming up a bit as well. But overreaction will not shed any light on the inability of the three schools to raise their scores.

Lack of money and modern facilities at the black schools—deficiencies cited by HEW officials more than a year ago—may well be part of the nursing school's decline, but other factors must be considered. For example, NCCU has improvised a more stringent program for its students, but the results of these efforts cannot be gauged until the 1981 class takes the exam. In addition to these changes, NCCU has a building under construction that should offset facility inadequacies.

A & T and WSSU also have made substantial improvements, including strengthened curriculums and faculty and tougher admission standards. Certainly, the low scores are partly vestiges of an antiquated system that has not had time to correct itself. One source blamed the quality of student as a possible explanation, and pointed out that the black schools get virtually the same amount of money per student as the other schools. Of course, until the schools improve their scores they will have difficulty attracting many of the best students, black or white; thus the vicious cycle continues.

Patience, persistence and priorities seem the answers for these seemingly sinking programs. UNC must continue to support the schools by giving recent improvements time to take effect. Faculty and administrators must continue to upgrade programs as time and money allow. Obviously, one is contingent on the other. If, in the next few years, the schools are unable to boast substantial improvement, then a restructuring of priorities and the phasing out of certain programs might be in order. But we hope—and expect—that such action will be unnecessary.

Congress and jellyfish

A federal commission asked by Congress to figure out just what's wrong with the U.S. government has delivered itself of a verdict—and shoved the blame straight back at Congress.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations chastized Congress for acting as a "municipal and county council almost as often as it acts as a national deliberative body." The commission, composed of representatives of Congress, the executive branch and state and local governments, scolded Congress for dabbling too often in other governmental bodies' business.

The commission began its work in 1976, and took four years to reach the remarkable conclusion that the federal government consistently sticks its nose in where it doesn't belong. It cited as examples of unwarranted federal intervention measures introduced in Congress to repair local highway potholes and control jellyfish. If Congress had bothered to ask, say, the Yaupon Beach Town Council, they would've found out that nothing can control a jellyfish, not even the jellyfish itself. The things just drift aimlessly, a lot like Congress.

As remedies, the commission recommended that federal, state and local officials straighten out the complicated process of obtaining grants, instill greater discipline in Congress and strengthen political parties. It stopped short of suggesting that we simply turn the rascals out.

Sadly, the commission did not address the question of municipal and county governments that take on national issues. That will likely take another commission—and another four years.

The Bottom Line

Kid poll

Jimmy Carter's re-election campaign got a resounding vote of confidence from a recent poll. According to the poll, Carter would be the landslide presidential choice at this time, receiving as much as 82 percent of the electorate's vote, while Ronald Reagan could do no better than 11 percent, and independent candidate John Anderson would figure in with such sentimental favorite write-in choices as Tweety Bird and the Road Runner.

Unfortunately for Carter, the supporters uncovered by this poll won't be able to vote this year, or for that matter, in this decade.

The poll involved a group of more than 300 first-, second- and third-grade students in Chicago, New York, Baltimore and California. Jack Goldenberg, an advertising executive from Evanston, Ill., conducted the poll as he traveled around the country. This is his third presidential poll of grade-schoolers, which he jokingly claims is "50 percent accurate."

The children backed Carter in 1976, but chose George McGovern over Richard Nixon in 1972. Twenty-third, a front-runner in past polls, received very few votes this time, while "Mommy,"

"Teacher" and "God" all found solid support. Goldenberg told the Associated Press that he was impressed with the children's honesty and candor more than anything else. "They're not politicians yet," he said. "They haven't learned the lies we all tell as part of every day life."

Along with his poll-taking duties, Goldenberg also records some of the more astute political observations of these candid constituents. Some of the more memorable include:

"Ronald Reagan got his start on *The Electric Company*."

"My dad says that Brother Billy is President Carter's biggest ability."

"Watergate was a bridge that caught Nixon and Kennedy."

"President Carter should be re-elected because then he wouldn't have to change his name."

"The president's job is to run things around Congress."

"Henry Kissinger was an emperor." "Mommy should be elected president because she likes a big place with plumbing service."

Our young observers may not be of age to vote, but their logic and perceptions sometimes seem beyond years.

And that's the bottom line.

Racism: simply a matter of convenience

By MATT COOPER

It seems to me that I've been discussing race problems ever since I was able to walk and talk. In playgrounds and sand lots we were always talking about "us guys" and "them guys." This was before we learned all the names for all the people we didn't like, or weren't supposed to like, from our parents. I always, always seemed to find myself in the middle of the name-calling or wrestling matches.

Maybe the reason for this was because I am one of them. You know—a darkie, lazy and shiftless. The kind of guy you think is all right as long as he stays away from your sister. A nigger.

I've lived with these labels and more. Now, though, since I've entered the University, things have changed. At least that's what all my liberal acquaintances tell me.

I won't argue with them. I enjoy listening to them tell each other how far blacks have come, how many doors have opened and how some black person who happens to be a very good friend of theirs is making it big in the

world. Then the discussions end and everyone sits around smiling at each other, with me smiling with them.

Let's be more realistic. I can understand how one might be unaware of the more subtle aspects of bigotry or racism or prejudice that exist here as well as in the real world. Things like an averted gaze or a cold hard stare are easily overlooked unless one has the paranoia that comes from a lifetime of such experiences. Yet how can one not hear the shouted obscenities leveled at me as I walk down a crowded street? How can one see and not question the way blacks totally separate themselves from whites on campus?

There is no way to ignore the writing on the walls, bathroom walls that is: "Why are niggers so dumb?" "Why are crackers so white?"

We can pass laws and make amendments until our fingers cramp from the effort and the hate will still be there. We can sing "We Shall Overcome" until we're blue in the face and nothing will change. We can recognize the fact that, according to our rules, everyone who suffers from the disease called bigotry is insane.

About the only thing we can do about this situation is to recognize that it exists. Then, maybe we can

ponder the reasons for its existence.

I have an answer myself. I think that everybody needs somebody to hate sometime. Scapegoats. Something convenient upon which to place the blame for things we cannot easily understand. If you have a group that looks a bit different from the majority of the people, or if you have a group of people who have been kicking you in the face and keeping you down for a long time, then you have plenty of people to blame for your own shortcomings.

If there is a problem with unemployment, then it has got to be because the government is giving all the jobs to the blacks. If you got cut from the team, it must mean that the coach is prejudiced—no matter that the guy who beat you out is bigger and faster than anyone else on the team. Convenience. That's what prejudice is all about.

All of this adds up to a pretty grim picture. The gloomiest aspect of it all is the fact that this stuff isn't taken from the past. This is today, and this is real.

Matt Cooper, a junior journalism major from Chapel Hill, is a staff photographer for The Daily Tar Heel.

Letters to the editor

Canady recommends Renwick for position

To the editor:

By creating a new vice chancellor for University Affairs this University has now put itself in a position from which it, at least partially, can fulfill its rhetorical commitment to the increased presence and enrollment of minority students.

The proposed position stems partly from a report, submitted jointly by Student Government and the Black Student Movement, presented to the chancellor's Committee on the Status of Minority and Disadvantaged Students. The university has stated in its solicitations for applicants to this position that the functions of the vice chancellor would be to "...report directly to the chancellor and advise and assist the chancellor on means for achieving increased minority presence and an improved environment for minority students and employees. This officer will also advise the chancellor on activities that will facilitate recruiting and retention of minority students and employees." The functions outlined by the University are consistent with the original recommendations made by Student Government and the BSM.

One can easily infer from the statements published by the University and the involved student organizations that the quintessential purpose of this new position will be to serve as a support service for minority students. Although this is a noble gesture on the part of the University, the creation of a vice chancellor for University Affairs does by no means guarantee the fruition of the University's stated commitment to the improvement of minority status on this campus.

To ensure that this position is truly effective in attaining the stated aims it is imperative that a person whose full commitment to minority presence is beyond question be selected.

Hayden B. Renwick, associate dean in the College of Arts and Sciences, is such a man. His record during the last three years is witness to his commitment toward minority students.

Largely due to his well-publicized efforts in 1977, the enrollment of minority freshmen in 1978 leaped by 35 percent over the enrollment of minority freshmen during the preceding year. This serves as an accurate indicator of his ability to create positive gains for minority students at this University and, similarly, across the state.



Renwick has long stood on this campus as an advocate of minority students and he most certainly was an influencing factor in the creation of the new vice chancellor position. His only sin has been to speak the truth and speak it loudly.

As vice chancellor, Hayden Renwick would have the capacity to enable this University to finally offer to the people of the state of North Carolina, and indeed the entire nation, tangible evidence that UNC is now prepared to fulfill the promises that have remained hollow for more than a decade.

Mark H. Canady, chairperson
Black Student Movement

Zeta Psi

To the editor:

Regarding your editorial, "The Zeta Psi" DTH, Sept. 9: it would seem to me that the answer to the Duke sorority complaint of insufficient punishment for those concerned is quite simple. As any attorney could advise, assault

can be defined as putting another individual or individuals in fear, this has obviously happened, in addition to attempted rape.

These are criminal offenses.

If members of that sorority want the offenders punished they have but to go to the nearest police station and swear out a warrant for a series of "John Does."

Why this University, of which I am an alumnus, has not expelled those involved is beyond me. The actions involved were clearly criminal in nature, and whether those involved have been indicted should have no bearing on the case.

Pat Fletcher
Chapel Hill

Open debates

To the editor:

I agree with your editorial, "Percentages and polls," (DTH, Sept. 10), that the League of Women Voters would have been better off to judge for itself whether Anderson merited inclusion in their debate. Rather than "only two-thirds of a debate to offer," the League may offer only half a debate. Ed Clark, the Libertarian candidate for president, is being excluded, even though he is already on the ballot in 46 states and expects to be on the ballot in all 50 states; thus, there are four candidates with a theoretical chance of winning. Ed Clark's limited government and free market ideas contrast sharply with the other candidates' ideas. Americans should have a chance to hear from Ed Clark, an eloquent spokesman for individual liberty.

Philip Fransiole Busby Jr.
Chapel Hill

American Mideast policy needs revision

By GEOFFREY MOCK

One of the most remarkable aspects of the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and the revolution in Iran is that no fundamental re-evaluation of American policy toward the Middle East has taken place. Obviously something is very wrong with U.S. strategy and needs to be corrected.

A policy re-evaluation is vital because our problems in the Middle East are far from over. Immediate attention is focused upon the hostages in Iran, but far more is at stake in Iran's neighbor Saudi Arabia.

American leaders have talked of taking steps to protect Saudi Arabia from Soviet threat, but it is becoming probable that within three years, the United States will not be receiving a drop of oil from Saudi Arabia. This will come about not because of Soviet adventurism, but because of American miscalculation. We would find ourselves far less capable of reacting than we were during the 1970 embargo.

The problems Saudi King Khalid faces resemble those faced by the shah a few years ago. Both rulers saw oil profits as a means to build a modern industrial nation from a conservative Islamic heritage. Perhaps no nation has ever evolved as rapidly politically, economically and socially as these two nations. That the shah didn't succeed may simply be due to the rapidity of the change, but it does echo the most disturbing question before Khalid: Is industrialization incompatible with Islamic culture?

Another disturbing matter is America's reaction to these problems. As we did in Iran, we are almost totally ignoring the political and religious forces in Saudi Arabia, and concentrating on meeting the Soviet challenge.

Despite Afghanistan, anti-communism is irrelevant in the Middle East. The history of the region is not of Russian domination, but of western colonialism. As in much of the Third World, this history colors the perception of the future. As real as the Soviet threat may seem to us, the Arabs fear it less than they fear a repeat of their past.

Khalid's stance is anti-communist, and his rule leans toward the west, but he is worried about the religious fundamentalism and political nationalism that shake his regime.

And well he should. In December, religious fanatics seized the Grand Mosque which was retaken only with heavy bloodshed. A few months later, Khalid collapsed with a mild heart attack. These two events sent shock

waves throughout the Arab world—as they should have in America as well.

The Saudi government reacted fast. They promised certain reforms ranging from a new consultative council to crackdowns on the corruption that pervades the bureaucracy and the extravagant lifestyle of the ruling family.

The Saudi government also faces severe economic problems, resulting from the influx of many foreign workers and the dislocation caused by migration to the cities from the poorer rural areas.

In May the ruling family promised to phase out all foreign workers in five years, while solving the uneven distribution of wealth with an ambitious five-year plan calling for a more diversified economy and increased aid to agricultural workers.

America must encourage Khalid to form a line of stability outside the army. The first step should be to slow down the pace of modernization.

These actions helped the government, but they may not have been enough. The five-year plan merely intensified the nation's industrialization process, and made only moderate allowances for Islamic needs. Yet Khalid is determined not to change course.

A Saudi official said the nation would achieve industrialization without being overwhelmed with western influences. A more skeptical western diplomat called the Saudi attempt "one of the great social crapschots in history."

Of course, the American stake in this gamble is oil. Unlike gold and other natural resources, oil requires a complex power structure to get it to market. The Arab oil is not being produced by individual enterprisers, but by the government. No stable government, no oil.

Unfortunately, few regions in the world are less suited to a complex government than the Middle East. Tribal bonds continue to be strong, and religious differences among the Muslims have on occasion threatened to break out into open war.

Currently, the Saudis are having difficulty with the Shi'ite religious minority which resides in the oil-producing lands of Eastern Saudi Arabia. One can easily sympathize with the Saudi government. History is full of nations struggling with sub-nationalist groups as they enter the modern era.

The Carter Administration has resurrected a variation of the Nixon Doctrine with regard to Saudi Arabia. Announced in 1969, the Nixon Doctrine

extended aid to our friends who were faced with external and internal threats. It referred to Indochina, but was given its fullest application with the shah.

The doctrine justified the massive arms aid given the shah based on the dubious assumption that a strong army would stifle internal dissent. In fact, American military aid has never acted as a stabilizing influence anywhere. In Iran, the only purpose it served was to make the U.S. government overconfident that when the time of decision came, the powerful army would throw in with a stable government friendly to America. This belief shows how seriously the United States miscalculated the nature of the shah's problems.

The shah's collapse should have dragged down the Nixon Doctrine with him. Instead, America began to base the stability of the Saudi government on its army, equipped with American weapons. One wonders whether this is really helping our friends. The same Islamic militancy that appeared in the Iranian army is present in the Saudi.

America must encourage Khalid to form a line of stability outside the army. The first step should be to slow down the pace of modernization. The Saudi government has been pressured to reduce the amount of oil it is producing and we should encourage this step, though it might create some short term problems for us.

A second step should be immediate aid to the underdeveloped Saudi agricultural program. One of the major complaints against Khalid is that he has developed the cities while ignoring the rural areas. A stronger agricultural base will relieve the pressure on the cities and provide a stronger, more diversified economy.

But most important, America must accelerate tenfold its own energy program. Seven years after the embargo, we are as heavily dependent on Arab oil as ever, particularly Saudi oil. The Saudis are finding that oil brings dislocations as well as riches, and American energy independence would perhaps free Khalid to initiate vital reforms.

Unfortunately, energy independence seems years away. Nobody knows what direction Saudi Arabia will take, but it's hard not to be pessimistic. The trend toward chaos in the Third World may only be short-term, but it comes at a time when the United States is vulnerable, and at a combustible location. The solutions can come only from an immediate shift of American objectives and strategies.

Geoffrey Mock, a junior political science and history major from Baltimore, Md., is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.