

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, Weekend Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

Wary of empty promises

The search committee charged with finding a vice chancellor for University Affairs has an awesome responsibility. It must scan a pool of more than 40 applicants and select a person who could have great influence in determining the role of minority students on this campus for years to come.

The person finally selected will define, to a large degree, the capabilities and boundaries of this office. He or she will determine whether the office will enhance the situation of minorities on campus or simply maintain current inadequacies.

As one of a half dozen other vice chancellors in the administration who have direct ties to the chancellor and make up his "cabinet," he will be responsible for meeting with minority students and organizations and deciding how best to translate their needs and concerns into action. Most importantly then, he will have power. Instead of being a solitary figure shouting up at the third floor window of South Building from the steps below, he will be inside talking and dealing with the people who make policy for this University.

Among the administrative offices under the new vice chancellorship's jurisdiction will be financial aid and admissions. Perhaps more than any other offices, these two have the most direct impact on minority enrollment. The vice chancellor will have the power to intensify recruiting for minority students and perhaps could restructure the financial aid system so that Carolina can compete more successfully for talented black high schoolers.

One applicant for the vice chancellorship, Hayden B. Renwick, associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, risked his job three years ago when he revealed to the entire state that qualified blacks were being denied acceptance at UNC. He claimed the University was not fulfilling its obligation to enhance minority presence on this campus. In a community whose population is 7 percent black as opposed to a 25 percent state figure, where blatant segregation exists in dorms, fraternities and sororities whether by choice or not, Renwick's charges were greeted with all the enthusiasm of a child taking castor oil.

He was tagged a troublemaker who manipulated figures, yet he stood by his convictions. Few would deny that Renwick's actions forced the University to seriously re-evaluate its policies, and, as a result, two committees made recommendations to the chancellor that ultimately resulted in the formation of the new vice chancellorship.

Renwick now has applied for the position, and some believe the controversy he stirred three years ago will make his appointment unlikely. But if any man knows the needs of minorities, it is Renwick, and a bias against him because of his past controversial stands is unwarranted and unfair.

Another man who has worked for the creation of the office and is being considered for the job is Charles Daye, associate professor in the School of Law. Daye chaired the chancellor's committee that recommended an administrative structure of some kind for minorities. He has demonstrated a genuine commitment to addressing minority issues honestly and calmly. He has shown an ability to work within the hierarchy of the administration and at the same time has sought to make the vice chancellorship a vital and effective office.

Others are qualified for the spot and certainly we are not endorsing anyone here, but we are extremely concerned that the selection committee choose someone who will not settle into a new office and play the old games of big smiles and empty promises. There are those who say change comes slowly, that it takes time to change attitudes. Sure, and maybe by the year 2250 racism will no longer be around.

But the problems at Carolina cannot wait. The University has recognized the need for a vice chancellorship of this kind only after a great deal of sacrifice by dedicated people; we will not tolerate anything less than an office that lives up to the spirit of those responsible for its creation.

Lake stumbles in debate; Hunt fares well

By ANGIE DORMAN

Security was tight around Cates Auditorium at Meredith College. State Bureau of Investigation agents and highway patrolmen guarded every entrance and exit. The capital press corps had taken their front row seats while approximately 150 guests filled the auditorium.

A confident Gov. Jim Hunt arrived 15 minutes early, greeting guests and mingling with the press. He was flanked by an equally-confident staff.

Sen. I. Beverly Lake Jr. arrived just minutes before the cameras started rolling. He greeted few guests as he made his way to the podium on the left side of the auditorium.

This was to be Hunt's night. Republican gubernatorial candidate Lake hoped to gain support when he met Hunt in Monday night's debate, but when the hour was over, Lake had stumbled over questions from the panelists and had never gotten down to the real issues of the campaign.

Lake gave short answers to many of the panelists' questions and used his response time to direct questions to Hunt, after which he offered the remainder of his time to Hunt for him to "answer to North Carolinians."

Lake used another tactic. During his opening statement, Lake produced visual aids. He attacked Hunt's administration, calling it a political machine, and accused Hunt of making a "political payoff" to a company headed by state AFL-CIO President Wilber Hobby through two federal job-training contracts awarded by the state.

The State

Lake displayed a poster labeled "Hunt's Political Machine," showing pictures of Hunt, Hobby, Howard N. Lee, secretary of the Department of Natural Resources and Community Development and Lee's assistant, Eva Clayton.



Sen. I. Beverly Lake at debate Monday ...breaks out 'visuals' against Gov. Jim Hunt

Hunt interrupted Lake and told moderator Wally Ausley that he had understood the debate rules prohibited the use of props.

"My clear understanding is that we are up here responding to questions ourselves," Hunt said.

Ausley and Hunt requested that the props be removed. Lake continued to protest, saying he did not know until air time that the candidates could not use props.

Hunt made light of Lake's continuing focus on the posters Thursday during his weekly press conference.

"Maybe sometime there will be a show-and-tell debate and we can have a battle of the props," Hunt said, "like a

first-grade poster contest."

In a press conference Thursday, Lake said he was considering filing a suit against the debate sponsors, the N.C. Association of Broadcasters and the League of Women Voters because he was not allowed to use the props.

"Governor Hunt demonstrated his lack of integrity by claiming that I violated these rules," Lake said.

Lake first attacked Hunt's integrity during the debate when he accused Hunt of building a coalition with Hobby in 1976 and misusing CETA funds. Lake demanded that Hunt explain why he had done nothing to correct the abuse of CETA funds.

"You cannot hide the truth forever,"

Lake said.

Hunt quickly discerned Lake's tactics and ignored the questions Lake directed at him.

At one point during the debate, Lake alluded to a statement made by Hunt that the Panama Canal treaty was a great victory.

"I would like the governor to answer the question on the balance of my time," Lake said.

Some wondered what the Panama Canal issue had to do with a gubernatorial race in North Carolina. Hunt did not respond.

Angie Dorman, a senior journalism major from Dunn, is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

CGC meetings: an exercise in inefficiency

By KERRY DEROGHI

With strong purpose to resolve the doubts we have inherited from 150 years of formless growth, with resolute determination to preserve the best in our tradition of responsible student self-government, we assert our goals to preserve order, make personal freedom secure, establish justice and win a lasting opportunity for responsible individual and collective action; and to these ends we ordain and establish this Constitution for the Student Body of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

—Student Constitution of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as amended, May 15, 1976.

When the 62nd session of the Campus Governing Council convened Tuesday night, it was to begin discussion of this semester's business. It did. For three solid hours, the council debated old issues and brought up new concerns. During the session Tuesday, two review committees were established, six executive positions were filled and one member resigned. Impressive, Right? Wrong.

The inconsistency and irresponsibility that marked the CGC budget hearing last spring again were evident. When students were called upon to speak they were met with blank stares, nudges, giggles, averted heads and an unprepared council. Members' attention was periodically diverted from the business at hand by envoys sent on missions to the Union Coke machines. Credit for sheer concentration should be given to council member Eleanor Smith, who diligently did needlepoint throughout the meeting.

The council members did not reserve their poor manners for other students. The lack of respect for co-workers reached a level bordering on sheer insolence. When Tom Preston, District 6 representative and

Finance committee chairman for the summer CGC, attempted to explain an allotment of \$500 for additional shipping costs, he was met by the same yawns, jokes and bored faces. The decision on the bill? It was sent to the Student Affairs Committee for consideration.

Joe Kawalcysk of CGC District 5 was the next member of the council to summon courage to dissent. On a vote to endorse the proposed new athletic center, he and Student Body President Bob Saunders entered into an interesting debate on its costs and benefits. The benefits of the discussion? It gave District 1 representative Wayne Rackoff enough time to decide if he was really going to leave the meeting that time or just change seats again. The cost? It wasted 15 minutes of time for lack of attention, and the resolution was tabled for further discussion.

Locally

One very efficiently handled motion was an amendment to a bill proposed by Saunders concerning the Audit Board. Saunders pointed out that there was an "s" missing from his name.

Later in the meeting Brian Goray of District 19, who had been named chairman of the Rules and Judiciary Committee earlier in the meeting, announced that he would have to resign from the council. It appeared that Goray had moved out of his district and then discovered that he could not represent his former district. He said he might run Sept. 29 for election in District 17, a position formerly held by Rebekah Radisch. Radisch resigned her position this summer after quitting school, and when asked then by reporters which district she represented she replied that she did not know.

Goray has the same problem. He said he did not know anything about District 17 but had four roommates who would vote for him. Ironically, those four votes would give him a greater number than he had in last year's District 19 election, which he won with two write-in votes.

Although the antics of one meeting cannot be taken as definite indications of future behavior, Tuesday's was a clear reminder of last year's budget fiasco, which resulted in confusion and frustration for many student organizations. The budget was completed in April but the final budget was typed and made available to students only this month.

Now there is even evidence of a misappropriation of funds because of poor investigation by the CGC. WXYC station manager Glenn Mitchell had discovered extra money this summer in an account marked the Order of the X. He took the matter to the CGC, which declared the account illegal and transferred the \$254.61 in it to the summer activities fund. It was then spent on a party.

Three weeks later, the money was discovered to belong to a former station manager. Oops. The money will now have to be reallocated. All of this never would have happened if there had been time spent on an investigation into where the money came from.

Perhaps more frightening than the CGC's problems is the apathy of the student body that put these people in control. In last year's election, write-in, last-minute candidates won several positions, some of them won with two or three votes. If the apathy on campus has reached the point where not only does no one want to vote, but no one wants to run for office, then no one can blame the caliber of leadership that is allowed to take control.

Kerry DeRochi, a sophomore journalism major from Greensboro, covers Student Government for The Daily Tar Heel.

Limited nuclear warfare



By JONATHAN RICH

Politicians characteristically manipulate facts and issues to further their electoral goals. As the presidential race moves into high gear, Democratic candidate Jimmy Carter and Republican Ronald Reagan are playing political football with an old-time favorite, the question of U.S. military supremacy and national security.

At their convention in Detroit, the Republicans asserted that the United States under Carter has lost its military edge in the face of growing Russian power. Since then, Reagan repeatedly has promised to establish American superiority at all costs. The Carter administration now seeks to counter that charge by leaking news of a new nuclear strategy that would make possible a "limited" nuclear war, involving only specific U.S. and Soviet military targets.

At Large

Unfortunately, such falsehoods and half-truths cannot simply be ignored as political rhetoric of little consequence. The nature of the current debate holds too great a potential for escalating the arms race, the end of SALT and increasing the chances of nuclear war, limited or unlimited.

The fallacious notion of the United

Carter policy change politically inspired; concept could prompt first strike

States as No. 2 is based on a large buildup of Soviet arms in recent years, to the extent where in the mid-80s bigger and more accurate Soviet missiles will threaten the American land-based missile force. But this does not take into account the fact that even if a surprise attack destroyed those intercontinental ballistic missiles, the United States could retaliate with 3,000 submarine-based warheads (5,000, after the new tridents are at sea) and 800 warheads in the alert bomber force—not to mention the cruise missiles now being readied.

The United States, on its part, hardly has eased up on nuclear missile production. In January 1970, according to the Center for Defense Information, it had 4,000 strategic weapons. In June 1980 it had 10,000 strategic weapons and more than 30,000 warheads. By 1990, under present plans, including warheads to be placed in allied countries, the United States could cause 19,000 nuclear explosions in the Soviet Union. Conservative military sources estimate that only 100-200 explosions in key Russian cities are necessary to ensure deterrence.

But, the new strategists argue, an American president might hesitate to retaliate on Soviet cities merely because they have destroyed his missile force. This scenario is highly unlikely, particularly due to the split-second nature of nuclear war. As submarine-launched missiles could reach our mainland within 10 minutes, the president would not have time to determine where the missiles were

headed. He would order immediate retaliation, as would any Soviet leader if the situation were reversed. It is even more unlikely that the Russians would launch a "limited" attack on roughly 25 percent of U.S. warheads, knowing that we could retaliate by obliterating approximately 220 Soviet cities and 113 million of their citizens.

What, then, is the justification for a "limited" war strategy? The best administration theorists can come up with is the argument that because the Russians are moving toward a strategy focused on military targets, so must we in order to deter them. The official strategy of both superpowers until now has been one of mutually assured destruction, with the emphasis on striking major population and industrial centers.

The Carter administration has managed to place the onus of the new strategy squarely on the Russians. The facts, however, tell a different tale. Ever since Henry Kissinger and a group of Harvard scholars issued a report in 1957 suggesting that American strategy be based on limited nuclear war, the theory has figured in Pentagon strategic policy. During the Kennedy years, Robert McNamara flirted with it in the guise of "counterforce," and it was implemented firmly under Defense Secretary James Schlesinger in 1973.

Numerous American warheads already are aimed at Soviet military targets, and we now have the ability to undertake the precise, limited nuclear strikes called for in the new strategy. Trident and cruise missiles also will be highly suitable for precise targeting. If

anything, the United States has driven Russia to develop its own limited nuclear war capabilities.

Carter's announcement of a new nuclear policy is little more than an attempt to look strong against Republican criticism. Another purpose may well be to provide a more plausible rationale for the MX missile, which at an estimated \$34 billion is hard to justify even if it doesn't double or triple in cost.

By far the worst aspect of the administration's deception is that for the first time the idea of a "limited" nuclear war has been publicly acknowledged as an integral part of American military strategy. If the notion of nuclear war becomes acceptable, it becomes that much more probable. In the past, leaders have been deterred from pushing the nuclear button by the probability of reciprocal obliteration. With the new theory, leaders will be more tempted to deal with crisis situations by ordering a limited nuclear strike.

It can only be hoped that the nation's leaders and citizens will not fall for the delusion that a nuclear war can be "winnable" or restricted to military targets. There is no such thing as a neat and rational nuclear strike, and any strategy that encourages such assumptions has no place in American policy, or electoral politics, for that matter.

Jonathan Rich, a sophomore English and history major from San Juan, Puerto Rico, is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.