

JIM HUMMEL, Editor

SUSAN MAUNEY, Managing Editor
JONATHAN RICH, Associate Editor
JOHN DRESCHER, Associate EditorEDWINA RALSTON, University Editor
JOHN ROYSTER, City Editor
CHARLES HERNDON, State and National Editor
BETH BURRELL, News Editor
CLIFTON BARNES, Sports EditorTOM MOORE, Arts Editor
KEITH KING, Features Editor
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor
ANN PETERS, Spotlight Editor
CHUCK JAMES, Ombudsman

The Daily Tar Heel

89th year of editorial freedom

Continued commitment

Monday was University Day, the 188th anniversary of the laying of Old East's cornerstone and the foundation of the University. To many, the day simply commemorates the founding of the first and perhaps one of the best state universities in the nation. Yet in addition to the elaborate pomp and ceremony associated with the event, the occasion should also provide a time for candid evaluation and criticism, and for recognition of what has been gained and what needs to be achieved.

The University has much for which it can be proud and thankful. In a period when most universities are suffering from declining numbers of applications, UNC has been able to maintain its high entrance standards. While most of the nation's colleges struggle to cope with declining funds and resources, the University is still expanding its educational, residence and sports facilities.

Many of the University's academic departments continue to rank among the top in the country. Despite the recognition accorded to individual departments and professors, UNC generally maintains a healthy balance between research and teaching.

University Day also marked the first anniversary of the chancellorship of Christopher Fordham, who was welcomed as a man who would place priority on the long-standing problems of recruitment and tenure for minority and women faculty. Paradoxically, it is in these areas that the University deserves the most praise and censure.

With the establishment of a full-time affirmative action officer and a black vice chancellor for University Affairs, the University has adopted a more comprehensive approach to the recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty. Meanwhile, this year's freshmen class, which is 14 percent black, speaks well of the administration's recent efforts at recruitment. Increased enrollment is the primary requisite for healthy black involvement in all aspects of the University community.

These positive developments, however do not excuse the embarrassingly low percentage of women and minority faculty. Of 1,887 UNC professors, only 57 (3 percent) are black, while only 19 percent are women. Although a low pool of qualified minority applicants presents inescapable limitations, the University can and should require a more aggressive recruiting policy for all departments. The University must also review its tenure policy formally and determine why so few blacks or women are ever tenured and why their retention rate is so low.

In his University Day address, Raymond Dawson, vice-president of academic affairs for the UNC system, criticized the federal government and civil rights leaders for attempting to impose orthodox solutions on UNC's complex segregation problem. Now that the University system has signed a non-binding consent decree it is up to the University and to the entire system to prove that it can be trusted to confront those problems actively that still mar the quality of higher education in North Carolina.

Who's in control?

Over the past few years, Student Government officials have rallied behind the basic concept of student self-governance. While serving as administrators of the student fees, they have watched carefully for hints of attempted control by the administration.

When Student Body President Scott Norberg attempted to borrow student fee money to pay for an LSAT counseling program he wanted to take, the action raised questions of who should have ultimate authority in the interpretation of the Treasury Laws which govern the way student fee money can be spent.

On Sept. 25, Norberg requisitioned \$175 from the executive branch discretionary fund, traditionally allocated for emergency use by other organizations. Because Norberg did not know if the requisition was in accordance with the Treasury Laws, he and Student Body Treasurer Rochelle Tucker sent the form to the Student Activities Fund Office.

But Director Frances Sparrow, also unsure about the request, called Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance John Temple who advised her not to authorize the money. Sparrow rejected the requisition based on a clause in the Treasury Laws that prohibits "expenditures which result in a tangible gain for any individual."

Norberg's reluctance to scrutinize the laws resulted in the administration's involvement in the student-run system. The SAFO was established in 1933 by the chancellor to handle financial transactions for all student organizations. Today, Student Government organizations account for about 30 percent of SAFO's operation.

An audit board was established in 1934 to have authority over the SAFO. Comprised of student and faculty members, the board technically serves as the ultimate authority when questions about the Treasury Laws arise. But lack of clarity in the definition of its role has contributed to a certain ineffectiveness of the board. Meeting only periodically, the board cannot address the daily questions of interpretation.

Clearly, the responsibility lies with the officials in Student Government. If students want to continue the role as guardian of student fees, they must define who has the authority in the interpretation of the laws. When questions arise, student officials should meet to discuss the problem and not pass the responsibility to SAFO or to the administration.

A thorough knowledge of their own laws could well be a major step in students' efforts to remain autonomous from the administration.

The Bottom Line

Mistaken Identities

Have you become wary of giving out your phone number to just anybody and everybody? Especially if you have ever received an anonymous call from a midnight prankster in a phone booth, uttering some rude comment or breathing heavily into the phone.

Well if you have, you are not the only one who is fed up with anonymous, inconsiderate phone calls. So is a Libertyville, Ill. couple — Norman and Marilyn White — who have filed a \$250,000 suit because of it.

The suit is against an Australian rock group AC-DC, whose latest album, "Dirty Deeds Done Dirt Cheap," initiated the entire situation.

The group's song, about a con-

tract killer, contains the lyrics:

"Pick up the phone. I'm always home. Call me any time. Just dial 36-34-36. Hey, I lead a life of crime."

Rock fans, who hear the "hey" as eight, have translated the number into the Whites' phone number. As a result, the Whites have received hundreds of suggestive, threatening phone calls since the album's release in March.

The Whites have asked the court to order AC-DC to record another version of the song using a different phone number and to ban the current version from radio broadcast.

So for all you happy breathers out there, be wary of long distance lines to Illinois. It could cost you \$250,000 instead of 20 cents.

And that's the bottom line.

Economic aid should be high U.S. priority

By DAVE McSPADDEN

As an intern working for Sen. Lowell Weicker, R-Conn., I recently had the opportunity to review a copy of President Ronald Reagan's budget cuts. Although the budget cuts are complex and involve all facets of American life, of particular interest to me was Reagan's foreign assistance recommendations. These are the cuts that possibly will have the longest-lasting effect on this nation.

Contributions were cut by \$137,955,666 to the Inter-American Development Bank; by \$56,464,687 to the Asian Development Bank; by \$17,986,678 to the African Development Bank; and by \$38,300,000 to the Peace Corps. The list goes on.

The general text of this proposal reveals two fundamental aspects that now dominate the Reagan administration's foreign policy. First is the administration's belief that we live in a "jungle which threatens to claim this clearing we call civilization," as the president said in his speech to the International Association of Chiefs of Police. This is not a notion that pertains solely to domestic problems. Second, to keep back the jungle, the administration plans to rely most heavily on military assistance.

The notion that the world is a jungle is a precarious idea in itself. It is the same reasoning that President Lyndon B. Johnson used in his administration — an era that saw a drastic increase in

	Jan. 1982 request	Sept. 1982 request	Change
Military assistance	33.50 billion	63.50 billion	+ 30.00 billion
International military assistance and training	35.69 billion	41.98 billion	+ 6.29 billion
Economic support	2.43 billion	2.55 billion	+ .12 billion
Contributions to International Bank for reconstruction and development	.71 billion	.16 billion	- 2.55 billion
Contributions to the International Development Association	1.08 billion	.82 billion	- .26 billion

America's involvement in Vietnam.

However, beyond that question of whether the world is a jungle, exactly what should our foreign policy be? A colleague of mine recently said: "Instead of attempting to figure elaborate new policies, why not go back through history and simply discard those policies which have obviously failed."

For the past 40 years, the United States has had one basic foreign policy. It has come under an assortment of different names. However, fundamentally it has never changed: arm our allies to prevent the spread of communism. The results of this policy have been communists in Cuba, Afghanistan and Vietnam, and

regimes favorable to the Soviets in Ethiopia, Libya, Nicaragua, Syria, South Yemen and Angola. Under this policy the United States has also lost a strong ally in Iran, and is on the verge of possibly losing others in El Salvador, Turkey, Namibia and Egypt.

This is not a very good track record. It leads one to question the reasoning that can justify embarking on this course once again.

Third World nations have made economic and developmental assistance their single greatest priority for over 15 years. The people of Pakistan, India, El Salvador, Somalia, Ethiopia, Cambodia and Columbia do not care about an East-West

conflict. They are worried about growth, survival and development. Whoever gives them the means to do so will be favored.

One reason Cuban dictator Fidel Castro has been so successful is the fact that under his regime the nation has had a steady growth in the standard of living, something they did not have under the U.S. supported government of former ruler Batista.

If the United States is truly determined to undermine the spread of communism, then it must work with developing nations by satisfying their wants and needs. The policy will be much more difficult to formulate because each individual nation has its own set of problems.

President Reagan has spent the past eight months attempting to convince both the United States and foreign nations alike that our new relations with South Africa will not change U.S. policy toward the rest of Africa. Chester A. Crocker, assistant secretary of state, has said many times that we will continue to keep the needs of all of Africa foremost in our minds. Yet, the administration in its budget request has cut our contribution of \$17,986,678 to the African Development Bank by \$17,986,678.

Balancing the budget? Maybe. But it is hard to justify to Americans, or any African nation, cutting the budget when you have increased military assistance by \$30 million.

Maybe it is a jungle out there. But if it isn't, we're sure making it into one.

Dave McSpadden is a junior political science major from McLean, Va.

Letters to the editor

The Soviets are coming — or are they?

To the editor:

Several things need to be cleared up concerning both my column ("Soviet Union hopes for world domination," DTH, Oct. 1) and Ashley Burnham's response ("Soviet menace, invasion a far-fetched threat," DTH, Oct. 7). Burnham obviously didn't read my column too thoroughly, but for that, I must blame the DTH itself.

My column was heavily edited and the last paragraph or two was completely deleted, destroying much of the purpose of the article. Facts and figures can indeed be twisted around to support any view, as Burnham pointed out and then proceeded to illustrate quite nicely himself. Without my last two paragraphs, the preceding information meant little.

Unfortunately, after I gave the DTH some additional information corroborating my sources and offering any other help they might need — and in addition, was told that I would be contacted if there were any problems — the DTH chose to print my column as they saw fit. I understand the problems involved in editing as I have worked on a newspaper before, but I feel the job done by the DTH was unprofessional. The memo from one of the editors I found attached to my column insinuating that I was a "neo-conservative," and that the DTH was publishing my column only because of its seriousness was definitely not professional.

The column was meant to say three basic things: (1) The Soviet Union intends eventual world domination; (2) They are willing to risk nuclear war to achieve that goal; and (3) The Soviet Union has or very soon will have the capabilities to win a nuclear war. The part of my article that was edited out was crucial to the entire argument because it showed how a nuclear war could be won by the Soviets.

As for Burnham's response, most of it I would have to define as nitpicking, "(wasted) time arguing over meaningless points of pure opinion." Russia's Central Asian forces also participated in the invasion of Afghanistan. Eighty thousand aircraft carriers may be formidable for conventional warfare but they are sitting ducks in nuclear war. True, the Soviet Navy is relatively defenseless to

American missile technology, but its attack potential is awesome. As for anything Al Haig may say, he merely threatens; the Soviets promise.

I could go on forever, as could Burnham, I imagine. But before anyone else decides to jump in to defend the Soviets, remember who it is you are defending — a ruthless mob of murderers, not the poor Russian peasants who are the worst victims of all this. They need the defense more than anyone.

Mark Langston
217 Teague

More Soviet propaganda?

To the editor:

The superficial thinking displayed by Mark Langston in "Soviet Union hopes for world domination," (DTH, Oct. 1),

carries little credibility and the column deserves consideration only by nature of its dangerous emotion-laden reasoning. Langston commits errors of fact, draws statements out of context, makes distorted exaggerations and ignores data that runs counter to his anti-Soviet sentiments.

To say that the Soviet Union has violated "almost every treaty ever signed" has no basis in fact. To claim that the Soviets have killed millions of people is true, but 50 million is a farcical exaggeration. And to assert that the USSR has dramatically increased military spending, while the United States "... has been trying desperately to achieve arms control, even to the point of unilaterally reducing its number of sophisticated weapons ..." has no relation to the reality of the Reagan administration's defense budget.

Langston is ignorant of basic Russian

military history, namely that Russia, from the czars to the Soviets, has generally armed itself with far more weapons than necessary to compensate for inferior technology and to defend immense borders.

Nikita Khrushchev once stated that the socialist economic system was superior to that of capitalism. He claimed that history would prove this fact, and that socialism would "bury" capitalism in the marketplace. How convenient for Langston to use Khrushchev's words in a military context.

Langston and others like him need to view history more maturely, with less emotion and more objectivity. It is far wiser to hold one's tongue than to speak on a subject about which he knows next to nothing.

David M. Poole
Chapel Hill



Dormspeak brings colorful language to Carolina

By RANDY WALKER

When I first moved into the dorm, I didn't know Dormspeak. I talked in regular English. I said things like "Turn up the stereo" and "Let's get some food." I called a car a car, a beer a beer, and a girl a girl.

Man, I was dumb.

They laughed at me, or worse, didn't understand what I was saying. But I caught on quick. In order to communicate, I had to. I became a master of a subdialect of Carolina English I call Dormspeak. It's a vital, constantly evolving language, remarkably precise, sometimes bizarre and always colorful.

Here is a preliminary glossary of Dormspeak. Some usages may be restricted to my particular dorm. Others, I believe, are universal among Carolina students. Let's start with a few simple definitions before moving on to more difficult words:

score, v. to acquire something. "Leon scored a six of Red White and Blue."

crash, v. to go to sleep.

z, v. to sleep. "Head's been z-in' for 14 hours." When you crash, you "hop on the Z-train."

book, v. to study. Someone who studies all the time is a "booking phenom." (Often a Chem major.)

quiz, n., v. any graded performance in class. Whether it's a weekly French test or a cumulative Organic Chemistry final, you call it a quiz.

slide, n. an easy class. Botany 10 is a well-known slide.

whack, v. to waste time. Often you whack when you should be booking for a quiz.

cruise, ride, v. nobody drives in cars, they cruise in rides.

cool out, ease up, v. to calm down. "Hey man, cool out and do a 'Lude (take a Quaalude)."

multiple, adj. most often used in "multiple bong hits."

get into, v. rapidly becoming archaic. Sometimes still heard with "action": "Can you get into some Frisbee action?"

Okay, those were easy enough. Now for some terms with more subtle meanings:

major, **mega**, **maxi**, **massive**, **intense**, **awesome**, **ultra**, **big-time**, **quality**, **to the max**, **adj.** Mega, maxi and massive generally refer to a quantity of something, the rest to a degree of intensity, but as with any language, usage determines correctness.

small-time, v., **adj.** opposite of intense, awesome, etc. If you hang around the dorm whacking on Friday night, you are small-time, you are a small-timer, and you are small-timing it.

babbe, n. replaces the archaic "chick." In general, any girl (not your mother). Specifically, your girlfriend.

blow off, **blow away**, v. The same concept, but on different scales. If you skip a Chem quiz, you are blowing it off. If your babe tells you it's over, she is blowing you away.

bag, n., v. Nothing like the '60s word meaning "your own thing." Today, it's a verb similar to "blow off." "I'm bagging that Econ 41 class." At my dorm it also refers to fraternities (from "baggers"). "Leon's living in the Pi Lam bag on Bag Row (Fraternity Court)." As a verb, it means to join a fraternity: "He's bagging it next semester." A third possibility: When the sun is out, you can "bag some quality rays."

jam, **crank**, n., v. You never turn up a stereo, you crank the jam. As a noun, "jam" can mean the actual stereo itself — "He sold his jam" — or the music being played; "Change the jam." The verb refers to intense partying: "They were jamming at the Chi Psi bag last night."

jack up, v. refers generally to physical aggression. "Leon jacked him up big-time."

ass, n. When combined with a possessive pronoun, it yields a personal pronoun. Thus, "your ass" equals "you," "my ass" equals "me," etc.

kick ass, v., **adj.** Often the same as "jack up" it can also refer to doing something powerful. "Carolina kicked ass last Saturday." As an adjective: "He's a kick-ass bass player."

trash, v. If Leon kicks somebody's ass, he "trashes" him. Someone who is really drunk is "trashed to the max." Also: "Leon got mad and trashed the TV room."

hit, n., v. It can mean a dose or measure-unit of some-

thing, usually something you ingest: beer hits, bong hits, spaghetti hits. As a verb: "We hit off the keg until it was spent."

carbo, n. carbohydrates, specifically rice of Macaroni and Cheese. If you cruise to Kroger and buy six 19 cent boxes of Avondale Macaroni and Cheese, you score maxi carbo hits.

do, v. The all-purpose verb, the only verb you ever really need. You can do carbo hits, do Quaaludes, do babes ...

Now for a word that reveals the full complexity and expressiveness of Dormspeak:

bad, **adj.** This word is so subtle, the shades of meaning so refined, it would take a separate article just to define it. However, maybe some examples will help:

A jacked-up '69 Charger with a 318 is bad.
Your father's 1980 Mazda is not.

Walking around in a leather coat, boxer shorts and pointy-toed cowboy boots is bad.

Walking around in khakis and an Izod is not.

However, just because a person lacks outward flash and style does not necessarily mean he is not bad. Take Dick Crum, for example. Not many people accuse him of being Mr. Excitement. But in his own laid-back, droning, yes, boring style, Dick Crum is the baddest of the bad.

Because of space limitations, I've had to leave out some favorite terms. But I think you've seen, Dormspeak is a true living language of the 20th century. If I didn't have to deal with the outside world, I could forget regular English and talk Dormspeak the rest of my life. The words of Dormspeak run from simple, vivid verbs and nouns to complex semantic paradoxes.

But enough of complex semantic paradoxes. I've been whacking to the max. I've already blown off booking for my German quiz. It's time to cool out. I just want to park my ride, do a massive carbo hit, hop on the Z-train and crash.

Randy Walker, a small-time junior journalism major from Richmond, Va., is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel when he isn't whacking.