

Weather

Partly cloudy today and Thursday. Light winds variable with a high in the mid-50s and a low tonight in the mid-30s.

Copyright 1984 The Daily Tar Heel. All rights reserved.

Volume 91, Issue 138

Serving the students and the University community since 1893

Wednesday, February 22, 1984

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

News/Sports/Arts 962-0245
Business/Advertising 962-1163

The Daily Tar Heel

Jordan, Heels No. 1

UNC's basketball team has easily retained its No. 1 ranking in the AP and UPI polls this week, and guard Michael Jordan has been named ACC player of the week.

Parker defeats Exum in president's race

By DICK ANDERSON
Staff Writer

Paul Parker was elected student body president Tuesday, defeating James Exum by 615 votes amidst moderate student turnout.

According to unofficial runoff returns, Parker received 2,432 votes, or 57 percent, to Exum's 1,817 votes, or 42 percent.

"I don't know how to describe it," Parker said of his victory. "I'm very happy, and I want to thank everybody for what they've done. It's been a tremendous show of support."

"I expected a much lower voter turnout, and I think it just shows that people really believe Student Government can be turned around," he said. Twenty-one percent of the student body, 4,433 students, voted in Tuesday's runoff.

Parker attributed organization and "having the right answers" to his success in the election. He said he had worried that students wouldn't see the importance of turning out to vote in the runoff, given his 807-vote victory in the Feb. 14 election.

While the Parker camp was toasting victory with champagne, Exum supporters quietly shuffled through, offering hugs, handshakes and condolences to their candidate.

"Obviously, it wasn't the outcome we would have hoped for, but I feel we ran a very hard race," Exum said. He added that he felt he had made a "pretty good comeback" after trailing Parker by a wider margin in the first election.

"I congratulate Paul; Paul ran a very outstanding campaign," Exum said. "I wish him the best in restoring the students' faith in their government."

Exum said he would catch up on his academic work between now and Spring Break, but was uncertain as to his future in Suite C.

"I'm going to take some time for myself and enjoy Carolina a little bit —



UNC's new student body president, Paul Parker, rejoices over his victory Tuesday night. Parker defeated James Exum, 2,432 to 1,817 in Tuesday's runoff election.

something I haven't done in 2½ years," he said.

Parker said he would "work out" a position for Exum in his administration and that the position "would be up to James."

Vote tallies proved Exum had his greatest strength on South Campus, where he won handily in Morrison, James, Ehringhaus and Craige dormitories. But decisive Parker wins in North Campus strongholds including Cobb, McIver and Everett dormitories and Granville Towers iced the election.

Cheers resounded throughout the Parker celebration as Student Body President Kevin Monroe tossed Parker the keys to Suite C.

Earlier Tuesday evening, Monroe reflected on his past year in office and attacks during the campaign on the inefficiency of his administration.

"If you look back at what I said I was going to do last year, you'll find that I pretty much kept on track," Monroe said. "As a candidate you really don't have the experience or the access to the same information."

"You have to learn the system from all sides," Monroe said. The only way that could be done was by assuming the office of president, he said.

As student body president, "You come, you do your time, and you leave," Monroe said. "It's time for a change. Maybe we need to move in a new direction."

"In retrospect, it's been a heck of a lot of fun," Monroe said. "The experience has been wonderful. There have been some good times and some bad times. See RUNOFF on page 2"



A campaign worker consoles James Exum after his loss to Paul Parker in the runoff election for student body president.

Problem is lessening

Mattione speaks on debt crisis

By KEITH BRADSHAW
Staff Writer

More reschedulings by major banks and continued economic growth in Western nations are essential to the prevention of a major international debt crisis, Richard Mattione, a fellow at the Brookings Institution's Foreign Policies Program, said Tuesday night.

In exchange, leaders of Third World debtor nations need to impose short-term hardships in an effort to allow their economies to adjust to the realities of high oil prices and low raw material prices, he said.

"These countries have shown that they have to get inflation, and other (economic) measures like exchange rates and public sector deficits, under control."

Sponsored by the UNC Office of International Programs as the fifth of the Great Decisions '84 lecture series, the speech in Dey Hall's Toy Lounge at-

tracted about 90 students and faculty.

Foreign debts have become a major problem for many Third World nations for three reasons, Mattione said.

First, in the early 1980s interest rates in the West became substantially higher than inflation rates, so the cost of repaying old loans and securing new ones soared.

Second, world prices for the raw materials typically exported by Third World nations fell, cutting the supply of foreign exchange these countries had to repay their loans.

Finally, to maintain political stability, leaders of debtor nations set too high exchange rates for their currencies, Mattione said. While imports were thus cheaper for their populations, the overvaluation encouraged residents to buy such strong currencies and the U.S. dollar with too few cruzeros, pesos or other currencies. Third World countries thus lost to industrial nations that could have been invested at home.

Banks were justified in lending hundreds of billions of dollars to the Third World, Mattione said. "It had very favorable growth rates since the early 1960s."

"Just because a country can borrow doesn't mean it has to borrow," he said.

Continued lending is needed now. But in the future, limits probably should be set on international lending to prevent the danger to the world financial system that existed in 1982 and 1983, he said.

Economic growth in the West helps the Third World by driving up commodity prices, he said. To increase the benefit to underdeveloped nations, Western nations need to lower trade restrictions against them.

"We have to realize that if we open our markets, then pretty soon they'll be buying more of our goods," he said.

Banks need to continue to reschedule old loans — allowing debtors more time to pay — and to make new loans, Mattione said. "If we tried to collect it all



Richard Mattione

now, we'd collect zero."

Already, reschedulings and new loans have downgraded the risk of massive defaults from a crisis to a very serious problem, he said. New loans are being made at low rates that offer little further profit for banks. Awareness has spread in

See DECISIONS on page 2

UNC desegregation plan upheld by Court

From staff and wire reports

WASHINGTON — The U.S. Supreme Court upheld a desegregation plan for the UNC system Tuesday, ending a major civil rights challenge to an agreement between the university system and the U.S. Department of Education.

The decision left intact the consent decree — accepted in 1981 by a federal judge in Raleigh — that outlines goals for desegregating the 16-campus system.

In upholding the consent decree, the nine justices, without comment, refused to hear arguments by civil rights lawyers who previously called the agreement a "sellout."

"I believe that the support of the General Assembly, Gov. Jim Hunt and the diligent efforts of the Board of Governors to provide better education opportunities for all the citizens of this state has been vindicated," UNC President William Friday said.

The court's refusal to hear the case is a defeat for civil rights forces, including the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. Contending that the consent decree was inadequate to eliminate segregation, the Fund and black students from North Carolina schools had sought to reopen the case before a federal judge in the District of Columbia.

Joseph L. Rauh Jr., chief counsel for the challengers, said in 1981 that the agreement was "the worst civil rights sellout of the Reagan administration thus far." The settlement put an end to the possibility, raised by the previous Carter administration, of a cutoff of \$90 million in federal aid to North Carolina universities.

Last June, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington blocked the challengers from reopening their suit, first filed in 1970 against the federal government and not against the state.

Allowing such a suit now "would disturb the fundamentals balance our rules of procedure strike, not only between courts and executive agencies, but also among the powers of coordinate federal tribunals," the appeals court said.

Joseph Levin, a Washington attorney who has represented UNC since 1979, said Tuesday there was no further avenue through the District of Columbia court for the Legal Defense Fund to attack the consent decree.

"One of the things all the courts have recognized is why the Fund, if it was so disturbed with the agreement, did not attack it in the North Carolina courts," he said. "It's obvious that the plaintiffs decided to pursue it here (in Washington), and not in North Carolina."

The petition was first filed in the District of Columbia court because that court had issued the order that UNC was not in compliance with the Constitution said Julius L. Chambers, a Charlotte civil

rights attorney and president of the Legal Defense Fund. The D.C. court then issued guidelines for corrections, he said in a telephone interview Tuesday.

When civil rights group filed suit opposing the consent decree, the Fund contended that the agreement did not comply with the Education Department's responsibility to enforce Title 7 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. That section prohibits racial bias in institutions receiving federal funds.

For now, the Fund has no definite plans for further legal action, Chambers said.

"The Fund will continue monitoring what the University does toward desegregation to ensure fairness to minorities. If it finds that the University is not in compliance with the Constitution, another suit can be brought."

Friday said his immediate reaction to the decision, which he learned of Tuesday morning from Levin was "one of profound gratitude."

"This has been a long and hard and important case," he said. "That's why we have been very careful and worked at it so hard."

Raymond Dawson, UNC vice president for academic affairs, said there were no legal obstructions remaining that would hamper UNC's efforts to achieve desegregation through the consent decree.

"I think (Tuesday's decision) indicates that what we've been trying to do is right," Dawson said. "We feel a real sense of gratification in this."

Friday said the universities are ready to proceed with implementation of the consent decree, which calls for North Carolina to improve its five traditionally black colleges with 29 new undergraduate and graduate programs by the end of 1986.

It also sets a goal of increasing black student enrollment at the predominantly white institutions from 7.4 percent in 1981 to 11.2 percent by 1986, and boosting white enrollment at the black colleges from 11.2 percent to 15 percent.

The challengers to the plan said it lacked specific quotas for enrolling, recruiting and employing minorities in the university system.

When the consent decree was reached, the Reagan administration dropped previous demands that the state university system also eliminate program duplications between neighboring predominantly white and predominantly black institutions.

Civil rights officials again took exception, claiming that duplication reinforces separation of the races in a college system once segregated by state law. The Carter administration had sought to eliminate the programs at the predominantly white schools, and thereby create a lure to attend the black schools.

Polls show Hunt leads Helms in Senate race

By THAD OGBURN
Staff Writer

Although Gov. Jim Hunt holds a lead over Sen. Jesse Helms in the most recent poll concerning the U.S. Senate race, Helms spokesmen feel the contest is closer than the poll indicates.

The poll, released Sunday by *The Charlotte Observer*, found that Hunt led Helms 46 percent to 42 percent. About 8 percent of the 1,005 registered voters surveyed were undecided, while 3 percent declined to answer and 1 percent said they preferred other candidates. The poll was conducted between Feb. 11 and Feb. 17.

Claude Allen, a spokesman for the Helms for Senate Committee, claimed recently that the *Observer* poll has a poor track record.

"The *Charlotte Observer*, in 1980, predicted that (Sen. Robert) Morgan would defeat (John) East," Allen said. East, a Republican, edged the incumbent Morgan

in the Senate race.

However, Phil Meyer, a Kenan Professor in the UNC School of Journalism, said the *Observer* poll is a good one.

Meyer, who helps oversee the School of Journalism's Carolina Poll, said several factors must be taken into account when judging a poll. He said the size of the sample is important, as well as how the poll screens out those not registered to vote.

Stephanie Bass, a spokeswoman for Hunt, agreed that the size of the sample in a poll is very important.

"For a poll to be credible it would have to have 600 respondents," Bass said. "I would not have respect for a poll that had fewer than 600 responses."

Bass said the Hunt campaign never made sweeping judgments from a single poll.

"You have to remember that a poll is only a snapshot in time," she said. "It's never really immediate, it's always the way things were."

Bass said the Hunt campaign committee was pleased with the governor's current standing in the polls, even though his lead has slipped from polls conducted in the fall.

"I've always believed that the race would be as tight as it is today," Bass said.

In a Carolina Poll released in early November, Hunt led Helms 56 percent to 36 percent. A new Carolina Poll on the Senate race began last Friday night, and the results are expected sometime next week.

Allen charged that the Carolina Poll, like the *Observer's*, has a poor track record of picking winners. "We hope that their track record will hold the same in this case," Allen said.

Meyer, however, said the Carolina Poll did not attempt to pick winners.

See POLLS on page 2

Leutze and Obler debate nuclear arms deployment

By RICHARD J. BOYCE
Staff Writer

All possibilities for conventional deterrence to the nuclear arms buildup in Europe should be explored, UNC history Professor James R. Leutze said in a debate with Jeffrey L. Obler, associate professor of political science Tuesday night.

Both men gave four reasons why they believe the United States should or should not change its policy to deploy nuclear arms in West Germany. The two then responded to questions from the audience of about 80 people gathered in Murphy Hall auditorium.

The United States only responded to a European initiative to put Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe in the first place,

Leutze said. The decision to place missiles in Europe was made by NATO, not by the United States on its own, he said.

When the Soviet Union put SS-20s in Eastern Europe, it was necessary for NATO to counter the Soviets so that NATO would have some bargaining power, said Leutze, who is chairman of the UNC curriculum in peace, war, and defense. He said he believed the United States should put missiles in Europe and then bargain with the Soviets to get Soviet missiles out.

Arms control involves perspectives, and if the United States and its allies respond weakly to a Soviet move, then they will put themselves in a bad position, he said.

"The Soviets took the initiative, and

someone must take their lead NATO needs the ability to arrive at a conclusion and stick to that conclusion in the face of opposition," Leutze said, adding that the Soviets respond best when confronted with openness and a strong, clear initiative.

Obler said that by placing SS-20s in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union was only following the lead of the United States, which started changing its nuclear arsenal in Europe to smaller, more active warheads in the mid-1970s.

Obler criticized President Reagan's "zero option" plan — the idea that the United States would not deploy any new missiles in Europe if the Soviets would reduce their nuclear weapons there to

zero. Great Britain and France still had 162 missiles pointed toward the Soviet Union, leaving the Soviets defenseless in Europe, he said.

The United States had seriously dimmed any prospect for real arms controls in Europe by putting ground-launched cruise missiles there, Obler said.

"I see two very powerful very insecure nations jockeying for power," Leutze agreed, saying the Reagan administration was more war-like than he had hoped it would be. A long-term solution to the problem in Europe, he said, was for the United States to increase the number of conventional weapons in Europe, giving it another option in Europe besides nuclear war. Such a policy would be very expensive, Leutze said.