

# The Daily Tar Heel

94th year of editorial freedom

JIM ZOOK, Editor  
 RANDY FARMER, Managing Editor  
 ED BRACKETT, Associate Editor  
 DEWEY MESSER, Associate Editor  
 TRACY HILL, News Editor  
 GRANT PARSONS, University Editor  
 LINDA MONTANARI, City Editor  
 JILL GERBER, State and National Editor  
 SCOTT FOWLER, Sports Editor  
 KATHY PETERS, Features Editor  
 ROBERT KEEFE, Business Editor  
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor  
 DAN CHARLSON, Photography Editor

## Editorials

### In Glaxo venture, use caution

Since the University announced a research partnership with Glaxo, Inc., a private drug company, one aspect of the venture has been anxiously disputed: Would the University sacrifice or tarnish its scholarly reputation by working alongside a profit-motivated company? While that danger exists, there is much to outweigh such fears.

As part of the deal, Glaxo will build a \$2.5-million biology laboratory for the UNC School of Medicine. The company will also spend \$1.2 million to renovate part of Venable Hall for a chemistry lab. In return, Glaxo will be allowed to use the lab for the next four or five years. The labs will remain University property.

Fundamental to this unprecedented cooperation between a N.C. public university and a private company is that both parties stand to gain from the union. Glaxo would receive research assistance from UNC faculty members and students, which could provide fresh insight into discovering treatments for diseases. The research could also provide Glaxo a solid research base when it moves into its new Research Triangle Park lab.

The most tangible gain for the University would be \$3.7 million in improved research facilities. These improvements would be especially helpful in light of Gov. Jim Martin's request that the University prepare for (but not necessarily expect) a 3 percent budget cut. The status of the budget will not be known until mid-1987.

But the economic gain for the University is perhaps less important and lasting than the knowledge and

experience UNC could acquire from this research opportunity.

Despite these positive features, some see the association with Glaxo as a threat to the sanctity of academic research. Skeptics fear that the University will be inhibited in publishing its findings, given the fact that Glaxo will be motivated to protect any drugs that might spring from the enterprise. This concern may prove to be justifiable if the research tends to concentrate on developing drugs for Glaxo's profit, instead of researching for the sake of knowledge and truth.

University officials have said that the project would allow Glaxo to focus on developing various drugs if it wished, while UNC would conduct basic research separate from Glaxo. Furthermore, University participants would direct the scope and focus of all research conducted. In its relationship with Glaxo, the UNC administration must deny any shift toward emphasizing the development of marketable drugs. Only if the University maintains control of the direction of the research can it avoid becoming the first N.C. university to mingle in the sciences for a profit.

If due caution is exercised, UNC can benefit from collaborating with private enterprise. In the partnership with Glaxo, the University will receive laboratory space and the fruits of significant applied science, which are always welcome. If the danger to UNC's independent scholarship is contained — and it can be — the University and the scientific world would benefit from such public-private cooperation.

### Serious talks appropriate

Diplomatic jargon has been whizzing between Moscow and Washington at record speeds in the last two months. Tensions soar, then cool, then intensify again. First the Daniloff-Zakharov ordeal, then the Reykjavik summit. The perpetual wave machine that ebbs and flows relations between the nations has ranged from tidal wave to barren desert.

The Soviet Union announced Monday that five U.S. diplomats would be expelled for activities "incompatible with their official status." That's bureaucratic slang for calling them spies.

U.S. response was predictable. Secretary of State George Shultz said the United States "will protest and will take some action." White House Chief of Staff Donald Regan called for "appropriate action" by the United States.

What is "appropriate action"? Who determines how appropriate an action

is? If the Soviets think a U.S. action to be inappropriate, can they send it back and ask for a new one? These questions are indeed silly, but they are no more ridiculous than the level of thought dominating U.S.-Soviet relations. The two nations are programmed like a pair of computers. Except for a few brief respites, the two have traded turns one-upping the other. Because of the stubbornness and hubris of both sides, no seriously "appropriate action" — such as an arms treaty — is attained.

Sunday's expulsion is obviously in response to the dismissal of 25 Soviet employees to the United Nations. To the less astute observer, the "score" in this latest diplomatic showdown now stands at United States 25, Soviet Union 5. But the rules aren't so simple. Until President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev realize this, the entire situation will be totally inappropriate.

### Move over, Coffee Generation

Are you a member of the Coffee Generation? "What's the Coffee Generation?" you ask.

You know. The Coffee Generation that group of Mary Lou Rettoneseque (well, it *should* be a word) go-getters who always start their day with bodacious gulps of The Beverage That Refreshes. Several cups of the stuff and they're ready to take on the world and do the impossible, such as comprehend what goes on in their 8 o'clock class.

Well, if you are a member of the Coffee Generation, you should know that your counterparts in the beef industry, never ones to be outdone, are after their share of PR, too. The National Livestock and Meat Board has announced a \$70 million ad campaign to extol the virtues of beef under the theme, "Beef — real food for real people."

Tom McDermott, a vice president of the Livestock and Meat Board, says the group is looking for big stars to aid its campaign, someone "with down-to-earth qualities." Nothing's official yet, but word is that Sally Field, James Garner, Cybill Shepherd and Tina Turner have the inside track at

### The Bottom Line

becoming beef spokesmen. At least one star David Bowie — doesn't stand a snowball's chance, though; the rock singer just "would be wrong," says McDermott.

The eat-beef hoopla comes in response to dwindling beef sales in an increasingly tofu-istic (well, it *should* be a word) society. The campaign is reminiscent of recent radio ads hawking sugar, another old favorite that's been all but forgotten.

But Sally Field in a beef commercial? That sounds about as incongruous as having Kurt Vonnegut Jr. plugging coffee, as he did for the Coffee Generation's TV push a few years ago. Vonnegut's arguably a go-getter, sure, but he's certainly a misfit in the incessantly perky Coffee Generation. Field would be similarly lost among the macho-men-and-tough-ladies-only Beef Generation.

And what's wrong with David Bowie? He'd be perfect for the part provided he's in his macho phase, of course.

### Food no payoff

To the editor:  
 I find "Pizza payoff" (Oct. 15) utterly appalling and plain stupid.

Let me ask you: whenever a large number of people gather together where there is music and/or speeches and banners and the chance to see newsmakers and respected people, is there usually some type of beverage and food available? Sounds quite a bit like a pep rally or even a UNC basketball game, doesn't it? So what is wrong with offering food especially when it is during lunch anyway?

And another thing: How can someone feel that the pizza was "nothing more than a gaudy attention-grabbing device for a political race?" Is a piece of pizza, let alone any food, going to change a potential voter's preference? Is someone going to vote for a candidate because he (or a supportive organization) gives out free pizza?

If one answers "Yes," then I highly recommend he sit down and search his values. Also, if the Sanford people really were interested in using this as a "gaudy attention-grabbing device" ala Steve Cole then perhaps they would have made ads with "FREE PIZZA" in capital letters.

Did they? No. "Terry Sanford Rally" and all the essentials (time, date, place) appeared. Then the pizza was at the bottom in smaller letters. That is not trying to "lure" anyone in my book. I would not think college students would be so naive, anyway.

Finally, I take it that Stephen Cole thinks the Sanford-Broyhill Senate race is comparable to the Hunt-Helms race in 1984. Well, he's right: just as before, one is a Democrat and the other is a Republican. That is the *only* comparison that may be made. I believe this has been and is an issue-oriented campaign and is very clean.

I resent the fact that anyone thinks I could be out to sell my vote. Any rational college student knows that a campaign and a theme needs a gathering of its supporters and those who wish to know more about a candidate, whether they are for or against the campaign — and a rally is one of the best ways to do that.

WAYNE GOODWIN  
 Sophomore  
 Political Science

### RHA no enemy

To the editor:  
 Blaise Byron Faint is a junior who is misinformed about some of the administration on this campus. I agree with the basic content of his Oct. 13 letter, "RHA Red Tape." The lounge use policy he spoke of is ridiculous and I don't think that anyone beyond the residents is more aware of that fact than the Residence Hall Association.

The RHA is the organization that represents the students. They are the ones who voice the students' response to the policies that Faint spoke of. This organization is not to be confused with the Department of University Housing. They are the ones responsible for all of the asinine policies and rules. In his letter, Faint accuses RHA of "converting the dorms into 'residence halls/life simulation modules.'" If he had paid closer attention to his Daily Tar Heel articles, he would have known that it is the DUH who is attempting this conversion, not RHA. In fact, RHA is opposed to this worthless attempt to make the dorms something contrary to what the resident desires.

I suggest Faint pay attention. He should know with whom he is having a problem instead of misdirecting his attacks. If he wishes to have action taken against a policy, he can direct his grievances to his governor, Neal Keene or to the RHA office. I would venture to guess he has not done this.

It angers me when a misinformed individual discredits the people who are working for the benefit of dorm residents. It further angers me that his statements should appear on an editorial page where others may form inaccurate conclusions. Let it stand that Faint's information was inaccurate and that the RHA is doing a "bang-up job."

RONI HARBERT  
 Junior  
 Speech

## Tar Heel Forum



The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comment. For style and clarity, we ask that you observe the following guidelines for letters to the editor and columns:

- All letters/columns must be signed by the author(s). Limit of two signatures per letter or column.
- Students who submit letters/columns should also include their name, year in school,

major and phone number. Professors and other University employees should include their title and department.

- All letters/columns must be typed. (For easier editing, we ask that they be double-spaced on a 60-space line.)
- The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to edit letters and columns for style, grammar and accuracy.

### Star Wars has research merits

To the editor:

It seems almost everyone finds problems with President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) — the president's unwillingness to limit research, SDI's effectiveness, its cost and so on.

However, SDI does have merits that tend to be ignored. First, most current SDI research is directly related to questions in the field of physics. It is true that a lot of research is tied to the defense industry. The big question is not whether the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy is funding the research, but whether or not the government should fund important, basic research. In a technology-based society like ours, it is important for scientific research to increase its scope and explore all areas, including potential defensive weapons.

Second, even if SDI does not stop all of the Soviet Union's missiles, it reduces the potential effectiveness of these missiles and the chance of a first strike; in today's world, if you don't destroy the other guy first time around then it's too bad — you won't get another chance. SDI would only be effective against land-based ICBMs. This would leave Western Europe fairly vulnerable, but the Soviets realize that the United States would defend Western Europe, and if we had SDI we could launch our missiles without having to worry too much about the Soviets retaliating. Submarine-launched and cruise missiles would be harder to deal with, but we outnumber the Russians in both categories.

Third, it would be cheaper to rely completely on nuclear missiles — no strategic defense and a very limited conventional force. But nobody likes that

option. Since most of the defense money goes for basic research, it is hard to prove that money is either lost or wasted until years later.

SDI has some very weighty advantages and the Soviets realize this. They know that a strategic defense race would paralyze and possibly destroy their already lagging economy. To prevent this, they have made killing SDI a prerequisite for arms reduction. What Americans and Russians can't see is that if nuclear missiles were eliminated there would be no need for SDI to be deployed. The knowledge gained could then be applied full-force in other areas and the world would be a whole lot safer.

After all, isn't that what we really want?

CURTIS HEDGEPEATH  
 Sophomore  
 Psychology

### Hidden kickers

To the editor:

Past weekends have marked the return of the pep rally and perhaps an increase in school spirit. But what many students may have missed was the introduction of possibly another Tar Heel tradition, the High Kicking Heels. The High Kicking Heels are a squad comprised of 22 of UNC's finest dancers who might be likened to the famous Rockettes. These girls do a number of marvelous, complex dance routines.

In its short existence, the group has gained support by both the school administration and a large part of the student body. Unfortunately, this group's debut was missed by many. Placed behind the band, majorettes and flag girls, the High Kicking Heels have performed their energetic routines to the visitors' side, receiving the definite approval of those fans as well as our otherwise lifeless alumni, while we, the students, missed out on these routines.

It seems to me unfair that we should be denied the privilege

of watching these girls, who have worked so hard for the opportunity to perform. It is also ironic that all the half-time shows including the band, cheerleaders, flag girls and majorettes performed facing the students, while the High Kicking Heels were placed out of our view. Should these girls again be placed where we cannot see them perform, I would ask you to join me in showing your support and respect for these girls' efforts by walking to the visitor's side at half-time to see their routines.

TOM MCCUISTON  
 Sophomore

### Unfair food

To the editor:

In response to Steve Cole's letter, "Pizza Payoff", I want to say that I, too, was shocked by the free pizza offered at the Terry Sanford rally. The gall it took these liberals to think they could sucker me with a slice of pepperoni and cheese and an ice cold coke after I

hadn't eaten all day was incredible.

I also thought the mud, or should I say food, slinging tactics of the 1984 senatorial race were gone forever. Apparently, in their losing struggle against the successes of Reaganism, Democrats have been reduced to hiding their inadequacies behind the mask of Italian food. Beware, civic-minded students! Don't let these blatant efforts to influence your vote by taking advantage of your empty stomach fool you. What is this great country coming to when people think my vote can be bought for the paltry price of junk food?

Do what I did. Next time one of these corrupt rallies is held, consume the free stuff and don't listen to what the candidate has to say. That way, you can kill those mid-day hunger pangs, keep your conscience free and preserve your civic virtue.

DAN TIKVART  
 Senior  
 History/Political Science

### A push to show Tar Heel pride

To the editor:

All Tar Heel football fans. It is long overdue to see if your vocal cords still operate. Loosen those ties, wake up your dates, focus your eyes on the field and yell.

Why? What is there to cheer about, you ask? I'll tell you. This 1986 team is good. Our defense has been a stonewall. Led by pre-season All-American Reuben David, Wild Man Mitch Wake and others, the Tar Heel defenders have humiliated their opponents. The likes of Harris Barton, Creighton "The Big Man" Incorninias, and Derrick Fenner lead an offense waiting to explode.

This team is packed with enough talent to win the conference and a prestigious bowl game. The fans in the past have not been mediocre. We have been hapless, noiseless and non-supportive. It is time to change.

Our players sacrifice many hours, not to mention their bodies, to prepare for

60 minutes of football. We can't show support for 30 seconds. Too many of us are more interested in who is at the game than who the Heels are playing. Let's get off our seats, open our mouths and give the team what they deserve and need — loud, obnoxious, loyal fans they can rely on for a deafening, rocking Kenan Stadium.

DAVID W. SMITH  
 Senior  
 Pharmacy

To the editor:

I agree with Ufuk Tukul ("Tar Heel fans could be 6th man," Oct. 14) when he says that Tar Heel fans lack enthusiasm when it comes to supporting athletic teams. Tukul, however, speaks of poor participation at the basketball games when the real problem is crowd support at Kenan Stadium. From hearing the silence of the crowd at Kenan, one would think the Heels hadn't won a game all year. Aside from the quiet, few people bother to wear Carolina blue. It would be

an awesome sight if everyone were to wear the color on football Saturdays. Anyone who has been to a Clemson football game in Death Valley can attest to that.

I disagree with Tukul's definition of crowd support. One of the things that separates Carolina's athletic program from the others is our "class." Waving arms behind the goal during foul shots and yelling obscenities at opposing coaches or officials is a show of poor sportsmanship and has no place at UNC. Carolina's excellent recruiting record is based largely on the ability of coaches to sell high school athletes, on Carolina's tradition of class and poise, not on showing films of wild parties. Yes, let's be loud and supportive at both basketball and football games, but let's do it in a way that will maintain Carolina's reputation as a class institution.

JOHN BOONE  
 Sophomore  
 Business