

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

For Senate, Sanford

The race for the U.S. Senate between Jim Broyhill and Terry Sanford has been pegged by political observers as a key race in the Republican effort to maintain its tenuous control of the Senate. Three N.C. appearances by President Reagan stumping for Republican incumbent Broyhill exemplify the significance of this race as he seeks another ally in the Senate.

But if North Carolinians send to Washington the candidate with the most vision, appeal and courage, the president will be disappointed. The candidate who can rightfully make those assertions is Democratic nominee Terry Sanford, whom The Daily Tar Heel endorses for the U.S. Senate.

As the state's 10th district congressman for 24 years, Broyhill built a record of continuity. He advocated policies supported by N.C. farmers and textile workers. But while he established a reputation as a behind-the-scenes worker who lobbied effectively, he failed to mature into a strong leader. Considering the time he spent in Congress, his record as an originator of major legislation is abysmal.

The same cannot be expected of Sanford, a man who has shown through a lengthy career as public servant and educator that he is a progressive, forward-thinking leader. As governor of North Carolina in the early 1960s, Sanford achieved major strides in public support of education — including development of the state community college system. He was influential in convincing major industrial firms to locate manufacturing facilities in Research Triangle Park. After a distinguished 15-year presidency at Duke University, it can be

assured that Sanford will be a friend to education and support key areas such as federal financial aid.

Perhaps the strongest attribute Sanford possesses is vision. He takes a thinking man's approach to issues, not the knee-jerk liberal reaction Broyhill's latest ads have asserted. For example, Sanford's support of the Strategic Defense Initiative stems from the research value of the project. He shows well-advised reluctance to consider SDI the save-all defense system.

Unfortunately, the campaign has not been as exemplary as the candidates. A major issue was Sanford's support of a food tax 25 years ago; Sanford turned Broyhill's tax-and-spend charges to his advantage. Broyhill's ads make no effort to distinguish his qualities, only his allegiance to Reagan's agenda. Broyhill and his organization have been unruly and downright rude in dealing with press, perhaps showing uneasiness in the Broyhill camp after years of enjoying the comfort of weak opposition in a regional race. In his press dealings, Sanford has at times been evasive, although not to the same extent as Broyhill.

A Sanford election would also reap benefits for the state's reputation, showing to the nation that North Carolinians are broad-minded people supporting more than the extremist philosophy of the state's other senator, Jesse Helms.

North Carolina needs a representative in Washington that will command respect for his insight, good nature and forthright approach to government. Terry Sanford will bring all these assets and more to the U.S. Senate.

For Congress, Price

Despite charges and countercharges from both camps — those rooting for Republican Bill Cobey and those pulling for Democrat David Price — this year's campaign for N.C.'s 4th Congressional District has by no means been beset by "negative campaigning." On the contrary, both candidates have conducted themselves rather well, and both have provided potential voters a clear picture of where they stand.

That said, Price — who effectively communicates the "deep sense of right and wrong" discussed in his campaign ads — is the better of two conscientious candidates. He was the unanimous choice of The Daily Tar Heel editorial board.

Price is no stranger to politics, having taught and written on the subject for Duke University and served as state Democratic Party chairman. And, judging by his mannered performance in both televised debates, he's a politician who recognizes the merits of rational discussion. Price has clearly and courageously voiced his stands on several pivotal issues in the race, providing voters a useful basis of comparison with Cobey.

To his credit, Cobey is an equally dedicated politician, one who's demonstrated an admirable devotion to the job he won from Ike Andrews two years ago. Cobey's attendance record — 98 percent — is phenomenal, among the best in the House.

Perhaps most important, Cobey, former UNC athletic director, has been an effective ombudsman for his constituents, improving various local services. For instance, he finagled additional customs officials from the Washington bureaucracy for Raleigh-Durham airport and stepped up law enforcement around Jordan Lake, among other things.

Yet it is the consideration of more vital matters — those affecting the

direction of the district and country — that cast doubt on a Cobey candidacy.

Cobey's fervent adherence to President Reagan's policies suggests that Cobey's prime loyalty is to the executive branch, not to the legislative — an attitude at odds with the logic of a system of checks and balances. Instead of asking serious questions about such projects as the Strategic Defense Initiative — an astronomically expensive endeavor about which even many scientists have serious doubts — Cobey has voted for full funding of the program, funding with minimal strings attached.

By voting to dramatically increase a horribly bloated defense budget at a time of record deficit — and at the same time place Social Security funds in jeopardy — the incumbent has also exhibited a deeply flawed sense of priorities. But this is, of course, in line with the president's policies.

Price, on the other hand, has said that he will be beholden to himself and his constituents — not the president — if elected. He has pledged support of Social Security and decied the throw-money-at-the-Pentagon syndrome. Unlike Cobey, Price sees the folly of such reactionary budget control measures as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law and the proposed balanced budget amendment.

And Cobey, as Price has noted, frequently votes in the minority, going against both Democrats and Republicans and, indeed, "mainstream thinking in North Carolina," as the challenger frequently puts it. If Price, a statesman of excellent character, should win Tuesday's vote, 4th District residents can look forward to another ombudsman in the next two years — but, fortunately, one who will represent their best interests and reject the jingoistic, out-of-step philosophy of the current representative.

Tar Heel Forum

Sanford: Innovation in leadership

Terry Sanford, Democratic nominee for the U.S. Senate, recently spoke to The Daily Tar Heel about his candidacy. The following are excerpts from that interview.

Which of the policies you advocate would affect college students most?

"I think that, generally speaking, students care about education and its place in society and the support that it gets. I think if you were talking about educational funds for elementary and secondary schools that students would have a greater interest maybe than the ordinary citizen might have.

"However, they (students) have a broad range of concerns and I think that is marked by idealism. They are more likely to be concerned with things like the protection of the environment than the average citizen. Also, the dangers of nuclear use, nuclear waste and nuclear war. They certainly have a greater appreciation of those things that would work toward a reduction of arms and the pursuit of peace. They generally have good ideas about it.

"I think also that students, like everybody else, are interested in jobs and the economy and how is it that we are sure that we're not going to get into a recession as soon as they come out of college. . . . So, they're bound to be disturbed about the mounting national debt and the instability of the economic conditions."

What issue do you feel is most important in your campaign?

"I think it's the issue of leadership, which breaks down into a willingness to make tough decisions. I think it's leadership in the sense of caring about people and looking for ways that you broaden opportunities for individuals to make more of their own lives. I think it's leadership and the ability to get what you've worked for done. . . . In this case, to get other senators to work with you . . . to be able to mobilize the energies of leadership across the state. Those qualities of leadership ought to be the main issue."

What issue do you see as the biggest difference between you and your opponent, Sen. Jim Broyhill?

"There's a difference in the way we look at people and the way we work at problems. Thomas Jefferson said that by their constitutions, people divide themselves into two parties: one that doesn't trust the people and would move authority and power from them at every chance to the more privileged group of people; the other group that identifies with people, cares about people, cherishes people and believes that people are the best place to put the trust for the issues of the nation. I put myself in the second category and my opponent in the first category."

Broyhill has affiliated himself closely with President Reagan. How do you feel about Reagan's policies?

"First of all, my answer to that is that I would wear the yoke of no man; that I would be the captive of no special and selfish interest. I would represent first and always the people of North Carolina.

"I don't approve of the president's neglect and apparent attitude that the family farmer



"It's unthinkable that we would have doubled the national debt in six years. . . . I don't believe you can run the government with a Mastercharge economy."

— Terry Sanford

is not important anymore. I think (farmers are) very fundamental to the fabric of America and certainly to the social fabric of North Carolina. I certainly don't agree with his lack of a trade policy.

"Now I'm not a protectionist, in that I think we just can build tariffs around the nation to keep people out of our market, but I think that an unrestrained policy that is not a reciprocal policy is doing great damage to the industries of America. I think we can simply have a sensible, reciprocal free trade policy that lets us trade with the world and gives consideration to emerging nations and their need for markets, but at the same time I'm aware of the fact that we can't take lightly our own working people in the industries or the industries themselves.

"The place that I have the most disagreement with the president is the policy that has resulted in utter fiscal irresponsibility. It's unthinkable that we would have doubled the national debt in six years. When you think that through all the problems of this nation — two world wars, the Great Depression and two other wars — that we didn't accumulate as much national debt that this administration accumulated in the first five-and-a-half years. I don't believe you can run the government with a Mastercharge economy. . . . I assume that my opponent agrees with those things, but I don't."

What do you see as North Carolina's biggest problem?

"I tend to see things that need to be done more as opportunities rather than problems. You fall into the habit of saying, 'This is a problem and that is a problem,' and you get your frame of mind going the wrong way.

"I think we need to continue to improve our schools. We made a good deal of progress, but I think we have stepped back and we have to continue to invest in improving schools.

"I think teachers are not paid anything near as much as we need to pay to continue to attract and keep in the teaching profession the very best possible professional corps of teachers. There are many other things that need to be done about education, but that's probably the thing that most needs our attention right now."

What do you feel would make you an

effective senator, as opposed to Sen. Broyhill?

"Well, I think that my sense of getting things done and my record in four years of getting more done (as governor) than most people get done in that office in four years in any state . . . I can bring to the Senate the capacity for leadership, for getting programs thought out and planned out and getting them done and running a state with a balanced budget. (As president of Duke), I ran a university with a balanced budget and brought it to new recognition in the nation and created new institutions, such as the Business School and the Institute of Political Sciences.

"I think that I would be interested to have a full comparison of what each one of us has done in the past 24 years. I think on the basis of that I can very well ask people to believe I will do things like that in the future because I have in the past.

"I think his (Broyhill's) record in the past 24 years is very slim. His record of bills that he has been the principal sponsor of numbers more than five, and they aren't very important. And that's 24 years. While I think he served his constituents very well and if they have problems with the bureaucracy, he straightens them out, he hasn't done much about creating the kind of government that doesn't give people all of those problems.

"I don't think he's been a very creative leader. His record supports that view. He's been a very satisfactory congressman in the sense of serving his constituents, and no doubt he's been a conscientious congressman in studying and voting on legislation, forgetting for a moment that I would have voted differently on a great many of those occasions.

"Nevertheless, he's facing a different kind of challenge in the Senate. We've got all kinds of severe problems to face and to turn into creative solutions. We have to do something about the debt and the unbalanced budget — that's going to take some creative and forceful action. He hasn't indicated that that's the kind of thing he does. . . . I think in terms of the challenge that is before him, his record doesn't give much promise that he will be up to it."

Staff Writer Nicki Weisensee, a sophomore journalism major from Laurinburg, conducted this interview.

Broyhill: Putting experience to work

When contacted by the Daily Tar Heel, a press aide to Sen. James Broyhill said that due to time constraints, the campaign staff was unable to provide an interview with Broyhill, or answer the questions which were also posed to Terry Sanford. During his Oct. 12 debate with opponent Terry Sanford, Broyhill made the following comments on some of his stances:

On Broyhill's potential effectiveness as a senator:

"Let me talk first about experience. I've had 24 years of experience working for the people of North Carolina. And in that time I have stood for election many times, and I've been proud of the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike have sent me back to Congress many times, thus endorsing my record of service and legislative record for North Carolina.

"I'm honored now to be there in the Senate, helping to solve problems for North Carolina. Now solving problems is not easy. It takes a great deal of hard work but also up-to-date vital contacts if you want to get things done for your state. And I'm putting that kind of experience and using my vital contacts for North Carolina now."

On differences between Broyhill and opponent Terry Sanford:

"(A) difference that I see is the kind of leadership that I support there now as opposed and contrasted to the leadership that my opponent will support if he's sworn in in January of 1987.

"I'm supporting the conservative majority — that is, the majority in the U.S. Senate today — the majority that is friendly to the program and the policies of our president, Ronald Reagan, who was supported by an overwhelming majority of the people of this state.

"On the other hand, my opponent, . . . will support an entirely different kind of leadership, will return to power the liberals who were in control there in the 60s and 70s — those who would be dedicated to tearing down the program and the policies that we put in place that have brought this country back from the brink of disaster."

On Broyhill's relationship to President Reagan:

"I strongly feel that Ronald Reagan has been the right man at this time in our history to lead us into a new era of progress and optimism and growth. And he has done a great deal to cure a number of severe problems that we were facing there in 1981 when he was sworn into office. 21 percent



"I've had 24 years of experience working for the people of North Carolina. And in that time I have stood for election many times, and I've been proud of the fact that Republicans and Democrats alike have sent me back to Congress many times. . . ."

— Jim Broyhill

interest rates, double-digit inflation, joblessness and also our military was in disrepair. And we've been working to solve those problems.

"I've been a leader in the fight for fair trade policies, and I'm going to continue fighting to make sure that we keep the jobs that we already have. Yes, the president and I did disagree on (the textile trade issue). But I'm going to continue fighting, and I think it's interesting to note that the administration is moving toward negotiating a better trading arrangement with our trading partners."

On agriculture:

"I worked very hard during (this summer's drought) to make sure that our farmers were getting the kind of help that they needed. I recall the many conversations that I had with cabinet officials, and they lent their help. For example, Secretary Weinberger, Department of Defense, permitted us to use some of his planes to bring hay down here to some of our beleaguered cattle farmers. And we had visits, of course, by the Secretary of Agriculture, actually looking at what was going on down here.

"Now Mr. Sanford talks about the Farm Credit Bill, and farm credit is an important ingredient in our farm program. That particular legislation I would remind him, came on top of farm credit legislation that had already been passed and a record amount of farm credit legislation that was already in place — and coming also at a time when we were concerned about the continued deficit spending and what we were going to have to do to make sure that we held down deficit spending. . . . It seems to me that what we need to do is provide our farmers more help to get back their markets

abroad. That's how we're going to be able to help the farmers in the long run."

On sanctions against South Africa:

"I have a very strong opposition to apartheid . . . it's a terrible system to see forced segregation over there like that, and I don't like to see what's going on in that country. When I was in the House of Representatives, I voted for a set of sanctions that have been imposed. The purpose of those sanctions was to send a strong message to the South African government that we expected some changes to be made in their behavior and in their form of government. When this package came up, that included a divestment, and saying to American business people who were there that you're not going to be able to utilize your money for new investment to provide jobs for the people of South Africa — a divestment policy that was leading toward a withdrawal of American business people from that country — I say that's going too far, when we're hurting the very people that we're trying to help."

On national defense:

"I'm proud of my record on defense and I've stood up for a strong defense and making sure that we don't cut the muscle of our military. And we must be concerned about the fact that in the 70s our military was short changed. Spending on defense has gone down as a percentage of the total budget. Back when John Kennedy was president, spending was about 46 percent of the budget. It's down to about 28 percent this year, and it seems to me that we're going to have to work hard to shore up that military and the muscle of our military if we're going to have any opportunity of withstanding the potential aggression from our main adversary, the Russians."