

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

Protest deserves active support

The UNC Anti-Apartheid Support Group used an attention-grabber Monday afternoon that's familiar to students and faculty. In their fight to sever UNC investments in corporations doing business in South Africa, group members erected a shanty in front of South Building. Camera shutters clicked, reporters took copious notes and students gawked en route to class.

Of course it was a media event. Rallying public support for such a noble cause is crucial. The return of the shanties signifies the strides made locally and nationally on the divestment issue. Thursday's meeting of the UNC Endowment Board can add another step in the advancement of the divestment cause.

Virtually every constituency in the University community sides with the

group — except the endowment board. The students spoke through a campus referendum; the faculty has spoken via resolutions passed by their own organizations. Several key administrators — including Chancellor Christopher Fordham and vice chancellors Donald Boulton and Farris Womack — now back divestment.

The group constructed the shanty Monday after gaining Boulton's permission (Fordham is out of town until Thursday). The loss of spontaneity did not weaken the message because, as group members stated, confrontation with supportive administrators is not the goal.

Dissuading endowment board members is the goal. Proper means to reach that goal continued Monday. Those means should not be needed after Thursday.

Bettering athletic scholarship

UNC-system President C.D. Spangler's report to the Board of Governors was good medicine — albeit a little harsh — for athletic programs throughout the system. And although it may be difficult, the University community should realize that the several suggestions Spangler outlined have the best interests of the institutions and athletes in mind.

More colleges and universities — including those in the UNC system — are pressuring the NCAA to revise its rules on recruitment, season lengths and other matters of athletic policy. The concerns focus on the student-athlete's welfare, while ensuring continued fair competition among universities.

Spangler and his peers across the nation are striving to bolster protection for the student-athlete. Evidence abounds that college athletes are subjected to considerable pressure from hectic training and game schedules. Maintaining a respectable academic record adds to these demands — a demand that is sometimes buried in the process.

Clearly, something must give. Several recommendations the NCAA Council will consider in January would ease an athlete's load. Among these are shortened seasons, fewer games and less time allotted for pre-season practice. Each suggestion would yield more time for the student to concentrate on schoolwork — a necessary measure to avoid recurrent reports of poor classroom performance by those athletes with only one foot in the classroom.

Some other proposals include protecting high-school athletes from succumbing to a bevy of collegiate recruiters. One suggestion would reduce the recruitment period and the number of visits allowed for recruiting football and basketball players. The intensity of recruiting in those sports exerts unreasonable pressure on the most gifted athletes.

Before any academic reforms can succeed, the big business aspect of collegiate athletics must be tempered. The targets of this suggestion are both athletes and athletic departments, as cost-cutting is projected for each: For example, cutting the number of football scholarships from 95 to 80 over a three-year period; or, reducing the number of assistant coaches from nine to seven. Similar cuts are proposed for basketball, another big-money sport.

Spangler said he would wait to see which, if any, restrictions would be adopted by the NCAA. If the UNC system imposes new regulations, it runs the risk of placing itself at a distinct disadvantage in competition with other, less-restricted schools. Thus, the need prevails to convince the NCAA to hand down alterations for national athletic norms.

At present, athletes across the spectrum are torn between athletic and scholarly responsibilities, often to the detriment of the latter. These measures would lead all student-athletes to earn that distinction, creating the opportunity and necessity to value and encourage scholarship more highly than athletic prowess.

Are you ready for proletariat pizza?

The Bottom Line

of Mary Lou Retton yelling, "Double double cheese cheese burger burger, please!"

There's an interesting question here, though. Pepsi entered the Soviet Union in the early 1970's, and Coke brushed aside the Iron Curtain a little later. (Remember the RC Cola commercial about those gutsy Siberian peasants gulping down RC in secret until the KGB catches up to them?) So Pepsi has tenure. Pepsi also owns Pizza Hut. But McDonald's drink of choice is Coke. That's the kind of conflict that halts arms control negotiations.

The view here is that Pizza Hut should stand tough. They were there first. If Ray Kroc's heirs want to peddle their fried burgers, let their customers drink Pepsi. (Sounds kind of Marie Antoinetteish, doesn't it?) But when it comes down to it, the paramount consideration must be American interests. Used correctly, McDLT could become a truly potent bargaining chip.

The real fun will ensue when Burger King hits the Soviet bloc. No more "Have it your way" slogans. In Moscow, it will be "Have it our way or we'll see you soon in Siberia." Kind of catchy, isn't it?

It gets better, though. Also negotiating to enter the fast-food wasteland is McDonald's, which already has agreements for new franchises in communist Yugoslavia and Hungary. (Will the golden arches be painted red?) And one can only hope the Russian masses will be saved from the sight

Tar Heel Forum

South Africa: pullout a copout

Loeffler/ Taylor
 Guest Writers

It is time for all the rhetoric concerning South African divestment to stop. Only by examining the facts of the current situation clearly and unemotionally can one make an intelligent decision about divestment.

First of all, being against apartheid does not entail that one be in favor of divestment. We all are against apartheid. The only question is the best means of disassembling it. Divestment, however, is not the way.

This may be seen by examining the issue in depth. Proponents of divestment claim that such action would be detrimental to the South African economy, bringing the system of apartheid crashing down. However, according to *The Economist*, a respected British newsweekly, the net effect of U.S. divestment would probably be a boost to the South African economy, because the South African government would freeze dividend exports, thereby improving South Africa's capital balance of payments.

In addition, as U.S. companies flee South Africa, remaining capital will be available to native white South Africans at bargain prices. Instead of having companies like Ford and IBM — firms that have striven to improve conditions in the country via the Sullivan principles — U.S. influence will become nil.

The Anti-Apartheid Support Group claims that by divesting we are helping to free black South Africa. Ironically, there can be no doubt that divestment would hurt blacks. Unemployment would put tens of thousands of blacks into dire economic straits. Especially hurt would be blacks in management positions, hired by liberal American companies. Their chances of

finding employment would be severely curtailed as the Afrikaners take over capital left behind.

Aside from the economic issues, how do black South Africans themselves feel about divestment? We Americans have been assured by Maki Mandela, daughter of jailed apartheid protestor Nelson Mandela, and others that black South Africans are ready to make the necessary sacrifices for divestment. We question this willingness when blacks participating in the revolution must be "encouraged" by the African National Congress with methods including terrorism. Winnie Mandela, Nelson's wife, has said, "We will win the revolution with our necklaces and limpet mines," and her husband, president of the ANC, is not even recognized by Amnesty International due to his human rights violations.

According to an August 1984 survey conducted by Lawrence Schlemmer, a noted critic of the South African government, blacks in South Africa oppose divestment by a 3-to-1 margin. Also, Zulu leader Mangosuthu Buthelezi, who represents 30 percent of black South Africans, says, "Enlightened investment in South Africa strengthens the forces working for change. Those who call for disinvestment do so in direct opposition to black sentiment in South Africa."

Apart from all these factors (which basically concern only South Africa), what

are some of the effects that would be felt here in the United States? The first would be loss of employment for thousands of Americans. More importantly, South Africa possesses raw minerals such as chromium and diamonds that the United States would have difficulty procuring elsewhere.

Finally, there's the question of Americans with stock holdings in South Africa. Why should they be expected to divest from South Africa and undergo the resulting economic loss for a policy that would be a complete copout?

On Oct. 15, Student Congress voted to call on the UNC Endowment Board to divest totally from all companies doing business in South Africa. While the symbolic gesture of showing student abhorrence of apartheid by divesting is undeniable, it would behoove our government rather to find methods of increasing our influence in that embattled country, rather than lessening it.

Students stand to lose by divestment, but not just in terms of smaller grants, smaller loans and fewer teachers. We stand to lose because by divesting, we are washing our hands of the entire situation and saying "solve your problems yourself," while we should be fulfilling our moral obligation of trying to work for peaceful change in South Africa. Divestment can only lead to increased tension between blacks and whites, and a worsening of the situation, rather than the transition to democracy that everyone desires.

William Loeffler is a senior economics major from Charlotte. Lori Taylor is a senior senior political science major from Charlotte.

True gentlemen

To the editor:

I find it ironic and a great source of amusement that one of the weakest arguments I have ever read in the Tar Heel Forum ("No reply at all," Nov. 12) contained the following statement from Amber Pratt: "I don't foresee any possible refutations — but I do invite them."

Pratt, with her vast knowledge of life as a sophomore, has made the gross generalization that the majority of men on our campus "openly and obviously" perpetrate the "love-them-and-leave-them" syndrome. I beg to differ. The author estimates that 80 percent to 90 percent of these men, after taking a lady out and using her, will never call back.

What kind of bars and parties does Pratt attend? What of her self-image? Is she not in control of her own destiny? I'm in control of mine. I've met several sensitive and intelligent men and have gone on to have fulfilling relationships.

My point is this: If you are in a situation where men use you and don't call back, then it is your fault — not the big bad world's — as you are an adult and responsible for your own actions. And please don't attribute your whining, whimpering, immature attitude to the gentlemen of this fine institution.

KELLI SMITH-ENGLISH
 Junior English

Misguided attack

To the editor:

Michael Broyles, I am intrigued as to how your Nov. 14 letter ("Another level") can take one hypothetical social gathering out of Amber Pratt's letter and distort the entire letter. I have witnessed and experienced many similar occurrences such as the one Pratt depicted. Your response to her letter consists of name



calling, generalizing and illogical ideas.

You cannot assume that all women who socialize at bars are "barflies." You also cannot generalize that all bar goers are not engaged in other activities you mentioned, such as church and political meetings. I myself have seen many campus leaders in these bars and this has not lowered my opinions of them. You are attacking the writer instead of the institution.

Secondly, I feel your entire concept of a social gathering is biased against bars. True, people can meet in the Union, in class and the library. But let's be realistic — how many individuals go to these places with the idea to try to encounter new relationships? Personally, I go to the library to study and to class to learn, and then to the Union only in passing for a quick call or snack.

When most people socialize, I would bet that the majority first consider a party or bar scene, instead of a political or religious meeting as you suggested. I also do not think they consider them-

selves to be looking in "the bottom of sewage pools" to meet people.

Heaven forbid, I must admit I not only go to bars but I also like others I have met in bars. I would even estimate that, until the recent change in the drinking age, over half of the UNC student body "slithered" into bars.

If an employee agrees to take a polygraph prior to employment and later refuses, he or she may well have waived any rights to an invasion of privacy claim. However, those denied employment for refusing the test, or employees suddenly confronted with test demands, should seek legal advice. There are serious questions about the validity of the test.

As Nixon may have guessed, if you have the hell scared out of you, you just might experience an aberrational respiratory rate, blood pressure and Galvanic skin response. And when that happens, you might as well say goodbye to that "presumption of innocence" we so dearly cherish.

DOROTHY BERNHOLZ
 Director
 Student Legal Services

Invalid tests

To the editor:

This letter is in response to the Nov. 10 article ("Lie detector use may rise, experts say") in which a private employer notes that it was very rare for employees to refuse to take a polygraph test and extremely rare for a legal action to be taken. The coercive nature of this abusive testing practice is best illustrated by a statement

Double-strapping double comfort

Frances Turner
 Guest Writer

If you are not cool, stop right here. Don't read any further. What I, Frances Turner, known non-conformist, am about to tell you is the secret to the '80s, the key to continue being as cool as you are.

But this is privileged information. Not for the athletes who carry briefcases. Not for the prima donnas who carry those obnoxious African bags, and certainly not for the freshman who just takes his notebook to class. This information is strictly for cool people. It's a concept brought about by the same people who steer their bikes by the seat when walking.

The secret? It's your bookbag, and the key is to wear it not over one shoulder but (GASP!) over both shoulders.

I, too, was a one-strap lady for two long years and chastised those who wore their backpacks over both shoulders. (They looked so silly!) My freshman year, I had the world's biggest crush on a gorgeous guy but he was like most men — he had a deadly fault. Yes, he was one of THEM. He was . . . he was . . . he was a double-strapper.

I couldn't bear to tell him how ridiculous he looked — that's like trying to tell someone he has lettuce in his teeth. It just wouldn't be cool. A few weeks ago, I thought I had a new crush, a great guy in my religion class,

but I was astonished to find he wore his backpack across both shoulders. HORROR!

As if that weren't enough, I recently passed another friend of mine, a fraternity boy, who was doing the same thing. Stop the world! Did I miss something? Suddenly I realized it was my destiny to tell all the cool people about the new thing.

These two demi-gods had shown me the light and sent me as the first disciple to spread the word that cool people should carry their backpacks over two shoulders.

OK, OK. Enough of my personal experiences — let's get to the real nitty-gritty. The real reason why two straps ARE better than one: Everyone on campus is "Busy." That's the most popular response to "How are you?" How often do you stop to smell the roses (besides at Morehead Planetarium)? Well, here's your answer. I know putting that extra strap on and off takes

time, but those precious extra moments could allow you a little procrastination time so that you can scope out the 250 people in your econ class. Maybe you'll catch the eye of that cute blonde in pink. It works the same way as you're leaving — a little more time to ask that special someone to the all-campus this weekend.

As for comfort, you must agree that the bag was actually intended to be carried with both straps and therefore MUST be the most comfortable worn in that way. How many times a day do you switch shoulders because your 789-page history book is so heavy? This alone could be the reason, but remember how cool you'll look, too.

In addition to comfort, you get freedom as a reward. You have both hands free to carry your Diet Coke or to read *The Daily Tar Heel* or to hug your crush in the Pit.

To wear your backpack over both shoulders is to contribute to your non-conformist understanding of what it means to be cool. Not only is it practical, but it is THE thing to do; so take that extra moment, put on that other strap. But hey, don't everybody do it — just the cool people.

Frances Turner is a junior psychology major from Wytheville, Va.