

# 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

### Divest now, UNC

The shanty now occupying the peaceful promenade by South Building is a blight to the beauty of the University. Passersby — students as well as administrators — are rightfully disgusted by its presence.

Yet, at the same time, they should be aware of the irony presented by the structure's presence: the shanty, ugly as it is, serves a useful purpose and deserves to stand. It acts as a reminder of ugliness elsewhere in the world — the ugliness of apartheid in South Africa. Of course, the most heated objections involve the shanty's second purpose, to protest UNC's investments in companies doing business with South Africa.

And justifiably so. The UNC Endowment Board, overseer of the University's financial ventures, controls the fate of no less than \$102 million, 6 percent of which is tied to businesses with South African connections. Of course, discussions of what to do with those funds merits

lengthy debate.

UNC officials, however, have had more than enough time to debate the issue. They've had plenty of time to ponder two separate student referendums asking for divestment. They've seen the intractability of student protest. They've heard top administration officials — like Chancellor Christopher Fordham and Farris Womack, vice chancellor for business and finance — say the University should divest. They've heard recent testimony from major businesses who have severed ties to South Africa — General Motors, Coca-Cola, Warner Communications, Honeywell and, just Wednesday, Kodak.

And they've seen that ignoble community, Soweto, N.C., erected near South Building once more. Endowment Board members: In your meeting today, do something noble, something that will, in the end, make the real Soweto a better place. Vote to divest.

### Keep the frosh from playing

Dean Smith has advocated it for years. Most observers agree the transition from high school to college would be made much easier if it were implemented. Freshman ineligibility is the bandwagon on which everyone in college sports should be jumping.

Tuesday, six major college executives gave that bandwagon some much needed momentum. UNC Chancellor Christopher Fordham joined the heads of Miami (Fla.), Minnesota, Maryland, N.C. State and UCLA and submitted a resolution to the NCAA calling for an end to freshman eligibility in football and men's basketball.

"We believe that all freshmen should be given an opportunity," Fordham said, "to make the transition from high school to college or university without the extreme distractions of time, energy and attention required by varsity intercollegiate athletics in football and men's basketball."

The abolition of freshman eligibility is long overdue. Since 1973 — the first year freshmen could play on the varsity level — the academic performance of athletes has gone downhill. Last year's passage of Proposition 48, which made freshman eligibility contingent on a 2.0 grade point average and a SAT score of 700, sought to stem that decline. But the new rule is, at best, a stopgap solution.

The weak student is not the only

one who needs time to grow acclimated to a new environment. Even the best student may have problems adjusting to life away from home. For varsity athletes, those problems are accentuated by their sports' demands: long practices, missed classes because of travel and media pressure.

If freshman ineligibility is to work, then, the frosh should be allowed to practice with the varsity. But they should not travel with the team nor dress in uniform for games. Athletic excellence cannot come at the expense of the academic ideal that higher education is supposed to embody.

Removing eligibility from all freshmen — not merely those in revenue sports — may be desirable. But non-revenue athletes typically practice less and miss fewer classes due to travel. More importantly, they are not subject to the media scrutiny which football and basketball players face on a regular basis, scrutiny which intensifies the problems every athlete must confront.

Some frosh can handle the pressure. And yes, Michael Jordan was a freshman when he hit the game-winning jumper against Georgetown in the NCAA finals. But too much has been said about academic woes that cannot be shrugged off. It's time for the NCAA to stop talking and start doing.

### Help puffing pals kick butt (habit)

Today is the Great American Smokeout, a chance for any hapless sot who ever wanted to quit smoking to see the error of his ways. Throughout the day-long carnival, smokers will be bombarded with tips and subliminal messages designed to make quitting easier.

Failing that, the healthy ones will resort to scare tactics too bizarre to be detailed here. What? You want to hear them? Okay, we'll just wait for it to come back around on the guitar. Now then, according to staff reports, these concerned, anti-smoking citizens will deploy 27 8-by-10 color glossy photographs with circles and arrows and a paragraph on the back of each one, explaining how charred lungs can lead to death and other serious illnesses. Pretty sick, eh?

Pity the poor smoker today. For example, as you enjoy a therapeutic siesta in your favorite Davis smoking lounge (the ones with the best views), don't chastise the misfortunate soul who has the audacity to light one up on this most holy day. Instead, ease that misguided, perhaps uncaring individual toward enlightenment. Some suggestions, in case you feel your tact may escape you:

■ A smoker is a most hardy sort, meaning he will puff his way to perdition if he so chooses. Subtle tactics are called for. Gently bury his nose in a newspaper, where he can learn of today's festivities. If that doesn't work, enclose his head in a handy Glad bag — pardon, gas mask

### The Bottom Line

to prevent the smoke from reaching your fair nostrils.

■ You may encounter a smoker who is steadfastly and violently determined to ignore the Smoke-Out. In that case, more drastic measures may be necessary. One machination that should work is carrying several gallons of unleaded gasoli — terribly sorry, several gallons of water — to launch at the impolite smoker.

■ You should realize that after a bland cafeteria meal, a smoker can be seen frantically fumbling for a cigarette, pipe or joi — uh, pipe. A single, well-aimed splotch of Dud-Spuds should purge the urge to fire one up. If that doesn't work, this is your perfect chance to start the Great American Food Fight.

■ We should also warn you that after several hours of smoke-free lungs, smokers will do anything for a toke. In case your best friend offers you his Audi if you'll just let him go to the bathroom by himself, threaten to turn him in to the authorities as someone who should have his urine tested. He probably won't even flinch at that, and maybe only the 82nd Airborne could give him second thoughts. So if it's close to midnight anyway, just take the keys and forget about it. Hell, if it's worth it to him, it's worth it to you.

## Tar Heel Forum

### Iceland summit yields scant benefits

Griff Hathaway  
 Guest Writer

It has been a little more than a month since Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev met in a quaint little haunted house in Reykjavik, Iceland. Billed as a "get-together," Reykjavik was supposed to accomplish little more than a handshake agreement on INF missiles in Europe and a Christmas visit to the United States by jolly ol' Comrade Claus (and you wondered why Santa wears red!). But the best laid plans of commies and men . . . at any rate, what do we have to show from Reykjavik, besides learning how to spell the hardest capital city in the bloody world?

For starters, both sides have steadfastly refused to call it a summit — proving that, if hounded by the press, these two can behave equally ridiculously. After this sum . . . oops, "high-level contact," did Moscow or Washington continue a public dialogue on reducing the nuclear threat and thereby make the world a safer place to live? Of course not. Instead we get the superpower version of "diplomatic poker." You know, "I'll see those 25 expelled United Nations diplomats, and I'll raise you five more."

"Oh yeah? Well, I'll see your five and raise you 55! How 'bout them apples?"

"Yeah, well . . ." You get the picture. The upsetting thing about all this is how quickly each power has allowed a meaningful discussion on nuclear weapons to disintegrate into a verbal battle about who was really serious about eliminating the nuclear threat and who just wanted a sunbat. To have this happen so quickly after Reykjavik leads one to question the sincerity of both superpowers.

I believe both Reagan and Gorbachev really do want an arms control agreement of some kind — but apparently not at the price that the other is demanding.

An agreement on SDI may have been made easier by the Democrats' sweeping

victory in the U.S. Senate. Certainly they will not be as (dare I say it?) "liberal" in their funding of SDI; this will represent a slow-down in Star Wars research. Gorbachev might bite, although odds are he will simply let the SDI debate sit until Reagan leaves office, then try to deal.

As a visiting professor pointed out last week, the real reason the Kremlin fears SDI is not that it will work, but that it won't. If SDI was absolutely guaranteed to work, then the Soviets would know exactly what they were up against and could plan counter strategies accordingly. What worries Moscow is that America will unleash her superior technology in pursuit of SDI and fail, but God knows what those crazy Americans will come up with instead — leaving the Soviets off-balance and far behind. This is why Gorbachev has been so anxious to confine SDI to the laboratory for as long as possible.

Thus, the question is, should Reagan have accepted a deal with Gorbachev in Iceland? What's past is past, but keep in mind one thing: when Reagan bargains over U.S. missiles in Europe, he is speaking for NATO as well as America. To simply withdraw the Pershings and cruise missiles would leave the Warsaw Pact with a tremendous advantage in conventional firepower, a gap NATO must close if it wants to be viewed by Moscow as a serious deterrent to Soviet aggression. If one assumes Moscow will not be as accommodating with her conventional troops as she was with her SS-20s, then a lot of money will have to be spent upgrading and enlarging the existing NATO conventional forces.

And considering the public's present mood on American dollars spent to foot European defense bills, I doubt any administration would be too keen on this type of scenario. As for the European community itself, coming up with the money for such an overhaul would only be the first of their problems. Therefore, without a major reduction in Warsaw Pact conventional forces along the Iron Curtain, it is entirely in the best interests to keep the Euromissiles in place.

Where does all this lead us — are the prospects for arms reduction better now than before Reykjavik? Well, if nothing else, Reykjavik gave both sides new and bold proposals which negotiators can argue about. As for future agreements, I don't see much happening as long as Reagan clings so tightly to SDI. I think Gorbachev will simply hold out until 1989, currying favorable world opinion and try to increase Moscow's bargaining leverage as Washington wanes during Reagan's lame duck period.

The Soviets have recently proposed high-level meetings for each side's negotiating teams to be held in December and January, the latter one in Moscow. Look for the United States to accept these invitations, but it already appears as though neither side is planning to make these into anything more than publicity photo sessions. That's too bad, because it seemed that after the near-miss in Reykjavik, both Moscow and Washington were finally moving in the right direction.

Unfortunately, it looks like the "almost club" of horseshoes and hand grenades does not include nuclear arms agreements.

Griff Hathaway is a senior political science major from Charlotte.

### Credibility lapse

To the editor:

There is cause for journalistic embarrassment in regard to the Nov. 14 article, "Organization petitions for Rev. Moon." The first example is sensationalism through a misleading headline, and other examples show journalistic sloppiness through inaccurate information.

In reference to the headline, CAUSA is petitioning for education about the fallacies of atheistic Marxist-Leninism, support for a theistic world view as an antidote and for moral values to be expressed in society to make the United States and the world a better place to live. CAUSA is not petitioning to theologically or financially support the Rev. Sun Myung Moon and the Unification Church.

Second, to quote the story: "The church preaches that Moon is the sole, true god who will reign on earth after the Apocalypse." Where did writer Jo Fleischer obtain this information? The church does not preach, people do. Who told Fleischer that this was Unification theology — a Unificationist or some little voice in his own mind? Moon does not teach that he is God, nor is this stated in Unification Church teachings.

Thirdly, "the church" is not going to send petition-signers educational literature about CAUSA. CAUSA is sending them information about CAUSA. For the sake of credible journalism, please check your facts. I checked mine with Ian Hayercroft, the national CAUSA representative in New York, and with Ron Papalardo, leader of the North Carolina Unification Church.

PAM PUMPHREY  
 Graduate  
 Evening College

Editor's note: CAUSA was founded by Moon and mirrors his staunch anti-communist beliefs. The statement that the church would mail CAUSA literature was a copyediting change from the original text, as stated in a correction in Wednesday's issue. Otherwise, The Daily Tar Heel stands behind the story.

### Funding waits

To the editor:

Look up, students! There is a new student organization on campus. We are based solely upon our abnormal sexual practices. We are a minority. We are also oppressed and ridiculed because our lifestyles flow against the tide of prevailing societal norms. No, we are not a new version of the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association. We are the UNC Straights Who Wait Association.

Our organization consists of heterosexuals who have decided to postpone their involvement in sexual relations until they are married to the person with whom they have fallen in love, having consecrated this relationship with



Order of Lenin



Disorder of Lenin

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.

### Lie detectors no test of honesty, moral character

To the editor:

In the Daily Tar Heel on Nov. 10, I came upon an article on the rising use of lie detector tests by employers in the private sector ("Lie detector use may rise, experts say"). Immediately this article evoked bad memories of my own experience with a polygraph test.

I was a senior in high school trying to make a little money by finding an after-school job. The manager was ready to hire me but told me to take a lie detector test first. I agreed, thinking it was no big deal, that I had nothing to hide. I failed my polygraph test, not because I lied, but because of extreme intimidation from the person questioning me and the test itself.

My interviewer interrogated me as if I had committed some crime. Not only did he strap me in a chair with wires

wrapped around me and attached to my hands, but he made me face the wall and keep my eyes closed during the questioning. I was berated for accidentally opening my eyes and made to retake the test. After repeatedly going through the same questions, my interviewer finally informed me in a satisfied tone that I had failed the polygraph test. Later, he called my future employer and reported that I had stolen such and such amount of money from my previous employer!

I felt humiliated by the nature of the polygraph test itself, but to be wrongly accused of lying and stealing was too much. Thanks to an understanding manager and several good recommendations from other employers, I was given the job, despite the test results. I resolved never again

to submit myself to a lie detector test, even if it meant foregoing a promising job.

As the article stated, . . . under optimal conditions the accuracy of the polygraph test was between 85 and 95 percent, assuming that a properly qualified person ran the machine. What happens to those in that 5 to 15 percent range who are unjustly accused of lying? Having failed the test, how could I have argued without looking ridiculous?

The next time you can voice your opinion on the issue of lie detectors in the private sector, please think of the human side. Do you really think a machine can accurately tell us someone is honest or dishonest?

LAURA LINE  
 Junior  
 Political Science/  
 Russian Studies

### Take a walk

To the editor:

I am puzzled by the problem athletes have in getting to Ehringhaus Dorm for lunch. I assumed our athletes spend hours maintaining their physical fitness, yet they seem unable to walk or take the bus.

The University shuttle runs every 10 minutes around lunchtime. Could an athlete explain the need to drive? My time is also valuable, and my research will contribute to UNC's reputation, but I get around campus without help. In fact, at times, I've been unable to park at Venable Hall (where I do research) on football Saturdays.

ANDI WEISS BARTCZAK  
 Graduate  
 Environmental Studies

RICK SPARGO  
 Senior  
 ADJU/Political Science  
 LORI TAYLOR  
 Senior  
 Political Science