

The Daily Tar Heel
84th Year of Editorial Freedom

Greg Porter
Editor

Joni Peters, Managing Editor
Ed Rankin, Associate Editor
Lou Bilonis, Associate Editor

Laura Scism, University Editor
Elliott Potter, City & State Editor
Chuck Alston, National Editor

Jack Greenspan, Features Editor
Jeanne Newsom, Arts Editor
Gene Upchurch, Sports Editor
Rouse Wilson, Photography Editor

Eaten up by inflation A slow, excruciating death

The idea is about as unpopular as raising taxes—in fact that's practically what it is—but there may be little other choice. If Carolina students want to maintain the services and the opportunities for group involvement they are accustomed to, they better think about voting to raise student fees.

Student fees haven't increased since Eisenhower was laying his hat in the White House 20 years ago. As in the fifties, students are still paying only \$7 (graduate) and \$9 (undergraduate) for a newspaper, an annual, Union activities, student government, several magazines, clubs, counseling services—dozens of organizations. And as all of us who drink coffee know, today's dollar won't go nearly so far as it did in The Happy Days.

For instance, printing costs, which make up a great deal of the student budget, have more than doubled since the fifties. The printing of the *Daily Tar Heel* will go up several thousand dollars this year because of the increased newsprint costs.

The inadequacy of student revenues came into stark evidence at last week's Campus Governing Council budget meetings. Publication after publication made plea after plea for more money—and many ended up fighting for their lives.

One reason this year's budget was so tight is the addition of the \$15,000 item for Student Legal Services, an organization in its first year of CGC funding. SLS is no doubt a worthy service, but its addition serves to remind us of the need for a student fee increase. It is self-defeating to expand services if revenue is not also increased.

There was not enough money for the current budget to cover last year's total sum plus inflationary increases, much less to add expenditures.

For student fees to be increased, two-thirds of the student body must approve in a referendum. This seems an impossible goal since it's hard to get even one-quarter of the student body out to vote for its own officials.

Still, the students should have the opportunity to vote on the matter before campus publications and services die a slow, excruciating death. If student services are to remain at a minimal level, fees must increase automatically with inflation. And if services are ever to be expanded, students must find the time to endorse such a move with thousands of votes.

The Daily Tar Heel

publishes Monday through Friday during the academic year. Offices are at the Student Union Building, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Telephone numbers: 933-0245, 0246, 0252.

News: Keith Hollar, assistant editor; Mark Andrews, Shannon Brennan, Jeff Cohen, Jeff Collins, Shelley Droscher, Bruce Ellis, Mary Gardner, Tony Gunn, Michel Habit, Kathy Hart, Nancy Hartis, Charlene Hamner, Chip Highsmith, Steve Huettel, Jaci Hughes, Jill Jennings, Will Jones, Mark Lazenby, Eddie Marks, Amy McCary, Karen Millers, Beverly Mills, Linda Morris, Beth Parsons, Chip Pearsall, Bernie Ransbottom, Mary Anne Rhyne, Leslie Scism, Barry Smith, David Stacks, Elizabeth Swearingen, Robert Thomson, Patti Tush, Merton Vance, Mike Wade, Tom Watkins and David Walters.

News Desk: Ben Cornelius, assistant managing editor; Copy editors: Richard Barron, Beth Blake, Vicky Daniels, Robert Fekke, Toni Gilbert, Newell Highsmith, Alan Murray, Paul Needle, Katherine Oakley, Karen Oates, Evelyn Sahr, Karen Southern, Melinda Stovall, Larry Tupler and Ken Williamson. **Campus Calendar:** Jan Parker. **Editorial assistants:** Robin McWilliam and Steve Perry.

Sports: Lee Pace, assistant editor; Evan Appel, Kevin Barris, Dede Biles, Skip Foreman, Tod Hughes, David Kirk, Pete Mitchell, Joe Morgan, Ken Roberts, Rick Scoppe, David Squires, Will Wilson and Isabel Worthy. **Features:** Laurie Baker, Bob Brueckner, Sara Bullard, Buddy Bultman, Peter Hapke, Carolyn Jack, Deborah Moses, Susan Reed, Steven Shrader, Tim Smith, Valerie Van Arsdale and Ellen Welles.

Arts and Entertainment: Tenley Ayers, Assistant Editor; Hank Baker, Pam Belding, Chip Ennsin, Bessie Graves, Marianne Hansen, Jeff Hoffman, Bill Kruck, Libby Lewis and Michael McFee. **Kaleidoscope:** Melissa Swicegood.

Graphic Arts: Cartoonists: Allen Edwards and Lee Poole. Photographers: Bruce Clarke, Allen Jernigan, Bill Russ and Joseph Thomas. Illustrations: Jeff Keleher.

Business: Verna Taylor, business manager; Lisa Bradley, bookkeeper; Debbie Rogers and Nancy Sylvia, clerks; Liz Huskey, receptionist coordinator; Tom Rawls, Mac Duncan, Lisa Watson, Priscilla Ellis, Michelle Mitchell, Jan Parker, Leslie Chilton, Karen Honeytuffel, Dan Nobles. **Subscription manager:** David Rights.

Advertising: Philip Atkins, manager; Dan Collins, sales manager; Steve Crowell, classifieds manager; Carol Besdoe, Ann Clarke, Julie Coston, Cynthia Lesley, Anne Sherrill and Melanie Stokes.

Composition Editors: Frank Moore and Reid Tuvim. **Circulation Managers:** Tim Bryan, Kevin Campbell, Pat Dixon and Bert Felt.

DTH Composing Room—Managed by UNC Printing—Mary Ellen Seate, supervisor; Jeffrey Loomis and Robert Streeter, typesetters. **Ad layout:** Evelyn Sahr. **Composition:** Ada Boone, Wendell Clapp, Marcia Decker, Judy Dunn, Milton Fields, Jim Grimsley, Carolyn Kuhn and Steve Quakenbush.

The *Daily Tar Heel* is printed by Hinton Enterprises in Mebane, N.C.

letters to the editor

Self-defense an alternative in rape attempt

To the editor:

Ms. Canoles' articles present a rather simplistic view of rape prevention (*DTH* April 21 and 25) and, more importantly, a misleading concept about self-defense.

The article states that according to Fred Storaska "self-defense courses are not the most effective way to deal with rape." On the contrary, Storaska, a third degree black belt in karate, says that the martial arts is the best method of protection. However, few women make the time or commitment to learn a martial art.

Ms. Canoles continues saying a woman should use her imagination and wits, not her fists, to avoid rape. There is no doubt that a woman should keep her wits in such a situation and use her imagination; however, studies have shown that women who resist have a better chance of avoiding rape.

Between 1970 and 1972 there were 915 reported cases of sexual offenses in Denver, Colo. (including child molestation, rape attempts, rapes and exhibitionism). In 304 of the 915 cases, women successfully resisted a potential rape. Of these women, less than nine per cent sustained anything more serious than a cut or bruise.

It is too simple to say that a woman should resist, or she should not resist. We are dealing with human beings, who in such circumstances are not very predictable. There are cases where women have talked the assailant out of rape and other cases where the rapist has been provoked to more violent behavior.

Fred Storaska suggests that it is better first to try to talk the assailant out of rape. If this does not work then she should resist. In this way she has not made a commitment first which cannot be reversed. It would be very difficult to use self-defense techniques on a rapist and then try to talk him out of the act.

However, there are some women who may not be able to convincingly jump down on all fours and begin eating grass in order to deter an attacker. A woman must decide for herself whether or not she would be able to successfully carry out one of these charades. This is something that should be thought about before a situation arises.

For those women who do not feel they could be imaginative enough or who could not urinate or vomit on command, a self-defense course is an effective alternative to aimless struggle.

If a woman decides to actively defend herself, she must react with full conviction. However, as Storaska explains, it is sometimes better to go along with the assailant until the woman can react safely. But if she waits until he is ready to maim or kill her, she may have missed a chance to protect herself.

There are no hard and fast rules for the best way to react in a rape situation. It always depends on the particular situation and the particular people involved. However, a fundamental course in self-defense offers a woman several alternatives. She may try to talk the assailant out of the rape. If that does not work she can use a variety of effective techniques to protect herself and, if necessary, to control her assailant.

Sarina Grosswald
Instructor
Women's Self-Defense

Newest T-shirt?

To the editor:

Have you seen the hottest selling item lately? T-shirts. On the front you have a choice of two names, Avery or BSM. And on the back, printed in bold letters, is "I'm a bigot." So hurry on down and get one in either purple or gold or blue and gold. Limited supply.

Don Page
G-11 Royal Park Apts.

Taste treats, part two

To the editor:

I was appalled at reading Anne Beckwith's letter (*April 25*). Her narrow-minded

reading of our store's slogan show her own lack of liberation—not ours. If the world's best taste treat is oral sex, as Ms. Beckwith implies, then this slogan is equally sexist towards men. Our slogan is a result of a worldwide survey taken by our parent company to determine the world's best taste treat. Each country seemed to have its own favorite, but everyone responded that Blimpie's was second; hence our slogan. For myself, my mother's cooking is best, with Blimpie's a close second. I suggest Ms. Beckwith check with our employees to see if they think we are a sexist institution. If she continues to think of this slogan as only a sexist slur, I suggest she change her head and stop seeing affronts where they do not exist.

Jerry Doliner
Owner of Blimpie's in Chapel Hill

To the editor:

Perhaps men and women both will be able to see more clearly the harm that sexist advertising does us all if they look at a more extreme example of the problem than the Schlitz ads. I am referring to the T-shirts worn by the employees of Blimpie's which proclaim Blimpie's subs to be "the second best taste treat in the world." I won't insult anyone's intelligence by explaining what the world's best taste treat is.

I hope that men who have enough self-respect to think of themselves as something

more than "taste-treats" will stop patronizing Blimpie's until the employees stop wearing these T-shirts. Similarly, women with enough maturity to respect men as human beings should not support this business.

Men should not become complacent with the progress we've made as long as this kind of thing exists. What good will equal rights be if another generation of women—as well as men—is being conditioned to think of men as objects and not as people?

Doug Chapman
1420 Granville West

To the editor:

Regarding Anne Beckwith's letter (*April 25*), I feel that she has done Blimpie's a severe injustice. Having been at this University for four years and frequented Blimpie's as long, I have not once interpreted the slogan on the employee's shirts in such sexist terms. Granted, I am only one among thousands, but isn't Ms. Beckwith going a bit too far? Why don't we petition Blimpie's to change the shape of their sandwiches? Blimpie's was merely being modest in assuming the role of number two.

Fred Mertz

To the editor:

In Monday's *DTH* Ms. Beckwith implies

that since Blimpie subs profess to be "the world's second best taste treat," women must be the first. Hogwash on this so-called sexist advertising. It works two ways. I can assure you, Ms. Beckwith, that when I wear my Blimpie T-shirt, women are NOT the number one taste treat I have in mind...

Susan Moneypenny
660 Ehringhaus

Haiku

To the editor:

A Haiku
Dear Richard,
I'll honk again and
Blow kisses in the crosswalk
Three six eight three two

Diana

Support for WXYC

To the editor:

Although the decision has already been made, I would like to let the CGC know that I and (I'm sure) many others will be very upset if WXYC suffers any hardship because of the size of their appropriation. I, for one, will gladly urge that my student fees be spent on this fine radio station, and I will vote cheerfully for the opponents of those who oppose its funding.

Van Knowles
Chapel Hill



PTA oppressed?

To the editor:

A minority of this University is suffering at the hands of bigots—yes, bigots! I am talking about the bigotry expressed against a PTA delivery man en route to Avery Dorm. When approximately 15 feet from the side entrance, he was maliciously attacked and severely soaked by two water balloons. This attack was accompanied by obscenities directed at the PTA man such as "Go to hell, PTA!" Such action clearly indicates that, after being in Chapel Hill for five years, PTA delivery men are still being persecuted simply for being "different." Yet these bigots go nameless, having no catchy handle such as KKK, BSM, CGA, etc.; hence we call them Bigots Against PTA (BAPTA for short). It is shameful that BAPTA is allowed to remain upon this campus.

Don Moore
103-B Isley St.

Inhuman discrimination?

To the editor:

Regarding the article on becoming a policeman:

"Hilliard said many candidates are eliminated by the psychiatric test: 'It reveals if someone lies, if he has homosexual tendencies and if he's paranoid or sadistic.'"

To my knowledge there is no test that reveals whether or not a person has homosexual tendencies unless the person answers yes to a question like "Do you prefer sex with members of your own sex?" The police force must know something that psychologists don't. Further, I object to liars, sadists and paranoid people being included in the same category as homosexuals.

If a person can enjoy masturbating (not necessarily alone) and can enjoy oral sex with a member of the opposite sex, why is it so inconceivable that a person can enjoy oral sex with a member of the same sex AND still be a healthy, competent, normal and desirable person?

Thank you, Laurie Baker, for revealing another instance of inhuman and ignorant discrimination against a very large segment of the human race.

Carolyn Turbyfill
816 Granville East

Publications article enlightening

To the editor:

Leslie Scism's excellent article (*April 26*) was absolutely correct in its presentation of the problem student publications face with rising costs. The solution for the CGC, the publications and for everybody is a cost-of-living index for student fees. To give credit where credit is due, however, it was my successors, Jon Sasser and Mark Smith, who persuaded the CGC to increase *Cellar Door* appropriations to a workable level, and not myself as it was reported in the article.

John Russell
Editor, *Cellar Door*

U.S.-Soviet relations not the first priority in Carter foreign policy

By ROBIN DORFF

From the day Jimmy Carter became the 39th president, journalists, professors and political analysts have been busily engaged in the task of "figuring this man out." Looking back on the 1976 campaign it comes as no great surprise that so much attention is now focused on understanding this gentleman from Plains. His persistently vague and sometimes contradictory campaign statements contributed very little to what this country might expect once Carter took office.

The most recent controversy and questioning focus on the difficulties encountered in Moscow by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. After the rebuff of Vance's proposals by Soviet Party Leader Brezhnev and the subsequent harangue by Foreign Minister Gromyko, conservative politicians, former presidents, academic experts and many notable journalists quickly assumed that the fledgling President and his foreign policy staff had blundered ignominiously. Gerald Ford accused the administration of spouting "too much rhetoric" before, after and during the negotiations and of being far too optimistic. Other reports labeled the President naive and his staff incompetent: the former because of his supposed optimism, and the latter because of the way in which "obvious signals" were either missed, or misunderstood.

There are reasons to believe that this assessment of Vance's trip to Moscow is patently incorrect. The success or failure of the latest "Mission to Moscow" cannot as yet be determined because that assessment is

contingent upon the contributions which the policy makes toward the broader set of goals that the Carter administration has decided to pursue. I contend that to date, many assessments of this foreign policy have been based on a traditional set of goals which may no longer hold applicable.

No formal statements of the overall Carter foreign policy have as yet emerged, but indirect sources have pointed out its basic components. Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's national security adviser and one of the major architects of the new policy, has been a prolific writer during the last 10 years, and his work provides a basis for anticipating the policy. Brzezinski, a professor of political science at Columbia University, is considered by many to be the dominant influence on Carter's foreign policy thinking, even though Cyrus Vance was ultimately selected as Secretary of State.

Two of Brzezinski's writings, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era* and an article entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy: The Search for Focus" (*Foreign Affairs*, July 1973), outline his foreign policy views.

Brzezinski believes that the world has entered a fundamentally new era (the "technetronic age") in which a "society is shaped culturally, psychologically, socially and economically by the impact of technology and electronics." At the global level, international politics is characterized by economic, political and even social interdependence.

The technetronic age brings with it problems such as population control, resource management, development, environmental protection and many others.

In particular, the so-called Third World poses the various problems in the most obvious forms: how does the U.S. facilitate processes of modernization and development with one eye on redistributing global wealth while at the same time preserving commitments to social and political justice and equality.

According to Brzezinski, American foreign policy in the mid '70s must be imbued with a fundamentally new focus. There are three problems inherent in that focus: 1) that of security and dealing with the Communist world; 2) that of the less-developed countries; and 3) that of alliance relationships between advanced countries.

The first problem is little more than the traditional one of maintaining national security, with new twists like international terrorism and nuclear proliferation. The second problem concerns the question of aid to developing countries: what form should it take, and what kinds of institutions or mechanisms for dispersing that aid should be created. It is at this point that the third problem, alliance relationships, enters the picture. It is Brzezinski's belief that foreign aid must increasingly take the form of nonmilitary, "untied" (without political provisos), multilateral provisions for the tasks of development. The source of these provisions would be the trilateral alliance between the U.S., Western Europe and Japan.

But it is both the recognition of these problems and the elucidation of a foreign policy with which to tackle them that sets Brzezinski apart from his predecessors in the foreign-policy bureaucracy. The contrast with the Nixon-Kissinger approach to foreign policy is pronounced. For Carter's

predecessors, the problems of U.S.-Soviet-Chinese relations constituted the No. 1 priority.

Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy reflected both the basic concern with manipulating adversary relations as well as the U.S. penchant for unilateral action. The tendency for the U.S. to make important strategic decisions with little or no regard for the possible effect on allies contributed to a noticeable cooling off of U.S.-European relations.

Preoccupied with detente and its demands, the Nixon Administration paid little attention to newly emerging realities of developing nations, treating them as objects or spoils in the global superpower contest.

The approach originally outlined by Brzezinski does not sacrifice detente altogether; in fact it presumes that the minimum level (the limitation of strategic arms) U.S.-Soviet interdependence will necessitate further cooperation. Primary considerations, however, will go to fostering a substantial improvement of U.S.-European and U.S.-Japanese relations in the hopes of realizing a cooperative approach to the problems of the developing countries.

The implications of such a policy are numerous. First, it lays some basic groundwork for understanding Carter's public statements regarding human rights, particularly in the Soviet Union. If this fundamental commitment to human rights is to be an integral part of the Carter foreign policy, then there should be no reason to "pull any punches" with the Soviet Union for fear of upsetting the proverbial applecart. Moreover, it provides a point of departure for refocusing U.S. foreign aid efforts from the provision of largely military aid to more constructive development aid.

Second, the proposals concerning "substantial reductions" in strategic arms carried to Moscow by Vance may no longer appear quite so naive and incompetent. Unwilling to continue the game of simply creating the appearances of meaningful cooperation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in this area, Carter and his staff may have made the decision to see just how committed their Soviet counterparts are to reaching substantive limitations on the arms race.

In the long run the Vance proposals may yet serve their purpose of providing a starting point for further negotiations. In the meantime, they have set the tone for what promises to be a more open and certainly more controversial approach to U.S.-Soviet relations.

Other actions taken by Carter tend to support this interpretation. For example, the trilateralist emphasis seemed to underlie Carter's refusal to set quotas on the number of television imports from Japan. Instead, he requested voluntary limitations to be set by the Japanese themselves. This request elicited a quick and positive response by the Japanese, perhaps an indication that a period of mutual sacrifice and benefit may indeed be taking shape.

Whether President Carter and his staff can in fact succeed in developing and implementing a new U.S. foreign policy to deal effectively with the new and perhaps unique problems confronting both developed and developing nations is quite another story.

Much of the criticism leveled at President Carter during the past three weeks rests on the conventional wisdom that any sign of friction between the U.S. and the Soviet Union is per definition a failure. Those



Zbigniew Brzezinski

critics who consider Carter naive and optimistic would prefer still more symbolic accords between the two superpowers to a fundamental reorientation of U.S. policy. Such a view is locked too stringently in the past and fails to realize that while we deal with such problems as installing Coke machines in the Kremlin, much of the globe remains characterized by starvation, deprivation and revolution. The Brzezinski approach recognizes this fundamental requirement of a new foreign policy; many political analysts would do well to reassess their criteria for judging the success or failure of current U.S. foreign policy.

Robin Dorff is a graduate political science student from Chapel Hill.