

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editors

STUART TONKINSON
Managing Editor
BEN PERKOWSKI
Associate Editor
DICK ANDERSON
Associate Editor
JANET OLSON
University Editor
JAMI WHITE
News Editor
ANDY TRINCIA
State and National Editor

LORETTA GRANTHAM
City Editor
MARK POWELL
Business Editor
LEE ROBERTS
Sports Editor
FRANK BRUNI
Arts Editor
SHARON SHERIDAN
Features Editor
LARRY CHILDRESS
Photo Editor

Giving up smoking

Saving lives usually costs money. Medical research, anti-pollution devices, municipal fire departments — these are some of the many expensive investments our society makes to protect its citizenry. Today Congress and President Reagan have a chance to save both lives and dollars. The federal excise tax on cigarettes is to drop from 16 cents to 8 cents a pack tonight, adding at least \$1.5 billion to the budget deficit unless a temporary extension bill can be passed by both houses and signed by the president before midnight. Not only this bill should be passed, but also a proposal doubling the tax to 32 cents a pack.

Sen. Jesse Helms supports the temporary extension bill, which would postpone the tax cut until Nov. 15. No, he has not forgotten North Carolina's share of the nation's \$80-billion-a-year tobacco industry. But a deal has been made securing the support of tobacco-state senators for an extension of the cigarette tax in exchange for more tobacco production subsidies. Moreover, 17 states have passed legislation which will raise state taxes on cigarettes by 8 cents the moment federal taxes go down. Fewer than half of these states included clauses repealing the higher state taxes if the federal tax later goes back up again. Helms, aware of strong congressional support for high cigarette taxes, doesn't want to take the chance that he would be able to keep the tax at 8 cents.

With the support of both non-smokers and the tobacco states, the extension bill should become law today. But it is not enough. With the country's tobacco-induced medical bills running at \$14 billion a year, Sen. John Chafee's suggestion of a 32 cent tax is a good one.

Opponents of higher cigarette taxes use two arguments. First, they say that most human activities involve at least some risk and that cars may as well be taxed to discourage auto accidents. Second, while cigarettes may be lethal, they are important to the state of North

Carolina and create needed jobs at the expense of people who are only hurting themselves.

Cars can kill. But when driven in compliance with all traffic laws the risk is minimal and an important economic benefit, transportation, is gained. By requiring car drivers either to carry insurance or to pay a state fund for the compensation of those injured by the uninsured, we also recognize an important principle: financial responsibility should be borne by those who create the risk.

Cigarettes kill even when used correctly and produce no economic benefit. The health problems they create deprive the economy of man-years of lost work days and are treated with taxpayers' Medicaid dollars as well as by the extra medical insurance premiums smokers pay. For now, we all pay the price for the self-indulgence of a few. Half of Sen. Chafee's 32-cent tax would go to Medicare, thereby making smokers bear more of the responsibility for their actions.

North Carolina would lose jobs. The tobacco industry claims that raising the tax from 8 to 16 cents destroyed 12,500 jobs. A further tax hike would eliminate more jobs. But lives must come first, particularly when more lives than jobs are at stake. Smoking-related diseases kill one out of every four smokers two decades prematurely. A new study by Harvard's Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy found that raising the cigarette tax by 16 cents would persuade 3.5 million Americans to give up or never start smoking — and thereby prevent 850,000 early deaths.

Smoking is a preventable disease, an avoidable addiction. Cigarette taxes, which both discourage smoking and force smokers as a group to pay for their self-inflicted injuries, make economic sense and deprive no one of his rights. Higher cigarette taxes make money and save lives at the same time — and you can't find a better bargain than that.

To the dth degree

Lone Justice and mass media rights

If a picture is worth a thousand words, then maybe the lack of one is worth a column.

Readers — or at least editors — have come to expect "live" photographs with reviews of local concerts. But they were missing from Monday's Lone Justice review in *The Daily Tar Heel*. The band had forbidden the use of cameras, we were told.

Photography editor Larry Childress was concerned. He didn't like someone keeping one of his staff members from doing his job, and he wondered what the problem had been. Even superstar Eddie Murphy let photographers take pictures for the first few minutes of his UNC show, Childress said. Performers know free publicity when they see it, and they usually work out a compromise with press photographers to allow pictures without unduly disrupting the show.

Something else, however, bothered us both. We deemed the concert a public news event and felt that a line had been crossed, that someone was infringing on our right to cover news. It was no big deal in itself, but it rubbed us the wrong way.

A photojournalism textbook states: "You may take pictures in public places and on public property . . . You can photograph in the city-owned airport as well as in public areas of schools and universities." (Italics added.)

But provisions supplied by bands routinely restrict photographers, even in public university buildings such as Memorial Hall. Lone Justice manager Carlyn Major said the ban was meant to exclude amateur photographers — not the press — and she apologized for any misunderstanding at Memorial Hall.

Amateurs use flash throughout a concert, which disrupts performers, Major said. Amateurs also contribute to a market of bad pictures that could haunt and embarrass the band if it reaches stardom, she said.

"We're trying to avoid crummy pictures," Major said. "You see so much garbage of your artist that your artist just cringes."

The problem had gotten so out of hand for Lone Justice that East Coast clubs were "allowing everyone and their dogs to come in with cameras," she said.

A Memorial Hall spokesman said that if a photographer refused to leave an event in the hall when asked, his camera would be confiscated. If the photographer resists, he'll be thrown out, the spokesman said.

Such actions on the part of band and Memorial Hall management may be understandable. They also are avoidable, if clearance is secured beforehand; the failure to do this apparently caused the misunderstanding with Lone Justice, as one group dealing with the concert gave permission to our photographer while those in charge knew nothing about it. And they're certainly beatable, by tricks photojournalists have practiced to take and save their photographs.

But, considering the textbook's statement, are the restrictions against taking pictures legal?

Yes, said Ruth Walden, an assistant professor who teaches mass media law in the UNC School of Journalism. "When you get in the situation of a tickets-only concert, it no longer has that public aura," she said. ". . . I can't think of anything that would be illegal about that action on their part."

When attending a "private invitation only" event such as a concert, or even a classroom lecture, even in a public building, "you agree to abide by whatever rules had been set down," Walden said.

The textbook, she said, probably was dealing with an invasion of privacy question. A photographer walking down a Franklin Street sidewalk, for example, could take a picture through the Burger King window — or of anything else he sees — and be able to print it.

The right to confiscate cameras in Memorial Hall is less clear than the right to ban cameras by contract, however. "That's an interesting question — whether they'd be within their power to do that," Walden said.

As it was, the problem with the Lone Justice concert was just a misunderstanding, and we don't expect it will happen again.

Now, I suppose, Larry and I will just have to lay our hackles to rest. (At least until it's time to continue the fight for signed editorials, that is.)

— DAVE SCHMIDT

To the editors:

I would like to clarify numerous glaring and potentially dangerous misinformation included in the article "Local groups teach self-defense," (Sept. 26). I am an instructor with a group that has been teaching self-defense full-time to women in the Triangle area and the Southeast for seven years. Contrary to what was stated in the article, women can and do learn a great deal in a self-defense course if that course is designed correctly and well taught. I feel it is a misservice to teach a self-defense course to women that the instructor say will most likely not be effective, especially without daily training.

UNC policy needs examination

To the editors:

As Jewish students at UNC, we are concerned with a lack of policy on a certain issue.

We feel that it is a total disregard of our religious beliefs that exams may be (and frequently are) scheduled on the holiest days of the Jewish year — Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. We are not asking for a school holiday, but consideration of the fact that these are days when people of our faith spend worshipping rather than studying. In fact, the High Holy Days are a time for family, much as Christmas and Easter are for Christians, and many members of the Jewish community go home on these holidays. For the University to allow exams to be scheduled on these days shows a total lack of sensitivity.

This is a case where ignorance is

Editorial glaringly moronic

To the editors:

The editorial concerning Afghanistan ("Genuine freedom fighters," Sept. 26) offers a method of reasoning that is surprisingly dangerous and narrow. While I am not about to condone the actions of the Soviet Union, I couldn't help but notice the glaringly moronic assertions made in the editorial.

You admit that not all freedom fighters are "white knights," but add that those in Afghanistan are genuine and merit our support. You assert this even as you admit that we know absolutely nothing about these guys, who they are, or what they have done. You back up your assertion, not with evidence about the so-called "freedom fighters" but

with a long list of Soviet atrocities. Is every group that the Soviet Union attacks suddenly worthy of our blind support? The little I've heard about the Afghan rebels indicates that they also are guilty of brutal and blind atrocities. It's my opinion that your narrow, reactionary approach to this problem is not only stupid, it puts us all in danger of supporting another Shah, Samoza or Botha, thus making us perpetrators of the very atrocities we are attempting to eliminate. This logic, though popular right now, is insane, and I don't buy it at all!

Bruce Kallor
Alexander
Eric K. Englehardt
Alan Germain
Teague
Randy Dean
Chapel Hill

Toby Gray
Winston

BCC one step forward in ending segregation

To the editors:

In response to Philip Thomas' letter "BSM should bury its holier-than-thou attitude" (Sept. 25), I would like to point out that the Black Student Movement does not say they need a Black Cultural Center, but the Office of Student Affairs and some education-minded students decided two years ago that the University needs such a facility. This correction ran as a "for the record" on Sept. 23. This center would benefit not just black students but all students who are

interested in preserving and understanding an important part of our history and culture.

Unfortunately, blacks do not share a "common heritage" with whites and Thomas' obvious ignorance of this fact strengthens the argument for the formation of the BCC. Black culture is indeed a unique and important segment of American society and every effort should be made to preserve and perpetuate its existence.

When Thomas says that the British students are not demanding

a British Cultural Center, he forgets that they have the International Center that serves a similar purpose and takes up as much, if not more, space than the Fastbreak area. Also, at this point, we have many more black students than British students, but if black enrollment continues to decline, this might not be the case. Then, Thomas, you will not have to worry about "angry young blacks," but angry Justice Department officials.

Because of ignorance and misunderstanding, segregation is a sad

reality on this campus and the Black Cultural Center will make progress towards eliminating this flaw in our society. However, for it to be an effective service a central location and easy access are essential. The Fastbreak area of the Student Union meets both of these requirements and, as a white student, I fully support using this space for what I consider a worthwhile, if not vital project.

Thomas Mills
Chapel Hill

UNC students must register their concerns

To the editors:

Everyone loves to complain about government. It seems to be a natural pastime, but historically precious few people exercise their option when it counts most — on election day. During last year's presidential campaign the Rev. Jesse Jackson led a noble effort to register voters so that people everywhere could participate in that most fundamental of policy decisions — who will run the government.

We possess the same power now in the Chapel Hill elections. No one can deny that the decisions the town makes affects each of us, so, why don't more people participate? Register and vote in the Chapel Hill elections!

Do you want your opinion to matter on issues such as Rosemary Square, traffic congestion, ecology and building policy — issues that affect each of us every day? Don't cut off your own political power. Register and vote!

To register in Chapel Hill you need only do two things. First, you must believe that you are a Chapel Hill resident. What the University says with regard to your in- or out-of-state residence doesn't matter. If your way of life in Chapel Hill matters to you, then you're a resident. Second, bring a document with your address on it (a letter or bill will do) to either the Municipal Building on Airport Road or the Carboro Fire Station between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. weekdays, or the

Chapel Hill Public Library on Franklin Street, open seven days a week from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. Registration ends Oct. 7. Elections are Nov. 5.

Please don't procrastinate. By voting, you express how you want to be governed. That is your power. Use it!

Todd Hart
Student Government

And if you're still not convinced . . .

To the editors:

I am surprised that the *DTH* has paid so little attention to the subject of voter registration. Any student who considers himself an Orange County resident, regardless of

whether he is considered a resident by the University, may register to vote at any of several area locations. International politics may not be your thing, but certainly public safety and transportation, water and the Rosemary Square issue — the things that have a direct effect on the citizens of Orange County — are worth voting about.

If you've moved since the last time you registered, all you have to fill out is a simple change-of-address form.

To avoid long lines, don't wait until the last day to register — Oct. 7. Don't take our democratic system for granted. Register to vote.

Janet Dickman
Chapel Hill

Lowering eligibility is a lousy proposition

By ERIC STEM

Last month, the National Collegiate Athletic Association Special Committee on Academic Standards approved an "eligibility index" that would combine the previously adopted Proposition 48 to determine freshman athletic eligibility. The proposition, as it stands, requires freshmen in Division I institutions to have a combined SAT score of no less than 700 and a minimum grade point average of 2.0 in English, history, math and science to participate in a varsity sport. The "eligibility index" alters this ruling and combines the SAT score and a multiple of the GPA to arrive at the index score ("BOG opposes standards for freshman eligibility," Sept. 16). Since this index would weaken Proposition 48 considerably, the NCAA should perpetuate the present Proposition 48 if they are to achieve a functional and consistent system of evaluating an athlete's academic performance before allowing him to participate in a varsity sport.

If the new index is implemented, academic standards for freshmen athletes would be greatly reduced. An athlete's GPA would be multiplied by 400 and then added to his SAT score to arrive at his index score. Although the minimum eligible

index score is 1500, this would allow an athlete to have the minimum SAT score of 400 and a C-plus average (2.75) and still be eligible to participate in a varsity sport. Such leniency would result in tenuous eligibility standards.

Moreover, having concurrent academic and athletic obligations can have a detrimental effect on an athlete's performance in both areas. An athlete who wishes to play a varsity sport should be of the academic standing that would allow such added demands. Athletes and coaches must remember that athletics are extracurricular activities and therefore subordinate to academics.

Most importantly, the founding principles of a university are to provide the highest quality education possible. Oftentimes, this fact seems to be forgotten by college sports enthusiasts who believe that the primary goal is to produce a winning team. Accordingly, some athletes look at college as another stepping stone to professional athletics. Even the athletes should realize the importance of an education.

Advocates of the eligibility index argue that the academic standards for freshmen should not be so rigorous. In having lenient academic requirements, it is possible to recruit better players for the teams. However, a university must maintain its academic standards without exception. Lowered academic requirements could lead

to preferential admissions to freshmen who play sports. Others contend that, without the index, talented athletes with low SATs and GPAs would not gain admission and therefore could not benefit from an education or have the opportunity to refine their athletic skills. It must be remembered, though, that there is a wide variety of colleges and universities that accommodate a broad spectrum of students. An athlete low in academic proficiency should attend a college that has a curriculum that suits him academically and then participate athletically at this institution. If an athlete wishes to develop his athletic abilities, he also has the alternative of participating in intramural sports instead of taking on the burden of a varsity sport. An athlete should not attend a university he finds academically unsuitable because it has better athletic teams and programs.

If the NCAA is to attain a practical and uniform procedure of academic evolution, they should maintain the present Proposition 48 and repeal the "eligibility index." Proposition 48 offers a sound foundation for the evaluation of the academic competence of athletes. Such regulation would ensure that academics remain the primary concern of college life.

Eric Stem lives in Winston-Salem.

READER FORUM

Self-defense courses shouldn't intimidate women

any size differential that may be present. I know because I have talked to women who have done just that. But don't take my word, read the several national government financed studies that have shown that women who resist attackers are more likely to get out of the situation than those who don't. Most importantly they don't increase their chances of serious injury by resisting.

It is often difficult for martial arts instructors to make the transition to self-defense instructors because they are accustomed to the slow evolution of changes inherent in the martial arts. Karate, judo and kung-fu are fighting arts that require long-

term commitment to perfect. Self-defense is a repertoire of skills — verbal, mental and, yes, even physical techniques and attitudes that any woman, child or man can learn to develop and adapt to their own needs.

My experience in teaching self-defense has taught me that women can learn to be powerful physically and mentally. But it is important that we be given correct information, effective instruction and an opportunity to break through our socialization of being victims.

Beth Seigler
Instructor,
Triangle Women's Karate Assn.

