

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor

ANJETTA McQUEEN
Production Editor
JANET OLSON
University Editor
JAMI WHITE
News Editor
JILL GERBER
State and National Editor
LORITTA GRANTHAM
City Editor

LORRY WILLIAMS
Business Editor
LEE ROBERTS
Sports Editor
ELIZABETH ELLEN
Arts Editor
MARYMELDA HALL
Features Editor
LARRY CHILDRESS
Photography Editor

TOM CAMP Back Page Editor

Face-to-forum

The campus election campaigns begin in earnest this week as the round of dorm and campuswide candidate forums gets under way. And yeah, yeah, it's an oldie, but - we're all for 'em.

There will be two forums a night tonight through Thursday and one more Sunday afternoon. Seven will be dorm forums, one will be for the whole campus, and the ninth will be the ever-volatile Black Student Movement forum. Please refer to the schedule printed inside on page 3.

Direct questioning of candidates is far more substantive than campaign fliers and posters and far more illuminating than statements and interviews printed in *The Daily Tar Heel*. Voters can ask questions about the particular issues that concern them — questions that might not always be discussed in the newspaper. They can make assessments of the candidates' ability to handle themselves under pressure, their articulation, their understanding of the positions they are seeking. More importantly, for one of the few times in the campaign, the candidates are assembled together and voters can measure them against one another.

Forums provide the main opportunity for this sort of face-to-face confrontation. Yet the past attendance record shows that they fall far short of fulfilling

Editorialist's column

Honorable disarmamentions

Another supposedly tough weekend of basketball passed for the Heels and the question you're all asking is, "What's going on in Russia these days. There were the peace talks, then Gorbachev got on the tube, and then shouts of Disarm! Disarm! like the Venus de Milo. But do they have mixers on Thursday nights too?" Here's the scoop.

MOCKBA, JAN. 23 (PU) — Soviet peoples are real people too, reports say. Just a few years ago, that darling little schoolgirl Samantha Smith wrote a letter to Yuri before he dropped off. She thought that maybe we could all be friends, and the whole thing charmed Soviet Leader Andropov to no end. He had her over for tea (she being too young for Smirnoff) and everyone liked her quite a lot. Bombs and blue jeans weren't the only thing Made in the U.S.A. Samantha seemed headed for a political career like no other, before her death in a plane crash last August.

But Sam has left a legacy. The Soviets think she was peachy-keen, the cutest little girl since Shirley Temple. And they're going nuts to honor her memory. So far, a diamond, a flower, a poem, a book and a street have been named for her. (And to think it took Liverpool over 10 years to honor the Fab Four with their own streets!) Now comes a Samantha stamp (CAMAHTA CMNT) worth five kopecks, or 7.5¢. Then there's this international friendship club and a museum in her memory, and 100 Soviet schools competing to be renamed for the little girl who didn't know what dancing had to do with politics. Show that to the Gipper.

Meanwhile, ABC is going on with a \$30-\$34 million mini-series called *Amerika*. According to this prime-time monodrama, those Moscow girls aren't knocking them out any more, and the Kremlin

fellows want to try some Jack Daniels. Just as a horse is a horse (of course, of course), the Soviets want to and have taken over America. The epic depicts life in these brave new etas unis.

ABC thought it over after the Soviet Foreign Minister informed its Moscow bureau chief that things could be made very difficult if the project were begun. Then Wednesday, ABC spokesman Brandon Stoddard stuck out his tongue and defended the "inherent dramatic quality of the material." Only financing, not peace talks, could disrupt ABC's intention to go through with the project, he said. Insiders report, though, that ABC's strong stance is in response to recent movie pirateering by the Soviets. An edited version of *Rambo*, portraying Americans as simply stupid, not anti-Soviet, has met with box-office success in Moscow.

Pirates also found success with a slightly edited version of *The Color Purple*, titled *The Color Red*. Only one line has been changed — "I think it pisses God off if you walk by the color red in a field somewhere and don't notice it." The Soviet news agency TASS reports this does not indicate a loosening of the restraint on religion. "It just means that if there is a God, we're damn sure He's a Leninist."

In other news, 22-year-old world chess champion Gary Kasparov accepted a rematch for next summer with arch-rival and scallywag Anatoly Karpov, who lost the title last fall. Both London and Leningrad have offered to host the rematch. Smith Center director Steve Camp said Chapel Hill had made no offer for the match because, "I just don't think the interest is there." So there you are.

— LOUIS CORRIGAN

To the dth degree

This is the way . . .

Dave explained last Monday why we chose many months ago not to endorse any candidate(s) for editorship of the *DTH*. We have also chosen not to endorse in the race for the presidency of the Carolina Athletic Association (incumbent Mark Pavao is running unopposed after a highly successful year). But the paper will be endorsing candidates in the remaining major races — for student body president and Resident Housing Association president.

A round robin of interviews will be carried out Saturday by the paper's news and editorial staff — comprising me and Dave, our editorial writers and each of the

desk editors named on the back-page masthead (see above). After completing the interviews, we'll discuss each candidate's platform and experience. And at last, each staffer present will cast an equal vote.

In fairness to all, the endorsements will weigh each candidate's merits and demerits, seeking to persuade readers through argumentation rather than through mere statements of support. Since there can be no perfect candidate, any endorsement will necessarily be a relative endorsement. So until next week, hold tight — and get out to a forum or two. Don't just rely on us. See for yourself.

— ARNE RICKERT

READER FORUM

CAA settles on 'experimental' policy

To the editors:

Distribution of student basketball tickets this season has proved to be a rather interesting but difficult exercise. Ideally, we're looking for the system that will please all of the people all of the time; realistically, we'll be happy with one that is convenient for most of the people most of the time. Many students, the ticket office staff and the Carolina Athletic Association ticket people have spent countless hours debating the merits and problems of the system and other options available to us. I am pleased to report that the elusive "ideal" system is finally coming into focus.

Before I get to the good part, let me describe some of the difficulties we've faced. First, nobody really knows what the demand for basketball tickets among the student body is. For every Smith Center distribution to date, there have been tickets left to be distributed the following Monday. In the case of Notre Dame and Clemson (good games, in my opinion), there were 2,000 and 3,000 tickets left, respectively. On top of that, there were still tickets left the following Thursday, which is when unclaimed tickets go on sale to the public. This

is indeed the second difficulty. All unclaimed tickets go on sale to the public the Thursday after distribution. This fact prevented us from instituting a fully random system, because we didn't want to see the public sitting in better seats than students.

The policy was designed primarily to avoid selling the better students seats to the public, and it did. The camping out we attracted for Duke and Georgia Tech was unintentional and unfortunate. We'll never know what portion of the lines was due to the policy and what portion was due to the magnitude of the games. We witnessed with Notre Dame and Clemson (where there was virtually no camping out) that the game does come into play. Philosophically, we've decided that the "perfect" system is not one that rewards the first student in line with the best seat in the house. Finally, permitting students to claim two tickets with proper ID has been successful, and is certainly an added convenience.

When we put all the factors into the equation we saw a radically different distribution. We saw a system in which the best 6,000 seats are randomized and distributed Friday afternoon to students who, with four IDs and registration

cards, can collect four tickets. The distribution would then continue the following Monday until all tickets were gone. If tickets were gone on Thursday, then the public would have a chance to purchase them; presumably though, we're talking about the highest seats — if any at all. We also see room for some block seating. This is the tentative plan for next season. Whether we actually adopt it depends on the feedback we get from you, and the results of the few changes we're going to make in the final three distributions of this season.

For the final three games of this season, the best 6,000 seats will be distributed in random order. This means lower arena tickets will be mixed with upper arena tickets in a ratio of 1-to-2. Therefore, there is no incentive to camp out. This does not mean that you should bypass the weekend distribution in the hope of getting a ticket on Monday morning. On the weekend, the ticket office has many ushers and eight ticket handlers to conveniently handle thousands of ticket seeking students. On Monday morning they have none of this. Thousands of students hoping to get tickets on Monday morning will only create confusion, disorder and

long lines; that is, if there are any tickets left at all. Also, for the last three games of the season, students will be permitted to claim four tickets if they present four athletic passes with four corresponding registration cards. So have a friend get you a ticket.

This is an experiment, but hopefully it will work, and we'll be able to move closer toward a more convenient football-style ticket distribution next season. Please contact me or anyone in the CAA if you have any further ideas or comments.

In closing, let me thank all the students who contacted the CAA and offered suggestions and constructive criticism. Also, thanks go to the CAA ticket committee for a good effort in what often is an unheralded job. Finally, thanks to the UNC ticket office for their patience and insight in trying to find the right distribution.

P.S. Your athletic pass will one day be a collector's item, because next semester it will be replaced by a card that is the same size as the registration card.

Mark H. Pavao,
CAA president

Abortion choice, women's right

To the editors:

As a supporter of the pro-choice movement, I take vehement exception to the remarks made by Anna Critz ("13th anniversary marks horror," Jan. 22) regarding the Roe vs. Wade decision. I strongly believe that abortion is a matter of personal choice. Who is Ms. Critz to decide what is best for all women in all situations? Does she not realize that every situation is different and that

not everyone shares her views? It is fine to have a particular set of beliefs but not at the expense of an open mind. Self-righteous people who fail to perceive the difference between having an opinion and inflicting that opinion on others need to take a moment to think about the ideals of personal freedom upon which this country was founded. It would be interesting to discover

what Ms. Critz suggests be done about such situations as victims of rape or young teen-agers who, thanks to a lack of adequate sex education, were genuinely ignorant of the consequences of their actions. What about cases where the life of the mother is threatened by childbirth? For some, the emotional trauma of pregnancy might be so great that adoption is unfeasible. I am by no means advocating abor-

tion as an automatic solution, but it should certainly be an option. Criminalizing abortion will only return us to the days of the dangerous back-alley abortions of yesteryear. The time is now for women to stand up for their right to choose. Our health and freedom depend on it.

Elizabeth Bell
Ruffin



"COME ON, GEORGE, PUT THE GUN DOWN... LET'S TALK THIS OUT."

Y advisors comment on rehiring

By GEORGE LENSING
and MARIA YOUNG

After the announcement by Zenobia Hatcher-Wilson, director of the Campus Y, in early October that George Gamble, associate director, would be dismissed Jan. 6, 1986, Les Garner, chairman of the Advisory Board of the Campus Y appointed a Committee on Administration. This committee is charged in the bylaws of the Advisory Board with serving as a mediating body in all matters involving personnel disputes at the Campus Y. The committee was to consist of the student co-presidents — Kim Reynolds and Roger Orstad — Garner and the two of us as co-chairs.

On Nov. 19, after a meeting of the committee, we agreed to invite Hatcher-Wilson to a breakfast meeting the following morning at the home of George Lensing. The two of us and Gamble would try to work out with her terms that might lead to the reinstatement of Gamble as associate director. Hatcher-Wilson, however, declined the invitation to meet.

On the following Sunday evening, however, Hatcher-Wilson contacted us, stating that she wished to make a proposal for reinstating Gamble. Because of the basketball game with UCLA, not all of us could be contacted until 11 p.m. Hatcher-Wilson, Gamble, Edith Wiggins, associate vice chancellor for Student Affairs, and the two of us met at about 11:30 at the home of Maria Young. All of the participants freely agreed to meet under these unusual circumstances. Vice Chancellor Donald Boulton was not informed that the meeting was to take place, nor were any parts of the proposals discussed with him by any of the participants before the meeting.

Hatcher-Wilson proposed that a letter of resignation dated May 15, 1986, be signed by Gamble as a condition for his reinstatement until May 15 and that the existence of such a letter not be publicly disclosed. The two of us and Wiggins discussed at length why such a proposal was unacceptable. The goal of both of us was

to bring about the reinstatement of Gamble under terms acceptable both to him and the director. Hatcher-Wilson's proposal offered Gamble no opportunity to try to establish a permanent professional working relationship. It left Gamble in an untenable position and only postponed the decision to dismiss. After a long discussion, Hatcher-Wilson agreed she would commit herself toward establishing a new and permanent professional relationship with Gamble. In good faith, she agreed to put the past behind her and begin anew in the attempt to restore stability and harmony at the Campus Y. The undisclosed letter of resignation would be operative only if the director and associate director could not establish a good working relationship.

At about 3 a.m., Gamble said he was not ready to sign the letter and proposed adjournment until the following morning. All of us accepted the suggestion; no effort was made to prolong the meeting.

The five of us reconvened at 9:30 the next morning in Young's office in South Building. Gamble announced that he would sign the letter of resignation in response to Hatcher-Wilson's concession of the previous evening — but under a condition of his own. He requested that meetings between him and Hatcher-Wilson to discuss the nature and progress of their professional relationship take place regularly, even monthly, in the presence of outside representatives who would be in a position to represent his interests. Hatcher-Wilson denied the condition. After another long discussion, however, it was mutually agreed that the five of us would serve as such a committee and that we would meet more than once between then and May 15. The following four conditions of reinstatement were then signed by Hatcher-Wilson and Gamble, and the letter of resignation was signed by Gamble.

1. That Gamble provide a letter of resignation dated May 15 to be given to the director Nov. 25, 1985. The director would hold that letter until such time that she has been able to assess the nature of his professional competence in working with students, the Advisory Board, the Division of Student Affairs and the director.

2. That between now and May 15, the associate director will not undermine the position of the director.

3. That it will be known publicly that the director initiated this agreement and that there are conditions mutually agreed between them.

4. That the director will meet at her discretion, but more than once, with Wiggins, Young, Gamble and Lensing between now and May 15 to report on the professional relationship between the director and associate director.

No one of us was completely satisfied with all these terms, but all of us agreed to them in an atmosphere of trust and with the strong hope of beginning a new relationship between the director and associate director and of restoring the Campus Y to its important work at hand. All the agreements, including the letter of resignation and the decision not to disclose all the details publicly, were founded on this sense of trust and with recognition of the risks involved. Both the director associate director made compromises, modifying their original positions in order to arrive at an agreement. At the conclusion of the approximately 5½ hours of negotiation, we felt that the agreement — again, accepted by both parties — offered the possibility of taking the Campus Y from crisis back to its normal programs and activities.

Before the end of the fall semester, Wiggins and Lensing met with the director and associate director once. At the meeting, differences between the two parties were still evident, but both responded positively to suggestions by the other on ways in which they might improve their working relationship.

The action taken by Gamble this past week repudiating these terms of agreement was done without any consultation with us. We regret that we and other members of the Advisory Board did not have a chance once again to try to negotiate with him and other parties the issues that disturbed him.

George Lensing is a professor in the English department. Maria Young is secretary of the University. Both are members of the Campus Y Advisory Board.