

The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, Managing Editor

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, Editorial Page Editor
JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor
TAMMY BLACKARD, State and National Editor
ERIK DALE FLIPPO, Business Editor
DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor
MELANIE BLACK, Design Editor

JULIA COON, News Editor
JENNY CLONINGER, University Editor
CHARLES BRITTIAN, City Editor
CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor
KELLY THOMPSON, Omnibus Editor
KIM AVETTA, Design Editor

DAVID SUROWIECKI, Photography Editor

Hall's hopes too high But suit highlights debate on athletics

Athletics at a big-name university such as UNC produce many benefits — large amounts of revenue for the school, prestige if certain teams do well and a sense of school pride among students. A lawsuit filed against the University this summer, however, highlights the dark side of those benefits, presenting legitimate concerns about lowered admissions standards for athletes.

board opinion

Don Hall, a salesman in Winston-Salem, filed a lawsuit against UNC that claims his daughter deserved to be admitted to UNC with a 2.8 grade point average and a score of "around 900" on the Scholastic Aptitude test. With that record, Hall said, she should be allowed in since certain "male, black athletes" are admitted with similar scores. According to admissions policy, an applicant is considered based on these scores, the difficulty of classes taken in high school, recommendations, extra-curricular activities and what the student can contribute to the University. While Hall did not elaborate on these other factors, the admissions office did make its decision based on his daughter's record, as it did every other applicant, and denied her admission — a decision that must be accepted.

Hall's comment that only "male, black athletes" are accepted by these "lower" standards is too blatantly racist and sexist to be ignored. Even if the admissions office does bend its standards for certain athletes, there is no evidence to indicate the giving of special favors to certain races or to males. And while athletes may be the most visible group of students who are admitted under admissions exceptions, the

majority of the University's exceptions are granted to non-athletes. According to Richard Baddour, associate athletic director, the University granted 120 exceptions to the admissions standards last year, but only 16 of those went to athletes.

Despite the fallacies in Hall's complaint, however, the issue is an important one, especially in light of N.C. State's recent athletic scandal. When academics took a back seat to athletics in State's chancellor's office, it was invariably the school's academic reputation that suffered the most.

Chapel Hill does not appear to be suffering from poor scores from athletes, but the potential for abuse of the system remains, and the UNC system cannot afford to let its standards drop in the name of athletics. This university deserves to be proud of its 75 percent graduation rate and to boast of having more than 169 athletes with at least a grade point average of 3.0. But, of course, there is no reason to believe that Chapel Hill will always be immune to the pressure to admit students who are not up to snuff in the name of a few more wins. No school in the system can allow certain athletes to use the program as a simple stepping-stone to higher athletics — academics must take priority.

The Hall lawsuit highlights an important question that universities across the nation seem unable to resolve. The case is too weak to force the University to perform any investigations of itself, but it should add emphasis to the call for a stringent system-wide policy — more than was suggested by system President C.D. Spangler recently — to prevent Chapel Hill and the system's 15 other schools from running into scandals of their own.

Drawing the line Sex story forces voters to think twice

Two weeks ago, one of the U.S. Congress' rising stars took a sharp fall. Rep. Barney Frank, a five-term Democrat from Massachusetts, saw his sex life from 1985-87 chronicled in a Washington newspaper, and the details were not pleasant. Frank quickly held a press conference and, in excruciating detail, explained his side of the story, but his honesty may have come too late to save his career.

Steven Gobie, a male prostitute and pimp, gave the Washington Times the story of his relationship with Frank, who went public with his homosexuality a few years ago. In his press conference, Frank explained how he had paid Gobie once for sex and then let him use his Washington apartment, in hopes of straightening out Gobie's life, until he discovered that the prostitute was running a prostitution service from the apartment. Frank, who had been paying Gobie \$20,000 a year from personal funds to do odd jobs for him, finally fired him and ended their relationship.

The story was disturbing when it came out, and it is one that is likely to continue to disturb voters in future elections. Except for the fact that he broke the law in paying Gobie for sex, Frank appears to be guilty only of bad judgment. Unlike other sex scandals involving Washington figures, Frank did not cheat on a spouse, have sex with a minor or harm anyone other than himself. Under those circumstances,

it's difficult to decide how much we can expect from elected officials.

Certainly, we can expect that they show generally good judgment and that they not break the law. But to condemn Frank, a smart, committed, caring politician, seems unfair and likely only to hurt Congress, which needs more men like him.

The issue is much more complex, of course — whether the media should have printed the story, whether we should leave Frank in office when we have denied other public officials their place — Gary Hart, for example, or marijuana-smoking Supreme Court nominees.

In this case, the media probably should have printed the story — to withhold a story about a Congressman who broke the law would be unethical. But to draw a comparison with Gary Hart probably won't work; on a very simplistic level, Hart's bad judgment hurt someone else, whereas Frank only hurt himself. And, to his credit, Frank has been completely up-front about the entire story, showing that he retains some good judgment.

Unfortunately, as much as voters may want an infallible litmus test that they can use on all candidates, every situation must be considered individually. Frank's crime should be punished, but it should not loom so large in voters' minds that they remove him from office. — Sharon Keschull

Drugs: What Bush should do -- but won't

Chris Landgraf
Staff Columnist

We've been hearing about it for over a year now. We heard the issue kicked around during the presidential election and we've heard George Bush and White House Director of National Drug Control Policy William Bennett (I don't like his nickname "drug czar" — he's not that powerful yet) discuss their plans for eradicating the problem. For the first time in almost 20 years, Gallup Polls reported that a social issue is the nation's number one worry. Americans are more concerned about drugs and the drug problem than war and economics, and for good reason. Not a day has gone by in the last two weeks without reports of another drug-related bombing in Medellin, Colombia. If drastic action is not taken or a drastic improvement in the situation does not occur, Colombia faces the serious threat of becoming a narco-cracy.

The situation in the United States is similarly horrifying. Anecdotes about the gang wars are quickly becoming cliches. A person in East St. Louis is 20 times more likely to be killed there than she or he would be in Northern Ireland. This is just one example of a situation that is becoming frighteningly common throughout urban America and this brutality is moving to more rural areas. There is no doubt that action must be taken to control the crisis.

Tonight, Bush will deliver his much-awaited plan of action, and many will be watching to see what he says (if only because he will interrupt all network television shows). Though Bush will surely outline some new strategies and — we hope — some effective ones, there are many things Bush and Bennett should do if the program is to be a success. To go out on a limb, the following are things they probably won't do, despite their necessity:

Raise taxes. The fiscal plans for the drug program seem to be nonexistent. Republican leaders claim the money is there, but no one will say from where it is going to come.

Cutting social programs would be counterproductive because many angles must be attacked for drug use to decline (generally speaking, they will be targeting sales and cocaine, crack and heroin use). Cutting funds from education, housing or Medicaid would indirectly negate any gains made by rechanneling the money to the drug program. Defense Secretary Cheney doesn't seem too happy about cutting defense spending, though B2 spending could be a likely target. The bottom line is that the program will be necessarily expensive. More police officers, weapons, intelligence operations, foreign aid, prison construction, treatment centers and education are not free, and all are necessary for an integrated plan.

Devote more resources to reducing demand. Bush and Bennett reportedly want to devote 70 percent of the drug war budget to reducing supply. This is not the path to take. As long as there are people who want to do cocaine and crack, there will be a supply. Surely we must work to keep the supply limited, but we should go about this by helping Latin American countries destroy cocaine factories and arresting drug producers (which is already starting to happen, as combat helicopters, transport planes, reconnaissance jets and grenade launchers arrive in Colombia). Admittedly, lowering the demand for drugs in the United States will never be simple, but the statistics painfully show that interdiction does not work. The most optimistic reports say 1 percent of all imported drugs is confiscated, making it silly to rely on improving interdiction. It doesn't take a math major to see what would happen to supply even if interdiction im-

proved twentyfold. We should devote some resources to curbing supply by working with the drug producing countries, but improved demand strategies will be more effective.

Consolidate jurisdiction. Despite the creation of Bennett's position, scores of congressional committees must be briefed on various areas of drug control policy. The establishment of a congressional committee with bipartisan leadership would eliminate some bureaucratic nightmares.

Bush has already taken some new, if not effective, positions on the drug crisis. His backing of Bennett will add tremendous credibility to the "czar's" plans. Since Bennett is not a true cabinet member, he could conceivably come up short without Bush's vocal support.

The recent public relations campaign against Panamanian leader Gen. Manuel Noriega (mainly the release of hard evidence of his ties to drug trafficking) will bring more international pressure on the dictator and if worse comes to worse, the campaign will make an American kidnapping mission more palatable to the world community.

Finally, as the policy and its effects surface, be weary of the statistics which Bennett will use to measure success. Many of the nine statistics which will measure the pulse of drug use are already moving in Bennett's favor. For example, he wants the number of admitted illicit drug users to decrease ten percent by 1991, but the reports which Bennett will use say illicit drug use has dropped 40 percent in the last three years.

The efforts of the Bush Administration are certainly noble, but unless more money is allocated and new avenues are approached, the rhetoric of the war on drugs will be nothing more than talk.

Chris Landgraf is a junior political science/history major from Atlanta, Ga.

Readers' Forum

Save sorority space for important issues

To the editor:
Who cares? This is the question I have asked myself repeatedly since reading Jannette Pippin's Aug. 31 column, "Small sorority deserves another chance." It was apparently intended to tug at the heartstrings of its readers and evoke sympathy for her cause, but it failed miserably in its attempt.

Ms. Pippin seems to be mourning the death of a small sorority and expressing her anger at both the Panhellenic Council of UNC and Sigma Sigma's national organization. Perhaps because I have chosen not to be in a sorority, I cannot relate to how tragic this situation is, but it is even further trivialized by the genuine tragedies expressed in the neighboring columns on the page. One of these is an editorial about the murder of Yusef Hawkins and the other is a letter in reference to the Chinese students killed recently in Tiananmen Square. Those are true losses to be mourned and real reasons for anger, whereas the pulling of a social sorority's charter is rather insignificant. The space that was used for this column surely could have been used for a more pertinent topic.

MICHELLE E. SMITH
Sophomore
Undecided

Get facts straight on blacks in war

To the editor:
In the review of the film,



"Casualties of War," the comment was made that "... most of the soldiers sent to Vietnam were black." This "fact" is commonly quoted, but is incorrect.

According to official statistics, approximately 24 percent of the soldiers sent to Vietnam were black. While this might seem high in light of the percentage of black persons overall in the U.S. population, during the war (and even afterwards, after the draft ended) the percentage of black soldiers in the Army hovered around 20 percent. Therefore, the "risk" for black soldiers to go to Vietnam was about the same as for white soldiers.

Another factor: blacks made up then (and make up now) higher percentages of combat units than those of combat support or com-

bat service support. There are many reasons for this — often prejudice is one. However, this is not the matter here, nor is the matter of whether some unit commanders sent black soldiers on more dangerous missions, as has been claimed. The percentage of black soldiers (many of whom distinguished themselves in valor and bravery) was never "most of the U.S. soldiers in Vietnam, either in direct combat roles or in support functions."

R. EVERETT LANGFORD
Graduate
Public Health

We goofed

Due to an editing error, the author of the letter "Helms Amendment protects taxpayers,"

Sept. 1, was misidentified. Sharon Sentelle is the chairwoman of the UNC College Republicans.

Letters policy

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticisms. When writing letters to the editor, please follow these guidelines:

•All letters must be dated and signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter.

•All letters must be typed and double-spaced, for ease of editing.

•Letters should include the author's year, major, phone number and hometown. Please include both a daytime and evening phone number.

Americans must face African atrocities

Dale McKinley
Guest Writer

Much is happening in Southern Africa right now, and unfortunately most of it is destructive. The patron that oversees this destruction and loss of human life is apartheid-ruled white South Africa, and all too often the great bastion of "democracy," a.k.a. America, acquiesces or actively supports this racist destruction. It is high time that the citizens of the United States realize that their government has supported and continues to support an apartheid system and its surrogate forces that have wreaked economic ruin, untold suffering and death on people who are only seeking rightful control over their own land and lives. I write this brief article in the hope that both UNC students and the Chapel Hill community will realize that apartheid in South Africa and its tragic results for the rest of Southern Africa continue their assault on peace and justice, abetted by the policies of the U.S. government.

Having just returned from an eight month stay in Southern Africa, I have been a witness to apartheid's vigor and the tragic consequences for those who attempt to oppose and challenge it. Americans need to know the specifics of these consequences, because whether you like it or not, this country shares part of the blame.

It is impossible to detail all of the atrocities and destruction caused by apartheid South Africa, but maybe a few examples will provide the general picture. Since 1980, the country of Zimbabwe has lost an estimated \$3.7 billion due to the destabilization efforts of extended apartheid. Not only has this greatly hindered Zimbabwe's potential for development, but it has also ensured that Zimbabwe remains partially dependent on South Africa for much-needed imports.

The destabilization of Zimbabwe is closely linked with that of Mozambique, where South-African armed and trained Renamo bandits

have caused untold destruction and death. In a report prepared for the Ford Foundation, researcher Bill Minter concluded that Renamo has been responsible for over 100,000 deaths since the early 1980s, has continued to be supplied and directed by the South African military, and has enjoyed support from both individual right-wingers in the United States and certain sectors of the U.S. government. In addition to this genocidal campaign, the conflict has created an estimated one million refugees who threaten to over-burden the limited resources of the surrounding African states.

South Africa's extended war against neighboring states also extends to Namibia and Angola. In Angola, after years of invasions and support for the bandit UNITA movement, South Africa has been forced to retreat by the heroic actions of both the Angolan military and their Cuban allies. Behind them, they have left a trail of death and destruction where an estimated 50,000 children have lost their arms and legs to a campaign of indiscriminate land-mining.

Throughout, the United States has actively backed South Africa and its surrogate UNITA and now looks set to become the major supplier of arms and material to UNITA through the CIA base in southern Zaire. Let no one be fooled that the United States and its policy of constructive engagement had anything to do with South Africa's withdrawal from Angola and the subsequent Namibian settlement. It has only been through the brave struggle of both the Angolan and Namibian people that

peace and justice might finally be realized in these troubled areas.

Despite the recent settlement on Namibia and the scheduled United Nations supervised elections later this month, South Africa has done all in its power to wreck the chances of a strong and united Namibia under the leadership of the sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people, S.W.A.P.O. The massacre of over 300 S.W.A.P.O. combatants by the South African military earlier this year was only the latest in a violent campaign of terror and intimidation that has continued for many decades. In spite of eyewitness accounts that the murdered S.W.A.P.O. combatants were merely attempting to turn themselves over to United Nations supervised demobilization camps, the United States, along with South Africa, has ludicrously attempted to fix the blame on S.W.A.P.O. for launching an "invasion" of northern Namibia. This is one of only many attempts to deny the people of Southern Africa their rightful place of control over their own destinies and to subvert the inevitable victory of the liberation movements.

It is all too easy for people here in the United States, and particularly those in the academic community, to rationalize away their silence and inactivity even in the face of such overwhelming injustice, brutality, and direct complicity of their own government in the ongoing events in Southern Africa. The geographical distance of the region from the United States, and the lack of any real news, has only contributed to an eerie silence while apartheid kills, economies are ruined and bright hopes are turned into nightmares. Don't be one of those people who "forgets." The reality of Southern Africa is there for all those who want to see it, and so is the reality of our own government's policy.

Dale McKinley is a graduate student in political science from Zimbabwe.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: James Burroughs, Kimberly Edens and Jennifer Wing.
Assistant Editors: Jessica Yates, arts; Jessica Lanning, city; Myra Miller, features; Staci Cox, managing; Anne Isehower and Steve Wilson, news; Lisa Reichle and Richard Smith, Omnibus; Andrew Podolsky, Jay Reed and Jamie Rosenberg, sports; Karen Dunn, state and national; Will Spears and Amy Wajda, university.
Writers: Craig Allen, Kari Barlow, Crystal Bernstein, Sarah Cagle, Brenda Campbell, Terri Canaday, James Coblin, Blake Dickinson, Mark Folk, Julie Gammill, Jada Harris, Joey Hill, Susan Holdscaw, Jason Kelly, Lloyd Lagos, Tracy Lawson, Rheta Logan, Jeff Lutrell, Alan Martin, Kimberly Maxwell, Helle Nielsen, Glenn O'Neal, Simone Pam, Gus Pappas, Tom Parks, Jannette Pippin, Karl Pfister, Mike Sutton, Laura Taylor, Emilie Van Poucke, Stephanie von Isenburg, Sandy Wall, Sherry Waters, Chuck Williams, Nancy Wykle and Faith Wynn.
Sports: Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, Jason Bates, John Bland, Christina Frohock, Scott Gold, Doug Hoogervorst, David Kupstas, Bethany Litton, Bobby McCroskey, Natalie Sckicky and Eric Wagoner.
Arts and Features: Cheryl Allen, Lisa Antonucci, Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Ashley Campbell, Diana Florence, Carrie McLaren, Elizabeth Murray, Leigh Pressley, Hasanthika Sirisena and Kim Stallings.
Photography: Evan Eile, Steven Exum, Regina Holder, Tracey Langhorne and Kathy Michel.
Copy Editors: B Buckberry, Joy Golden, Angela Hill, Susan Holdscaw and Clare Weickert.
Editorial Assistant: Mark Chilton.
Design Assistants: Kim Avetta and Melanie Black.
Cartoonists: Jeff Christian, Pete Corson, David Estoye and Mike Sutton.
Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Leslie Humphrey, classified ad manager; Kirsten Burkart, assistant classified ad manager; Amanda Tilley, advertising manager; Sabrina Goodson, business manager; Allison Ashworth, assistant business manager; Lora Gay, Kristi Greeson, Beth Harding, Lavonne Leinster, Tracy Proctor, Kevin Reperowitz, Alicia Satterwhite, Pam Thompson and Jill Whitley, display advertising representatives; Kim Blass, creative director; Pam Strickland, marketing director; Sherrie Davis, Ingrid Jones, Shannon Kelly and Tammy Newton, sales assistants; Jeff Carlson, office manager.
Subscriptions: Ken Murphy, manager.
Distributions: RDS Carriers.
Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, managers; Anita Bentley, assistant manager; Stephanie Locklear, assistant.
Printing: The Village Companies.