

GEORGE SHADROU, Editor

DIMITA JAMES, Managing Editor  
BRAD KUTROW, Associate Editor  
THOMAS JESSIMAN, Associate Editor

KAREN ROWLEY, News Editor  
PAM KELLEY, University Editor  
MARTHA WAGGONER, City Editor  
JIM HUMMEL, State and National Editor

BILL FIELDS, Sports Editor  
MARK MURRELL, Features Editor  
LAURA ELLIOTT, Arts Editor  
SCOTT SHARPE, Photography Editor  
MELANIE SILL, Weekend Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

88th year of editorial freedom

## The debates

Fewer than 30 people sat in the Carolina Union television lounge waiting for the first nationally televised debate of this year's presidential election. At first it seemed a bit anticlimactic. President Jimmy Carter, the cold calculating campaigner that he is, would not be on hand for discussion of the issues. The debate didn't seem to mean a lot.

But once it began, Carter was forgotten and Ronald Reagan and John Anderson had to be weighed and compared. At the outset Reagan's delivery style served him well. On economic and energy questions he stated his views clearly and confidently. Initially, Anderson's voice sounded strained and harsh, making him appear tense. But by the second question, Anderson's depth of knowledge became clear as he aggressively distinguished his views from those of Carter and Reagan.

By the end of the debate Anderson was consistently making points while Reagan skirted some questions, resorted to apple-pie homilies and basically allowed himself to be viewed as foolish (or so it appeared to the audience in the Union, which laughed at Reagan's patriotic spiels and cheered Anderson's quick wit and lashing style.) It would be safe to assume Anderson won the debate, right? Not necessarily.

While college students may look for intellectualism and quickness in a candidate, others who constitute a large percentage of the voting public may look for humility, patriotism and the old twinkle in the eye. While Reagan did not seem to possess that twinkle Sunday, the general public might have perceived it. Winning a debate for political purposes does not depend on fielding question after question, but on the perceptions of the public. So while Anderson won the debate in the Union hands down, he may have lost it in numerous homes all across the country.

More importantly than who might have "won" the debate is Carter's reaction to it. Anderson stressed throughout that he was more than a spoiler, that he offered voters a choice. But Carter is not likely to debate Anderson under any conditions. To elevate Anderson to the same stage would hurt Carter by suggesting to voters that Carter himself considers Anderson a force to be reckoned with. And it is unlikely that Carter could out-debate Anderson anyway. Carter's position may rob the country of much-needed discussion and it may do nothing to enhance people's perception of his leadership ability, but it could deny Anderson the major boost he needs. Whether voters will fault Carter for avoiding Anderson or simply deem his position as politically realistic will determine the extent of the damage to the candidates. As of now, it doesn't appear that either Carter or Reagan has been substantially hurt by the current situation. Any way you debate it, that's bad news for Anderson.

## School is fun

There has to be a conspiracy out there. They are organized and know how to use their power. And though we thought their reign of domination was over, that somehow summertime was still here, it is time now to acknowledge our mistake.

They probably had a meeting this summer. Somewhere in the Caribbean on a golden beach, they worked out all the details. They devised a system that guaranteed a test or term paper for each course the fourth week of school. The pledge they signed was more binding than the Honor Code. "As responsible faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, we hereby vouchsafe a deal whereby no students shall sleep or eat for the time period of Sept. 21-28."

Kenan professors were there, lying out in Bermuda shorts and smoking the finest Cuban cigars. Department chairmen were there, sipping tropical rum punches and applying suntan lotion to their pale skin (Too much time hibernating behind smiling receptionists and closed doors ruins a tan.) One of them even had the pretension to quote *Prufrock*. He lauded their superiority over that poor man who procrastinated and hesitated on his decisions. "Shall I part my hair behind? Do I dare to eat a peach?" one of them said and they laughed at Prufrock. Their hair was neatly combed and the peaches were yummy.

Knowing what was planned for us, they smiled when we appeared fresh and prepared on Monday. They whispered and patted each other on the back Wednesday when our faces were pale with exhaustion and the bags developed under our eyes. And they scheduled a celebration banquet for Friday night after we collapsed into our chairs that morning for the final tests. We did not even mutter when we had not even begun the second essay as they announced only five minutes remained in the period. One student, on his way out the door, suggested to his professor that the system needed to be changed. Obviously, that student had not the slightest suspicion of the master conspiracy.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant Managing Editors: Edwina Ralston, John Royster, Amy Sharpe  
Distribution Manager: Terry Cameron

Editorial Assistants: Buddy Burniske, Lynn Casey, William Durham

News Desk: Melody Adams, Laurie Bradsher, Beth Burrell, Cindy Cranford, Amy Edwards, Anna Fite, Eric Frederick, Virginia Friday, Beth Graybeal, Lisa Goldfarb, Pamela Johnson, Lorrie Howard, Katherine Long, Darlene O'Brian, Karen Pace, Carol Pearce, Bill Peschel, Valerie VanGorden and Edith Wooten; James Alexander, assistant weekend editor.

News: Melodee Alves, Mark Ancona, Ted Avery, Stephanie Bircher, RoAnn Bishop, Jeff Bowers, Linda Brown, Laura Carter, Eileen Curry, Elizabeth Daniel, Kerry DeRochi, Angie Dorman, Lee Dunbar, Natalie Eason, Scott Green, Debbie Goodson, Karen Haywood, Charles Herndon, Deborah Hirsch, Lucy Hood, Jule Hubbard, Dale Jenkins, Keith King, Karen Kornegay, Diane Lupton, Susan Mauney, Elaine McClatchey, Mike McFarland, Rachel Perry, Bill Peschel, Tim Preston, Anne Prosser, Amy Prugh, Jonathan Rich, Rochelle Riley, Beverly Shepherd, Cookie Sheppard, Betsy Simmons, Frances Silva, Ann Smallwood, Lindsey Taylor, David Teague, Frank Wells, Nora Wilkinson and Frank Zang

Sports: David Poole, assistant editor; Clifton Barnes, Norman Cannada, John Drescher, John Fish, Chip Karnes, Gary Mangum, Geoffrey Mock, Scott Peterson, Linda Robertson and Mark Taylor.

Features: Kim Kleman, Susan Pruett Lucas, Mary McKenna, Joe Morris, Lori Morrison, Ann Peters and Diane Veto.

Arts: Tom Moore, assistant editor; Jordan Hawley, Tim Pope, Bob Royalty.  
Graphic Arts: Dan Brady, Greg Calibey, Bob Fulghum and Danny Harrell, artists; Matt Cooper, Jay Hyman, Will Owens and Charles Vernon, photographers.

Business: Mark Kadlec, business manager; Linda A. Cooper, secretary/receptionist; Karen Newell, classifieds manager, Sally Cook, accountant.

Advertising: Nancy McKenzie, advertising manager; Paula Brewer, advertising coordinator; Buddy Burniske, Jeff Glance, Steve Jolly, Julia Kim, Robin Matthews, David Parker, Gena Shreve and Tina Venable, ad representatives. Warren Allen, distribution manager.

Composition: UNC Printing Department.  
Printing: Hinton Press Inc. of Mebane.

# Fraternity rush

## Selection process difficult for brothers

By JOHN DRESCHER

When I was a rushee participating in formal fraternity rush, I always thought I was experiencing the worst aspect of the rush process. The tension, the formality and especially the questioning—these same shallow obligatory questions over and over again—were tolerated as a necessary part of the road to brotherhood. How nice it will be, I thought, when the roles, will be reversed and I will be on the inside looking out.

I was wrong, very wrong. Now that I have seen the inside of formal rush, I almost wish I could go back to being on the receiving end of the smile, handshake and hometown question.

The process is innocent enough for the rushee. Other than possibly deciding on a house, there is no personal decision involved. One does not evaluate individual brothers; they are evaluating you. All a rushee has to do is be himself, and that should always be a goal, not just during rush. Other than presenting oneself in his usual manner and battling question fatigue, a rushee can go home at night knowing he did the best he could. There was no morality involved.

This is not so for a brother. It is a basic fact that not all rushees can pledge the house they want to. Brothers must get together and decide which candidates "fit in." "Fit in" means basically that the rushees can contribute to the fraternity and that the fraternity can contribute to the rushee.

## Anti-Greek sentiment does not cure problems

By JOHN ROYSTER

I went to formal rush at two fraternities. Neither gave me a bid, but my time was anything but wasted. It was a great learning experience.

I emerged from rush with essentially the same attitude about the fraternity system I had going in—it has both virtues and faults.

I don't know why the first fraternity voted me out. It may have been a lot of things. I didn't always remember names. My name tag wasn't on right one night of formal rush. I wanted a bid and pressed some—I was nervous. And I'm not much on the social graces under normal circumstances.

*I emerged from rush with essentially the same attitude about the fraternity system I had going in—it has both virtues and faults.*

I'd like to believe I was voted down because of those petty reasons, but I doubt that's what happened. It is a lot more likely that those who voted against me met me, got to know me to some extent, and thought that I would not fit into the fraternity. I'm sorry about that; I liked every brother I met in both fraternities, and that has not been changed by their votes.

The second fraternity rejected me under more

That this decision must be made is an unfortunate but necessary evil of the Greek system. It is not unlike trying out for a team, play or any other special activity. But there is one major difference: When cut from the special activity, one knows the judgment is based on ability to perform. It is not a judgment of personal character.

Ideally, it should not be in rush either. But, no matter what any brother from any fraternity has ever told me, it often is.

Since there is no talent to be judged, the person himself becomes the quality to be decided upon. And more often than not, it becomes no longer an objective question of whether the rushee would "fit in," but a highly personalized and biased opinion of the rushee in general, including everything from his looks to his social abilities.

The pettiness can become unbearable. If one is not a good athlete, an excellent student or a possession of a nice smile and conversational gifts, he can find the door. A premature judgment, often made by a minority, has been reached.

This point was driven home to me the other day by a highly respected brother in another fraternity.

"There are times when I'm ashamed to be a member of my fraternity," he said. "If the guys could just be decent about it and say that the guy wouldn't be happy here, I'd understand."

"But often they're not. They tear down guys and attack them personally. And it doesn't matter if the guy is a friend of a brother or not."

unusual circumstances. A week or so before formal rush, I was leaning toward the first frat, but still rushed the second one in case frat No. 1 didn't give me a bid.

By the weekend I liked them both and thought I would be faced with a tough decision. Somebody in fraternity No. 2 got wind of my attitude and confronted me with it. I told them the story and they voted me out. Fair enough. In this case, the rush system worked better.

I have one quarrel, however, with the way the fraternities treat rushees. The two houses I am familiar with sent brothers who had become friendly with the rushee to inform him of his rejection. That can be a painful experience for all concerned.

It would seem that a fairer, more courageous procedure would be to send those brothers who voted against a particular rushee.

Many people criticize the fraternity system because it encourages conformity. I see what they mean, but I fail to see how they can use that as a valid argument against the Greek system.

After rushing, I've got pink and kelly green coming out of my ears. But for every fraternity member with an alligator on his shirt, there's a fraternity critic who owns a big dog with a bandana tied around its neck. There is nothing really wrong with that; I'm just trying to say that conformity is a human characteristic, not a Greek characteristic.

Another charge often leveled at fraternities is racism. To this one, the best thing for many brothers and rushees to do is plead guilty.

The fraternity system is voluntarily segregated. Whites do not have much desire to join black



Rejecting a rushee in humane and dignified language is not enough for some. What they want to do, in short, is play God. Playing fraternity brother is not enough. Some people cannot handle power when it is given to them. They become obsessed with authority. Often these are the same people who have little authority in their everyday lives. They treasure their momentary fling with power and try to get the most out of it.

This is by no means a condemnation of any one fraternity, or of fraternities in general. The fraternity system merely provides a more formalized manner of acceptance and rejection.

I love my house and I'm happy to be a part of the Greek system. I realized long before I pledged that there are both positive and negative aspects of the system. Obviously, I feel the positive decisively outweigh the

negative, or else I would not be a participant. Unfortunately, as my friend in another house said, I feel that every time I sit and listen to a prejudiced and unjustified comment I have sold my soul to a system I don't believe in.

"I really like this place," he said, "except for formal rush. Then I wish I could go inactive for a few days."

Me too. But my inactiveness would only serve to condone the words of the minority who must degrade others. So I stay and hope that rush will end quickly. And when it does, I hypocritically place the problem in the far corner of my mind and forget about it until the next formal rush session arrives.

John Drescher, a junior journalism major from Raleigh, is a staff writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

fraternities, and blacks do not have much desire to join white ones. That is not racism in its purest form. But it is segregation.

But as a rushee I met some real, live racists—guys who just did not want blacks in their fraternity, because they were black, period.

Again, though, fraternities are not any more guilty than the larger society. I met plenty of people who are just as racist and are strongly anti-Greek. I've met racists who know next to nothing about the Greek system.

The strange thing is that a lot of the guys who are against blacks in general have some black friends. But I doubt if they would vote to admit those blacks to their fraternity. Society's impetus to segregate apparently takes precedence over that friendship.

Fraternity brothers complain that the positive aspects of the Greek system are not emphasized enough. They do in fact, perform some very valuable services for the community. They promote a spirit of brotherhood among members, and many people get excellent leadership experience by working in them.

Those who say there is a lot wrong with the Greek system are correct. But it will continue to be difficult to change things by standing aside and harping on that. Changes are much more easily made from within. The Greek system has too much potential for good for us to give up on it.

John Royster, a junior journalism major from Henderson, is assistant managing editor for The Daily Tar Heel.

## letters to the editor

# CGC setting up staff committees

To the editor:

The Student Affairs Committee of the Campus Governing Council appreciates the article, "CGC forms ad hoc committee," (*DTH*, Sept. 22). We hope all interested individuals will apply to serve on our ad hoc staff, as well as ad hoc committees dealing with the proposed student athletic center, the bus situation in Carrboro and the recently proposed Southern Bell rate increase.

Because the story may have left some misunderstandings, let me clarify a few items. The Student Affairs Committee is one of three standing committees of the CGC; each representative belongs to one of these committees. Our duties include speaking out on behalf of the student body on issues that concern them, communicating CGC activities to the students, reviewing student organizations that receive student fees and keeping the student code up to date.

The Student Affairs Committee is setting up an ad hoc staff to help it deal with the amount of business it is taking on this session. This staff will work on raising awareness of issues involving the students of UNC or the University system as a whole. The staff members will participate in investigating these concerns, including being active on committees that Student Affairs will set up to report on these issues. And they will assist us in making a more effective review of student-funded organizations. Besides being questioned before the budget hearings in the spring, Student Affairs hopes to have observers attend at least one activity or meeting of each organization monthly and report back to us.

We have already begun setting up three ad hoc committees, each of which will investigate a single issue and report back to the Student Affairs Committee



THERE ARE THOSE THAT LOOK UP THE FACTS, AND THEN THERE ARE THOSE WHO MAKE UP THE FACTS. (BUT THEY RUN MY CAMPAIGN AND I'LL STAND BEHIND THEM.)

BRADY 09/24/80

for possible action to be taken by the CGC. The newsletter, which we hope will help representatives in their efforts to keep in contact with their constituency, will be put out monthly and distributed by the representatives in their own districts. Efforts are being made to have the student code on file in the University computer by December and we are looking for anyone interested in helping us type the laws into the computer. We will teach those who do not know who to use a computer terminal. And one last note, WXYC will

again air "CGC and Me" this fall for three minutes every other week, alternating with the Carolina Union's report.

Eleanor Smith  
Chairperson of Student Affairs Committee  
Campus Governing Council

Goray reply

To the editor:  
I would like to clarify an item that The Daily Tar Heel has mentioned recently.

While I was elected to represent CGC District 19 last spring, I now reside in District 17. Since there is a vacancy on the council (due to the resignation of Rebecca Radisch), I have decided to run for that seat.

Contrary to the impression given by The Tar Heel, I have in the past lived for a full year ('78-'79) in District 17. It is not true that I "know nothing about District 17" as stated in a *DTH* editorial last week.

Brian M. Goray  
Chapel Hill