

JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor
MICHAEL TOOLE, Associate Editor
MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor
WAYNE THOMPSON, State and National Editor
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor
VANCE TREFETHEN, Business Editor
STUART TONKINSON, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
CINDY DUNLEVY, Features Editor
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

Eye-opening visitation policy

A recent brainstorm of Interfraternity Council leaders that would have black fraternity members visiting white fraternity houses is not proposed as an end-all solution to racism, nor should it be taken as one. It is not even meant to suggest that fraternities integrate. Instead, it is a way to create greater racial awareness and fight existing attitudes on campus.

Most of us remain blind to the enormity of segregation at UNC. As it stands now, our campus is festering in an environment divided by race. Not only do the majority of blacks live on South Campus and only a few on North, but, similarly and to an even greater extent, the University's fraternities are segregated.

The IFC's brainstorm, credited to Phi Beta Sigma President George Perry, who also is executive assistant for minority relations for the IFC, cannot hurt. Even so, those of us who fear change, or simply exposure to different ideas, probably will discourage Perry's notion.

Before rejecting the idea, though, we should concentrate on the goal it would help attain — that of future interaction.

We are at a University that was created to promote learning inside and outside of textbooks. As students here we cannot close our eyes to others or try to deny their culture, their background.

The program can be as successful as the fraternity brothers want to make it. While Perry's proposal provides an excellent opportunity for the IFC to exert greater leadership and make more than just "sugar-coated statements about racism," as he puts it, hand-holding on the part of the IFC will accomplish little.

Rather, the fraternities themselves must take the initiative and improve on the IFC's broad suggestion of holding visitations with question-and-answer sessions. It is the fraternity brothers who must apply their creative energies to devising specific, productive means of interaction, whether through house tours, over coffee and doughnuts, or through some sort of mixers.

In other words, they must work to diminish inhibitions. As Perry says, "The main thing is to face our racist attitudes, and ask each other frank questions that get under the surface." Bingo.

The pleasure is ours, sir

Viewers who tuned in to Sunday's debate between gubernatorial candidates Rufus Edmisten and Jim Martin could be forgiven if they wondered if they were still in the state that has generated the bitter Senate contest between Jim Hunt and Jesse Helms. In contrast to the trivial arguments and name-calling that have dominated the Hunt-Helms debates, Martin and Edmisten treated each other with courtesy and respect, and even seemed to enjoy each other's company.

The debate was conducted with a geniality that North Carolinians should expect, but lately have not seen, in the state's political arena. At one point during Sunday's telecast, Edmisten, apparently overcome by the pressures of months of campaigning, even referred to his opponent as "a very splendid person."

The telecast was not a battle of emotion-laden charges and immature taunts, but rather a thoughtful exchange between two experienced, articulate and concerned candidates. Unfortunately, it was not the stuff of great television. Many viewers were probably lured from the debate by the more combative 60 Minutes. Even UNC political scientist Thad Beyle, who makes his living by watching campaigns, found the Edmisten-Martin match a little dull. "It was boring because it didn't have the high drama and nastiness I was socialized into expecting," Beyle said.

Beyle said he was disturbed that neither candidate expressed an overall vision for the future. Rather than charting a course for the state, the two seemed more like "technicians working in the bowels of the ship," Beyle said.

Maybe he's right. But we still found it reassuring that the candidates dealt in real issues, rather than dredging up obscure statements and votes to attack each other.

While the issues debated Sunday night may have struck viewers as highly technical and agonizingly mundane, they nevertheless are the meat of state politics and will likely have more direct impact on North Carolinians than more attention-grabbing concerns. For instance, Martin expressed the belief that power companies should be allowed to charge consumers for plants under construction; he says it's a matter of paying a little now or a lot later. Edmisten, on the other hand, says consumers are unfairly burdened if they are forced to pay for a plant that has not yet produced electricity. Whichever view prevails, voters' pocketbooks will feel the impact.

Viewers dulled by the Edmisten-Martin match should remember that schools aren't funded by political slogans, and new industry will be attracted more by adequate roads and water-treatment plants than by some eloquent vision of the future.

Rather than being put off by the Edmisten-Martin debate, we'd like to see more of the same. It's unfortunate that Edmisten feels voters are "debated out." With the Hunt-Helms battle gobbling up much of the media's attention, the people have had few opportunities to scrutinize our gubernatorial candidates. The state stands to gain from further sensible, rational exchanges of views. We just hope Jim and Jesse were watching.

The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant News Editors: Lynn Davis, Steve Ferguson, Jo Ellen Meekins and Heidi Zehnal
Editorial Writer: Ben Perkowski

Assistant Managing Editors: Dick Anderson and Elizabeth Huth

News: Mike Allen, Diana Bosniack, Lisa Brantley, Richard Boyce, Tim Brown, Matt Campbell, Tom Conlon, Katy Fridl, Mike Gunzenhauser, Lane Harvey, Tracy Hilton, Jim Hoffman, Mary Benton Hudgens, Guy Lucas, Sallie Krawcheck, Georgia Ann Martin, Dora McAlpin, Margaret McKinnon, Andy Miller, Jennifer Mooney, Margorie Morris, Brian Mullaney, Janet Olson, Beth Ownley, Ruthie Pipkin, Mark Powell, Frank Proctor, David Schmidt, Amy Stiers, Kevin Sullivan, Lisa Swicegood, Dan Tillman, Andy Trincia, Jennifer Trotter, Kevin Washington, Leigh Williams, Karen Youngblood and Jim Zook.

Sports: Scott Fowler and Lee Roberts, assistant sports editors. Scott Canterbury, Kimball Crossley, Mike DeSisti, Scott Fowler, Tamera Majors, Glenn Peterson, Kurt Rosenberg, Mike Schoor, Scott Smith, Mike Waters, David Wells and Bob Young.

Features: Sharon Sheridan, assistant features editor. Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Tom Camacho, Vicki Daughtry, Peggy Fuller, Loretta Grantham, Marymella Hall, Bryan Hassel, Missy Holland, Jenifer Keller, Beverly Lester, Mary Mulvihill, Tom Rose, Liz Saylor, Devi Sen, Joy Shell and Sonya Terrell.

Arts: Ed Brackett, Frank Bruni, Steve Carr, Louis Corrigan, Elizabeth Ellen, Ivy Hilliard, Eddie Huffman, Steve Murray, Virginia Smith and David Sotolongo.

Photography: Larry Childress, Nancy London, Jamie Moncrief, Stretch and Lori Thomas.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Tammy Martin, student business manager; Angela Booze, accounts receivable clerk; Terry Lee, student advertising manager; Reid Barker, Alicia Susan D'Anna, Greg Goosmann, Patricia Gorry, Melanie Parlier, Stacey Ramirez, Doug Robinson, Amy Schutz, Randi Thompson and Scott Whittaker, ad representatives; Patti Pittman, classified advertising manager, Laura Bowen, assistant; Jim Greenhill, office manager; and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager; Lori Crow, assistant.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, assistant.

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

If you don't like Playboy, turn the channel!

To the editor:
Freedom of expression and freedom of choice are basic human rights affirmed both biblically and constitutionally; biblically beginning with Adam's choice to eat the apple, and constitutionally in the first and 14th amendments to the United States Constitution.

The attempt by some Chapel Hill residents to prevent the Playboy channel from being transmitted on Village Cable is a violation of these freedoms.

The United States Supreme Court has ruled on many cases relevant to the Chapel Hill issue. In the 1957 case *Butler vs. Michigan*, and more recently in 1975 in

Erznoznik vs. City of Jacksonville, the Supreme Court ruled that it is illegal for a state to ban transmission of material which might be construed as obscene to children, or even to some adults, based on the principle that children might view the transmission.

Furthermore, in the *Home Box Office vs. Wilkinson* decision of 1982, a passage of the justices' majority opinion included: "That's one of the nice things about TV... there is no law that says you have to watch. There is no law that says you have to purchase a TV set. There is no law that says you have to subscribe to a cable service." Vanessa Williams' story ("TV

dirtied? Playboy channel opposed," *DTH*, Oct. 1) stated that two of the local leaders of the "delete dirt drive," Victor Bowles and Joy Cornwell, received the Playboy channel without requesting it. I assume they live in Chapel Hill and subscribe to Village Cable. I subscribe to Alert Cable. But, if Village is anything as fast as Alert, when a subscriber receives an unpaid-for service, that service is cancelled that same day. All it takes is one phone call, an effort hardly worth banning transmission for the entire town.

Assuming the worst, if the Playboy channel was received after Village Cable offices closed, causing the subscriber to wait until the next

business day to cancel it; what forces the subscriber to watch the allegedly obscene transmission? Surely they and their children, if any, have the ability to change the channel or turn the set off.

Mr. Bowles and Mr. Cornwell and the remaining 1,000 petitioners have the God-given and constitutionally-guaranteed right to view whatever they desire, but so does everyone else.

I am not advocating pornography, I am advocating freedom of choice.

Pete Austin
Carrboro

Doonesbury



Cig warnings pack power

To the editor:
I just had to express my glee regarding the new cigarette pack warnings. Having always considered the rather vague warnings in the past to be half-hearted attempts only to appease part of the general public, I am quite pleased to see such a direct and forceful new approach. In my opinion, the new warnings express a true desire to protect smoking Americans while still respecting their right to make the decision to smoke.

Past warnings talked merely of possibilities and probabilities. Finally the facts are stated, in four different messages, about what will really happen if one smokes. Indeed, four statements must certainly be more effective than one, especially if each appeals to a different aspect of persuasion.

One warning confronts you with the bare facts, appealing to your intellect with logic — "Smoking causes lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, and may complicate pregnancy." Another is almost encouraging you not to smoke by offering an opportunity to improve — "Quitting smoking now greatly reduces serious risks to your health." Another warning attacks

you with guilt — "Smoking by pregnant women may result in fetal injury, premature birth and low birth weight." If none of these ideas persuade you to "break the habit," then the last statement lets you have it with shocking disgust — "Cigarette smoke contains carbon monoxide." Yuck! That's obviously going to be detrimental to your health! You might as well sit behind a running car a few times a day!

I hope these new statements on cigarette packs will reduce the number of smoking people in this country. If smokers are still not dissuaded, it certainly is by no fault of the surgeon general, the government, or supportive non-smokers. Think about it. If all of these horrible things will happen to you if you smoke, and you have the power to choose, what possible reason is there not to stop?

Maybe someday Congress will approach this matter from a new angle, and try to reduce littering as well, by passing a bill stating that smokers are required by law to eat their cigarette butts after they've finished smoking.

Donna E. Hersey
Carrboro

Hey, CGC — students could use a little help

To the editor:
When the intent behind certain actions is so noble, it seems a shame to complain about the actions themselves. But the recent actions of the Campus Governing Council demand review.

A sincere hurrah for the Black Student Movement, the CGC and the many students who supported, actively or passively, the divestment of student fees from the control of the Board of Trustees, which invests in corporations that operate in apartheid-ridden South Africa! Though I think it ludicrous to say the BOT is "apartheid-supporting" as the *DTH* (probably inaccurately) paraphrases Paul Parker, the CGC action is an accurate statement of students' intolerance of South African domestic social policy.

The investment of student fees in an interest-bearing reserve, however, is an untimely and poor decision. At a time when one of

the most mootable campus issues is that of whether to raise student fees, the decision of the CGC to create any kind of reserve is awkward. The heart of the fee increase issue is that there is not enough money to fund all the existing student organizations. What's more, the University is generous in making it very easy to form new organizations, and they are being formed constantly. Each year, when the CGC must prepare a budget, the fees available are spread thinner over more organizations.

So why withhold \$12,000 from the students now paying the fees and having their organizations underfunded?

And why build up a reserve for future CGC appropriations to students who will be paying their own fees?

In such a case it is incredibly presumptuous for the CGC to invest in the Self-Help Credit

Union. Here again, noble intent, but inappropriate action. While a majority of CGC representatives may find the SHCU a worthy, "socially responsible" organization, many of us whose fees the CGC is handling may not. One would be hard pressed, I think, to find a person who does not support some type of charity or "socially responsible" organization of his or her own choosing. But one would be harder pressed to find one who is excited about having money he or she has paid to finance organizations on campus given instead to the SHCU — albeit for a profit — by the CGC and then to future Carolina students who will themselves be paying student fees.

Present Carolina students are paying the fees, so use them to fund our activities! Give more to the Fine Arts Festival for our refinement; or to the Union Forum Committee for our intellectual stimulation; or to the Rape and

Assault Prevention Escort Service for our safety; or to club sports so Men's and Women's Crew can buy badly needed new equipment. We are paying for it!

I would like to provide the treasuries of the student organizations of the future, but I can't. I can hardly afford the proposed fee increase which I had planned on voting for. But as long as \$12,000 is being saved for someone else's funding while some of my organizations are underfunded, I cannot and will not support the increase, and I will encourage others to oppose it.

Our fees are paid to fund our student activities and organizations. They are aimed at helping us get exposure, experience and a liberal education. The CGC should invest in this self-help organization!

Marc W. Wright
Chapel Hill

C'mon college football, make it fun!

By JIMMY TOMLIN

Call me a cynic, but I hate Carolina football. There are certain inevitabilities about the whole experience that I simply cannot tolerate.

Take, for example, the weather... please! On any given football Saturday, the weather will be terrible — unless, of course, the weatherman has predicted foul weather, in which case it will be a beautiful day in the neighborhood. And then unfortunately the law of averages states that any college football Saturday with good weather shall be immediately followed by seven days of bad.

Why am I so cynical?
I suppose the underlying reason is that football is no longer a game to be played, but a battle to be won. Perhaps I am concerned that the true spirit of the game no longer exists, that sportsmanship and the joy of participation have nearly been destroyed. On the other hand, that sort of reasoning is much too lofty for an undergraduate like myself. Besides, it sounds corny. I must be frank.

Before I continue, though, let me say that my comments here are by no means the result of any hard-nosed, investigative journalism. In fact, it was these idle thoughts that rescued me from the depths of despair during Carolina's recent 33-30 setback at the hands of Navy, a perennial anchor in the NCAA's football rankings.

Perhaps more than anything else, I despise the spectators sitting around me. First of all, there's the obnoxious alumnus who manages to sit behind me at every game because he feels obligated to tell me and those around me what the Tar Heels are doing wrong.

"C'mon Crum! Throw the damn football!"
Alas, Dick Crum, your coaching job is in jeopardy. To be honest, I've always hated these "armchair quarterbacks." I did find it hard to believe that a football nobody — okay, maybe he played in high school — wants to match wits with the head coach of a major university football team. Not only should his opinions be taken with a grain of salt, but it should be realized that his keen hindsight is 20/20. Armchair quarterbacks, like backseat drivers, should be stricken



from the face of the earth.

"C'mon Crum! Throw the damn thing!"

Then there is stereotypical blonde next to me who doesn't know a forward pass from a half-time show. On one play in which Carolina quarterback Kevin Anthony tripped as he was backpedaling with the football the blonde screamed, "What'd you do that for?!" in dismay, as if Anthony had fallen on purpose. Nobody else in Kenan Stadium could possibly be more ignorant.

"C'mon, Crum! What kind of a call was that?"
Except for him. I can just hear Anthony in the huddle now: "Okay, men, reverse stumble on two. Ready? Break!" I can't take this any more; I have to ignore him. Maybe I'll just ignore the whole game altogether.

So here I am staring open-mouthed at one of those tow-planes dragging along a banner that reads (now get this!): TARHEELS AND RUFUS #1. Why can't they just —

"C'mon, Crum! Get your head out of your a---!"

That wasn't a nice thing to say, but it would make a great cover picture for the *National Enquirer*!

Now where was I? Oh, yes, the tow-plane. Just another diversion from the game, ranking right up there with the tailgate parties and the cheerleaders.

Don't get me wrong. I hold no personal grudges against tailgate parties, or even pre-game court parties, for that matter. It's simply that I have great difficulty finding my seat when I'm in a

drunken stupor. I know others must, too: I have been forced to dress casually to every game because each time I wind up wearing some frat boy's mixed drink before game's end.

Likewise, I have nothing against cheerleaders. But can anybody beyond the seventh row actually hear them? Let's bring back the mikeman — that was a diversion worthwhile. If the game got boring, we could throw paper airplanes at the mikeman.

I suppose you're wondering why my holier-than-Woody Durham-and-everybody-else evaluation of a Carolina football game has so conspicuously omitted the Marching Tar Heels. To tell the truth, I was rather enjoying the band's half time performance until a voice behind me yelled, "C'mon Yesulaitis! Do 'Foggy Mountain Breakdown!'" (Okay, perhaps I'm stretching it a bit!)

In closing, lest you misinterpret my purpose here, let me clarify myself. While my remarks might be construed as the idle ramblings of a sore loser, let me assure you that my ire is purely incidental to the team's performance. Still, I am indeed disgusted with the Tar Heels and with college football in general, and as of this moment I am boycotting the sport altogether.

Unless, of course, Dad comes through with those freebies on the 50 for the State game. Or if we get block seats. Or maybe if...

Jimmy Tomlin is a senior journalism major from Statesville, N.C.