

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor

CATHERINE COWAN
ANJETTA McQUEEN
JANET OLSON
JAMI WHITE
ANDY TRINCIA

Associate Editor
Production Editor
University Editor
News Editor
State and National Editor

LARRY CHILDRESS

LORETTA GRANTHAM
LORRY WILLIAMS
LEE ROBERTS
ELIZABETH ELLEN
SHARON SHERIDAN

City Editor
Business Editor
Sports Editor
Arts Editor
Features Editor
Photography Editor

Weather or not you know, the slow dorm is coming

The Katherine K. Carmichael dormitory didn't open in August — and it won't be opening in January either. Wayne Kuncel, director of University housing, announced the second postponement of the dorm's opening early this week. Why aren't we surprised?

According to Kuncel, students should be able to move in next August, one year after the "planned" opening. Previous plans to move Olde Campus residents into the new dorm between fall and spring semesters have now been scrapped. Perhaps you recall a similar incident happening to those who bought into Kensington Trace condominiums — a private project which overran last August, failing to open until January. And that, too, was blamed on the weather.

Ah, the weather... Security Building Co., the Chapel Hill mega-developer busy constructing Carmichael dorm, blames bad weather for the postponed opening date. But just how much can be blamed on the weather? Dating back more than a year now the weather has been fairly unremarkable. April was a bit wet, but weather this summer in Chapel Hill was fairly average, perhaps even dry — as it was last winter. October and November, the driest months of the year, have more or less carried true to form this year. Of course, we had those five straight days of rain about a week ago, but two of those days were during the weekend and... well, let's just say we don't necessarily buy the line about the weather.

Perhaps the University and its contractors ought to begin figuring in the average number of work days lost to weather per month — if they don't claim to do it already. The worst they could

do would be to overestimate the number of days that would be lost on a project and accidentally finish ahead of time. Now that would be a twist.

But that's about all that's funny here. Students residing in Olde Campus dormitories have been anticipating a move into the new dorm for a couple of months now, ever since the last time construction ran over. The move was intended to leave Everett, Grimes and seven other dorms empty for major renovations. Now Kuncel says the upgrading of those dorms can't be done over the summer, for lack of time.

Security Building Co. will be fined a paltry \$300 for each day they overrun the Dec. 31 completion date. But that will hardly improve upon the fact that Olde Campus dorm renovations will remain incomplete.

The biggest fear we have is that, what with the central air conditioning and the weight room being installed in the new dorm, we're about to see an athletes' dorm come into existence. Supporters of such a project may argue that athletes need to live in a place accessible to practice areas and what have you. But no one goes to the trouble of securing such "accessible" dorms for students who work just as hard at the Carolina Union, the Campus Y, Student Television and, yes, even at the newspaper that ends up covering all the athletic events themselves.

Is the extensive interior work now being done on the new dorm — which is, in turn, preventing the upgrading of nine other dorms — intended to primarily benefit athletes in the long run? Perhaps. But we'll never really know, will we? In four or five years' time we'll all be gone — and maybe no one will be the wiser. But if the weather motif holds true, the answer may be blowing in the wind.

Zionism lives in infamy

Zionism is racism. President Reagan and Jeane Kirkpatrick do not agree. On the 10th anniversary of a United Nations resolution that linked Zionism to racism, Reagan sent a message to the U.N. General Assembly asking for its repeal. Reagan quoted Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, D-N.Y., saying that the United States "does not acknowledge, it will never abide by, it will never acquiesce in this infamous act."

Perhaps in the past Moynihan could have protested the resolution in good conscience, but the Zionist stance no longer provokes sympathy. It is entirely militaristic and imperialistic. The present plight of the Palestinians is indicative of Israel's insatiable desire to conquer and divide. Splinter groups of the Palestine Liberation Organization are scattered among Syria, Kuwait and South Yemen after being systematically dispersed from Israel, Lebanon and finally Jordan by the Jordanese. The Israelis refuse to recognize in the PLO a replica of their past state, nor can they recognize the PLO's acts of violence as sheer desperation.

Israel provoked the violence and insists on perpetuating it. In addition to sporadic West Bank skirmishes, Zionists in the United States are gearing up for some action. The new leader of the already militant Jewish Defense League, Irv Rubin, has laid plans to train members in the use of weapons and paramilitary tactics, claiming that anti-Semitism is on the rise across the country.

On the contrary, Reagan's action toward the U.N. resolution should indicate that there is presently a pro-Israeli sentiment in the United States. Rubin's plans and recent bombings and

assassinations attributed to the JDL are unjustified. Indeed, they cannot fulfill the purpose of the organization — to protect Jews. Instead, they provoke the fear, anger and desire for retaliation earned by the PLO with its 1972 kidnapping of Israeli athletes at the Summer Olympics in Munich, West Germany. They will certainly lead to counteractions.

The Israelis assert that their actions are based on fear and a desire for retaliation against the PLO and other anti-Semites groups, but, at least with the moderate faction of the PLO, there needn't be so much fear. Although Yassir Arafat has never formally recognized the Israeli state, he shows every sign that he will give it recognition if Israel and the PLO could arrive at a truce. However, Israel obviously does not want the PLO's recognition; it wants the PLO's obliteration. Israel will not compromise for peace, but will continue to destroy until it arrives at peace: a deadly silence.

In his message to the United Nations, Reagan condoned violence toward the PLO. Not only is this action strategically poor — the United States' exaggerated support of Israel alienates the Arab nations right into the arms of the Soviet Union — it is ethically unsound. As the Jewish Defense League proves, Zionists have behaved and continue to behave in a maniacal, militaristic manner. Their actions toward the PLO are the blind irrationalities of prejudice.

Zionism is indeed racism. Until Israel can arrive at a real peace with the PLO, Reagan ought to retract his message to the United Nations.

— SALLY PONT

Big Talk

Gab, gab, gab...
Oh sure, a lot of you like to talk all the time. You talk about this; you talk about that. You talk about... well, lots of things.

All we're saying is — put it in writing. Or actually, type it, triple-spaced, nice and neat. Then send it on in.



U.S. wants peace not war in Middle East

To the editors:

Keith Cooper's logic in his letter "The West is the true culprit in the Iran-Iraq war" (Nov. 8) is, without trying to sound harsh, at the very least laughable and yet ultimately a dangerous approach to U.S. foreign policy.

The area that stretches from Southwest Asia across the Fertile Crescent and Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean, is, as we all know, torn not only by tension and division, but also by deep-rooted, tenacious hostilities that erupt repeatedly into violence. The Iran-Iraq war is just one example. Cooper says that "mediocre reasons" such as "oil, religion and politics" have nothing to do with the conflict. How naive to think that petty things like religion and politics have any impact on the Iran-Iraq war. We are very fortunate to have "experts" like Keith Cooper to set us

straight on the real reason behind the war. He explains that this war is caused by what he calls "military intelligence operations" of Western intelligence agencies, namely the CIA. Cooper even has the audacity to proclaim Israel, one of our closest friends and allies in the world as the "common enemy." This assertion alone displays Cooper's total ineptness in foreign policy.

Cooper suggests that the United States deliberately creates turmoil in the Middle East so as to strengthen and protect Israel. The thought that Mideast turmoil protects Israel is absurd. Mr. Cooper merely looks at the surface problems in the area, without realistically looking at the underlying tensions. Neither the PLO, Iran, nor Iraq has recognized Israel as a nation. I suppose this is just a "mediocre" political reason. Secondly, the "Islamic radicalism of Khomeini" as called by *Business*

Week has consistently been in conflict with the more moderate Ba'ath regime of President Saddam Hussein in Iraq. But, as we should realize, religion has nothing to do with the Iran-Iraq war. Finally, the Shi'ites in Iraq (55% of the population) see the war as an "ancient conflict between Arabs and Persians" according to *US News and World Report*. Cooper needs to understand that instability in the Middle East may serve the best interests of some nations, such as the Soviet Union, but it does not serve the United States interests and it does not serve the interests of our friends, be they Israeli or Arab.

All of us with an interest in peace, freedom and national independence have a high stake in the Mideast peace process. Israel's stake is highest of all. The long term goal of the United States and its agencies, including the CIA, is to

preserve peace. We must never turn on our friend and ally, Israel. As former U.N. Ambassador Jean J. Kirkpatrick once said, "the strength of the U.S. ties and commitment to Israel are well known. The warmth of the human relationship between our peoples is understood." The best way to protect our ally is to work for peace in the Middle East. I am reminded of President Reagan's commitment to peace in his first Inaugural address: "As for enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it — now or ever."

H. Keith Poston,
vice chairman
Students for America

Religion not a part of Iran-Iraq war

To the editors:

Keith Cooper's letter blaming the West for the Iran-Iraq war ("The West is the true culprit in the Iran-Iraq war," Nov. 8) is tarnished by twisted logic and assertions that have no factual basis. Cooper dismisses religion as a "mediocre" explanation of the Iran-Iraq war because he believes that it is absurd for members of the same religion to fight. Cooper notes that it would be inappropriate for Baptists and Anglicans to fight because both are Christian. I agree with Cooper that it is absurd for wars to be waged on the basis of religion. But this has not stopped Protestant and Catholic Christians from murdering each other in Ireland. Sunni and Shiite Moslems, as Lebanon demonstrated, show little remorse in fighting each other, either. Cooper's claim that religion is not a plausible explanation of the Iran-Iraq war is

erroneous.

Cooper forwards a grandiose theory blaming the instability in the world, including the Iran-Iraq war, on Western intelligence agencies including the CIA, the Israeli Mossad and Scotland Yard. Scotland Yard? I hate to break this to you Keith, but Scotland Yard is involved only in domestic operations in Britain. I just can't imagine Sherlock Holmes as an agent in South Africa. Cooper backs up his theory by claiming that only Middle Eastern nations not friendly with the West are plagued by instability. Again, facts do not confirm Cooper's theory. Has Cooper forgotten the assassination of Anwar Sadat, leader of pro-West Egypt, or the virtual collapse and surrender to Syria of a Lebanese government that America strongly supported? I also find very questionable Cooper's statement that an alliance of Iran

and Iraq would bring about the destruction of the State of Israel. Such a union would constitute a threat to Israel, but Israel's destruction would hardly be a sure outcome.

Intelligence agencies such as the CIA do cause instability in the world. To blame all the world's problems on these agencies, however, is simply naive. I suggest to Keith Cooper that before he writes another letter on the Middle East he should perhaps research his subject. My shock at the absurdity of his letter was only exceeded by the *DTH*'s headline proclaiming that "(Nuclear) Holocaust will cause problems." I wonder how long it took the *DTH* to come to this profound realization.

Jon Oberlander
Hinton James

How about more mainstream, XYC?

To the editors:

Hey guys, I've got an idea! I'm sitting here listening to WRDU (something that my roommate considers a serious character flaw) and it hit me that I am not really enjoying all of the music that I'm hearing. It's not that I expect to love every note on the airwaves, but it is disheartening to listen in the morning and again in the afternoon and evening and hear the same songs.

"Aha!" you say, "I have the answer you are looking for, Chris: WXYC." Right? Wrong. Actually I do enjoy our student station occasionally, but I really appreciate hearing music I have heard before. Granted, XYC does play some

classic rock'n'roll, but not enough for me. Don't get me wrong, my musical taste is broad. I mean very broad: John Denver to Yaz. You get the point. Anyway, what I had in mind when I pulled the old typewriter out was this: It seems to me that XYC (our student station) really appeals to very little of the student population. What is "in" is "out" at XYC.

So here is my clever solution: why doesn't XYC do a mainstream segment each day? Possibly it could just adopt a more mainstream format. I would definitely listen more often if I could be sure of enjoying a few more songs in between "expanding my taste." I mean, all "but-XYC-is-the-only-

station-of-its-kind-go-listen-to-G-105" arguments aside, I'm paying for part of it and I want to enjoy part of it.

Don't get mad, fans. Please, please don't get mad. Some of my best friends listen to the big X or nothing at all. Uncle Chris doesn't want to ruin a unique station. He just wants input. You know, input from the masses, expansive outlook, enlightened format, serving the student. Tres out-of-state, non?

Chris (where can I get a station with the right balance) Shearer Teague

John Giragos Teague

SBP must understand bureaucracies

By FETZER MILLS

The next race for student body president is closer than we realize. The stakes are too high not to take this election seriously. It is time now to reflect upon the qualities we should look for in one who seeks this position.

More than any other trait, we need a student body president who understands the nature and psychology of bureaucracies, and who has the perseverance and creativity to make the bureaucracy which runs our university responsive to changing student needs.

University bureaucracy is like bureaucracy everywhere: vague, confusing and seemingly unpenetrable. Students are unable to redress their grievances through the bureaucracy unless someone within the bureaucracy so wills it and gives a benevolent nod. A bureaucracy enables its functionaries to say "no" without speaking.

The administrative bureaucracy also allows each member to escape responsibility for actions which affect student's lives. Vice-chancellors and associate vice-chancellors can escape responsibility for decisions by pointing to lower staff members, and lower staff members escape responsibility by pointing back at the vice-chancellors or by pointing to committees and noting the small, token number of student members, as if to return the blame.

If this should not work, vice-chancellors and deans can point fingers towards the chancellor's office, where, it is often claimed, the "real" power lies. But our chancellor, it has become clear, points his finger everywhere, claiming to act for the trustees, alumni, the public, the faculty, etc., etc., etc.

Responsibility that lies everywhere lies nowhere. Persons affected by administrative decisions are easily identified. Those who make the decisions are not.

We need a student body president who is able to recognize campus problems and who is willing to take the initiative to study, attack and resolve those problems.

Countless issues and problems on campus are resolved not through administrative action, but through student initiative. The Drug and Alcohol program, the Student Part-Time Employment Service, and even the Chapel Hill Bus System are excellent examples.

Administrators often claim to support student initiative, but secretly thwart it because it is unpredictable, impatient and demanding of energy and attention. The initiative requires administrative co-operation or approval, it becomes a monkey wrench in an otherwise well-oiled "system."

A bureaucracy is a world where predictability, consistency and stability are valued over principle and creativity. Thus, change is avoided, seldom embraced.

We need a student body president who can mobilize student opinion and energies so that the student perspective can be injected firmly and

intelligently into the decision-making processes which affect student's lives.

Ideally, the University encourages skills and values integral to democratic processes. Ironically, the University itself is governed in an authoritarian manner, not a democratic one.

In a democracy, the chosen power wielders must appear regularly before the voters for approval or replacement. In our university, as in others, the power wielders of the administration confer with the faculty and dictate policy to the students without ever having to come forward to account for their actions or performances, as do leaders who are democratically chosen.

If students have input, it is usually on administratively designed committees, in out-voted numbers, and at the pleasure of the administration. For example, the students on the committee which recently chose the new dean of the College of Arts and Sciences were appointed by administrators, not elected by student leaders. The power to appoint is the power to flatter and to remove — strong signals, though subtle, that the one who appoints is the one to please.

Students are brought into the University decision-making process not because they are the ends towards which the decisions are made, but because their presence in small numbers is a handy means of thwarting latent dissent among the student populace. This is why students began serving on committees in greater numbers in the sixties. You can bet that a student demand for greater voice or a more significant presence would be ignored or "postponed."

It is the appearance of student input that administrators, especially those in Student Affairs, seek to cultivate. Actual student control or influence over decisions threatens the administrative structure of control which has been carefully woven amidst unseen and often unacknowledged power struggles that occur behind closed administrative doors.

It has become evident that the need of some administrators to protect their position in the power structure prevents them from assessing the right and wrong of their actions; and the more feeble their position, the louder they deny it is their flanks that they guard.

We need a student body president who is willing to fight on behalf of his/her constituents, and who is willing to proclaim, when the situation so warrants, that the Emperor wears no clothes.

Administrators claim that they desire to build student leaders and to foster leadership potential, yet they erect cages within which leadership can be tamed and channeled.

Many of the men and women now running our university were cutting their administrative teeth in the 60's and early 70's when students were, by varying reports, "the enemy." Loud and intelligent student opposition to university policies is almost impossible to handle. After all, despite the indications of many of their actions, administrators are bound by protocol to claim their support for students, just as Reagan is

compelled to claim his concern for South Africans and Helms for civil rights. Here, as there, principles are pushed aside and reduced to irrelevant arguments over procedure.

I have learned many lessons from my numerous contacts and conflicts with our university's bureaucracy. I fear, however, that the only lesson learned is that it is more efficient and orderly to dictate policy overtly than to choreograph the charade of broad-based participation.

The greatest obstacle to democratically-made policy, however, is not an administration willing to use authoritarian or dictatorial methods; rather, it is a student populace willing to acquiesce to decisions contrary to their best interests. The second greatest threat is the student leader who rushes to defend our administration and their decisions, but who is reticent, even tongue-tied, when it is the student position that needs to be articulated and publicly defended.

I have discovered that I share a common experience with innumerable student leaders from over the years. Upon first encounters, we were impressed and surprised at how "nice" certain administrators here can be. Consequently, we were lulled into a false sense of trust and friendship. We did not recognize the tension in our respective goals. But after a series of encounters, we discovered that such diplomatic cordiality was closer kin to that which is seen between opposing candidates in front of cameras when at the debating tables, and not the kind between buddies who happen to meet on the street.

Finally, we need a student body president who is potentially able to serve more than one term, and who can thereby capitalize upon mistakes and experience and maintain the momentum that is denied presidents who serve but one year.

Our student leaders are democratically elected in mid-February, and spring break halts most action until mid-March. A simple "let's wait and see" or "I can't speak with you now," or "let's put that idea into a committee" from an administrator can leave an idea floundering until exams and summer break put a four month hold on everything; everything except unbridled and unwatched administrative action in the direction of it's own choosing. And as soon as Thanksgiving break, exams and Christmas vacation put a halt to student government action, the student body president returns in January as a lame duck.

The student body president should be more than a figure head. The student body president is the students' one, legitimate avenue of communication with our administration. In this position we need a student who understands that it is respect among students and administrators, not popularity, that makes the critical difference. In short, in this position we need a student who understands that the student body president must be more than just a friend and a politician. That person must be a leader.

Fetzer Mills is a senior international studies major from Wakesboro.

Classical music, anybody?

To the editors:

"WXYC listeners hear anything from blues and jazz to reggae, folk and new wave."

And classical?

As WXYC tries to cater to all tastes, I feel it should have some type of classical programming during its broadcast hours. Certainly, there exists a sizable student audience for such music.

It has been argued by the station that WUNC (81.5 FM) plays classical music and therefore no need exists for XYC to play classical. WUNC also plays jazz — is XYC's jazz programming to be considered a "duplication?" To receive WXYC (89.7 FM) in Raleigh is sometimes a challenge as its broadcast frequency is very close to that of WXYC. And while XYC has no classical collection, I am sure some dedicated people could start a collection.

WXYC is Carolina's fine student radio station. It should be flexible enough to strive to provide all listening pleasures to the diversified tastes of its listeners.

John Giragos Teague