

# The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

JILL GERBER, Editor  
 AMY HAMILTON, Managing Editor  
 SALLY PEARSALL, News Editor  
 KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor  
 KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor  
 SHARON KEBSCHULL, State and National Editor  
 LEIGH ANN McDONALD, City Editor  
 MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor  
 FELISA NEURINGER, Business Editor  
 HANNAH DRUM, Features Editor  
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, Arts Editor  
 CHARLOTTE CANNON, Photography Editor  
 CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor

## Put candidates on financial aid board opinion

Though some find April the cruelest month, January is undoubtedly the hardest to endure. The thrill of new classes wanes, cold fronts redden the ears, and we begin counting the days to spring break. But suddenly, like a miracle, we find ourselves inundated with smiling faces professing the curious caption "VOTE FOR." These campaign posters spawn and multiply in a human presage of Spring.

Though we may marvel at such novel graffiti, little do we think of what such posters cost. And the hefty expenditures — equal to a semester's tuition — ensure only competitiveness, not victory.

Spending limits do exist. Candidates for student body president and Daily Tar Heel editor can spend no more than \$400, plus \$200 more if they are in a runoff.

But for the student unendowed with disposable income, such costs are significant, even prohibitive. As a result, the financially well-to-do possess an inherent advantage in such elections.

A bill passed Thursday night by Student Congress' Rules and Judiciary Committee seeks to open up the electoral process by reimbursing half the campaign expenses of all SBP candidates who receive at least 10 percent of the vote in next month's election.

## The new breed of greediness

Question 1: Which are important reasons to attend college?

- to become a more cultured person
- to gain a general education
- to improve reading and study skills
- to make more money

If you're like many freshman college students polled last fall by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, you probably chose answer "d." Out of the 209,627 responses to the poll, 33 percent desired to become more cultured people, 60 percent wanted to gain a general education, and 40 percent valued their reading and study skills.

"To make more money" was the clear frontrunner of these, chosen by 71 percent of the freshmen. Only "to get a better job" was more popular, with 83 percent. But after all, a better job leads to more money.

So it seems that the latest "Wall Street" chant of "greed is good" will continue out of the '80s and into the next decade with the class of '91. Other indications of the future's corporate mentality — 27 percent of freshmen intend to major in business-related fields, while 25 percent anticipate careers in these fields. So, at least 2 percent of these Gekko-ites will drop out of the race.

Maybe with a little persuasion the converts will join the ranks of those

The reimbursement money — roughly \$800 to \$1,000 — would come from the Executive Branch, which receives student fees allocated yearly by the congress. The executive branch would ask congress for more money to fund the project.

The most obvious response to the problem would be to limit spending, perhaps to \$200 a candidate. But such a limit would significantly decrease campus awareness both of the candidates and the election as a whole, and few students vote already.

Another potential objection to the bill is that candidates are aware of the costs when they run and would receive a stipend if elected. But the stipends provide little more than a part-time job would, although the offices require 50-hour weeks.

Finally, it seems odd for Student Government to justify spending \$1,000 on such a program when many organizations must claw for every dollar during the budget process. Yet the program would be an investment in the system, an attempt to broaden concerns and strengthen existing positions for the benefit of all constituencies.

Some may suggest that if it's not broke, don't fix it. But the threat of going broke in a bid for campus office is a festering sore in the student body that this proposal can easily heal. Let the gaggle of Babel babble, and the voice that emerges will be stronger.

who intend to teach at a university level — all .3 percent of them. And that decimal point is in the right place.

Now, there must be a few business majors out there reading this and getting mad. "This editorial is manipulating figures to make its point! I have plenty of other interests, and money's not the only reason I'm here!"

Fair enough, the above figures do include some overlap — many people want to make more money and also get a general education. But consider two yes/no, cut and dried questions:

- Chief benefit of college is to increase earnings? 70 percent agreed.
- Being very well-off financially is an essential life objective? 76 percent nodded yes.

Business is not bad. Obviously the United States needs people to manage its capitalist system, oversee the buying and selling of goods, etc. But the attitude that college is merely a step toward a higher salary is bad.

If this poll holds true, the '90s look like they'll be at least as materialistic as the '80s have been. One can only hope that the members of the next Budd Fox generation have a better sense for business than for their own charisma. Forty percent of the freshmen rated themselves in the top 10 percent in sex appeal. — Brian McCuskey

**The Daily Tar Heel**  
 Editorial Writers: Matt Bivens, Brian McCuskey and Laura Pearlman.  
 Editorial Assistants: Gary Greene and David Lagos.  
 Layout: Cara Bonnett, Peter Lineberry and Mandy Spence.

**News:** Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Laura Bennett, Lydian Bernhardt, Brenda Campbell, Jenny Cloninger, Staci Cox, Laura DiGiano, Carrie Dove, Laura Francis, Amy Grubbs, Lindsay Hayes, William Hildebolt, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Susan Kauffman, Will Lingo, Barbara Linn, Steve Long, Lynne McClintock, Brian McColium, Myrna Miller, Rebecca Nesbit, Helle Nielsen, Susan Odenkirchen, Cheryl Pond, Amy Powell, Beth Rhea, Becky Riddick, Mandy Spence, Christopher Sontchi, Laura Summer, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Amy Weisner, Jackie Williams and Amy Winslow. Mark Folk and Justin McGuire, senior writers. Juliellen Sarver, wire editor. Brian Long, assistant business editor.

**Sports:** Chris Spencer and Jim Muse, assistant sports editors. James Surowiecki, senior writer. Robert D'Arruda, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Brendan Mathews, Patton McDowell, Keith Parsons, Andy Podolsky and Langston Wertz.

**Features:** Laura Jenkins, Jim Mock, Corin Ortlam, Leah Pressley, Kathy Wilson and Julie Woods.

**Arts:** James Burrus, senior writer. Scott Cowen, Stephanie Dean, Kim Donehower, David Hester, Julie Olson, Kelly Rhodes, Alston Russell and Richard Smith.

**Photography:** Christie Blom, Tony Deifell, Janet Jarman, David Minton, Elizabeth Morrah and Julie Stovall.

**Copy Editors:** Karen Bell and Kaarin Tissue, assistant news editors. Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Bert Hackney, Lisa Lorentz and Sherry Miller.

**Cartoonists:** Jeff Christian and Greg Humphreys.

**Campus Calendar:** Mindelle Rosenberg and David Starnes.

**Business and Advertising:** Anne Fulcher, general manager; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Peggy Smith, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Michael Benfield, Lisa Choreanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovinsky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary.

**Distribution:** Tucker Stevens, manager.

**Delivery:** David Econopouly, manager; Billy Owens, assistant.

**Production:** Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon, production assistants.

**Printing:** The Chapel Hill Newspaper.

## Readers' Forum

### Fraternities deserve support, not scorn

Editor's note: The author is vice president of Kappa Sigma fraternity.

To the editor:

Once again, UNC fraternities have come to the forefront of discussion, thanks to the series of articles that the DTH has featured over the last two weeks. This paper displayed its penchant for good timing again: this time the debate comes during our spring rush period. After a while it becomes hard to overlook the ignorance of this newspaper, especially when it is used only to take potshots at a respectable organization. Two articles in particular have disturbed me: "UNC, town officials decry fraternities' negative image" of Jan. 14 and the Jan. 21 letter "Frat reporting is fair" by Alex Cousins.

This paper has perpetuated the "Animal House" myth that frustrates all of our positive efforts. The public continues to get an image of us as miscreants, felons and sloths. Cousins would have you believe that the way to Fraternity Court is via the River Styx. As rush chairman of my house, I have been forced to attack this negative image. Imagine my surprise when rushees told me gruesome hazing tales, and that fraternities are distractions from the more important pursuits of intramurals and Student Government. I felt a similar humor while reading the DTH article on Jan. 14.

It is true that a fraternity has its share of social outlets; however, it also provides

many psychic and scholarly rewards. Anyone who has played on an organized team should be able to identify with the loyalty and closeness of a brotherhood. The Greek system builds character and matures its members. I have seen many arrogant "country clubbers" humbled. On the other hand, fraternities have enhanced the personalities of many introverts and built confidence in insecure people.

What good are fraternities? My house visits the Oxford Orphanage twice a year. Many of these children have developed friendships, if only superficial, with our brothers. Last fall we raised almost \$6,000 for two charity organizations. The Sigma Chi Derby Days is also for a charitable cause, yet non-Greeks probably wouldn't know that, or even know what it is. The list goes on, but the local media have no interest in such a story — it is positive journalism, something no longer respected.

As for the idea that we are lazy, spoiled people who party more than we study, this is a gross misclassification of many bright, ambitious young men who will no doubt become tomorrow's leaders and trendsetters. Great numbers of fraternity men represent us in the political and business arenas. World renowned heart surgeon Denton Cooley was a fraternity man, and yes, girls, Robert Redford was a "fratty bagger," too. At UNC, Student Government representatives have traditionally been Greek. I am willing to bet (oops,

better watch my language) that the fraternal GPA is greater than the all-men's average; at least it was in 1985.

I am disturbed by the anti-fraternity bias that the DTH has shown. Yes, believe it or not, I am glad that our house was condemned. It taught us a lesson. I do not enjoy living in a sloppy house, and that is why it upsets me that most of the damage that occurs is beyond our control. Many of our so-called guests have the idea that we don't care, so they shouldn't care. At a recent party we had two fights, a guy urinating on our carpet and another who dumped his cooler of ice water behind our bar. I have encountered people who think it is our obligation to provide facilities to hundreds of people at the court parties. If nudity is so offensive, why do hundreds of girls applaud a boy who is thrown into the Granville pool? I was never paddled, and frankly, I enjoyed being kidnapped by the brothers — it was fun.

My association with the fraternal system has been very rewarding. Let's not make this a good guy/bad guy issue. We are students first, and our extracurricular pursuit is no less important to us than UNC basketball is to Jeff Lebo. I hope students will take heed and respect our institution and support it rather than denigrate it.

CHARLES VOLLMER  
 Junior  
 Chemistry

### Bush was bushwhacked

To the editor:

In Jill Gerber's editorial, "Getting stuck in the sand-box," Jan. 27) she says that "the most important issue to come out of the broadcast is (George) Bush's reluctance to answer questions about the Iran-contra scandal." As long as the all-important American public wants to hear about the affair, so her argument goes, Bush should capitulate. All right, fair enough; he is, indeed, a politician.

But does it not bother her that Bush was misled by CBS as to the nature of the interview? Does "integrity of the press" mean anything to her? The live broadcast, as Bush insisted, was to be a campaign profile, and, on those grounds, he accepted. We witnessed his consternation at the fact that every question focused on the Iran-contra affair. Gerber says that "the whole episode could have been avoided," had Bush answered calmly. CBS would have been happy, the American public would have been happy, and that would have been that. But what about Bush? If he had been informed that the interview really was to concentrate only on his role in the Iran-contra affair, do you think that he would have accepted? Evidently, neither did CBS.

JILL McCARTNEY  
 Senior  
 English

### South Campus is no prison

To the editor:

It is rare that a simple news story offends me so much as the one concerning the new, on-campus housing policies ("Housing director announces guaranteed housing policy," Jan. 25). Yet, as an Ehringhaus resident for two years, I feel I must speak out.

A new alternative offered to returning students who want to live on campus is to relocate from wherever they previously lived to South Campus. In the article, this fact is referred to several times and is done so with a smack of "I'd rather burn than live there."

I am citing in particular



housing director Wayne Kunc's words that students who would agree to live on South Campus are guaranteed housing. Do people think we're fenced in like animals down here? Why shouldn't anyone be willing to live down on South Campus? True, we have a fairly long hike to class, but there is a bus that comes to Chase Hall every 10 minutes or so. We also have all of the modern conveniences — indoor plumbing, heat, beds. We even enjoy a small, yes, an actual convenience — we're only a few steps away from both Kenan Stadium and the Smith Center.

Why, when I tell someone where I live, do I receive a sympathetic glance and a heart-felt, "Oh, I'm sorry?" We who live on South Campus and like it would appreciate a bit more tolerance from our fellow students who hail from "up North." If it were not for the bad Social Security numbers, we would all live in Cobb, too.

MARIA BATISTA  
 Sophomore  
 Journalism/Spanish

### Flag symbolizes bitter past

To the editor:

Sunday Spinn and Leonard Emory, in their letter "Flag symbolizes Southern pride,"

(Jan. 28) claim that the Confederate flag is a way of showing that the new South should remember its "heritage" and "independent spirit." They also recall the South as having developed pride and unity. I, too, am a Southerner; however, my memories of the South symbolized by the Confederate flag are somewhat different from those described in the letter.

First, the old South bears only bad memories for those of us whose ancestors were bound into involuntary servitude. When we begin to think of the "independent spirit," we are sidetracked by memories of whippings, rapes and lynchings. You see, our ancestors were not much into the "independent spirit," but more into day to day survival from those who were so big on "Southern pride."

Second, when we try to picture our so-called rich heritage, we are met with lifelike visions of our people working from the crack of dawn until dusk for less than substantial rations. You see, while our ancestors were integral in the shaping of the South, somehow it just didn't seem like home.

Third, when you say strong "pride and unity" developed, I somehow do not believe that this pride or unity included my people. Is it your intention to have me believe that masters, neighbors and slaves all joined hands to sing "Dixie"? Or are

you simply choosing not to include the plight of those bound by slavery into your account of the old South?

You see, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is simply trying to remove a symbol of bondage, rape, maiming and wrongful death. The Confederate flag, while it may bring you the fondest memories of lily-white painted homes and nicely hand-plowed fields, leaves a bitter feeling in my soul.

KENNETH PERRY  
 Junior  
 Psychology

### Letters policy

When submitting letters or columns, students should include the following: name, year in school, major, phone number and the date submitted. Other members of the University community should give similar information.

### We goofed

Thursday's editorial "The Bell Tower deserves better" incorrectly said that the Bell Tower was painted after the UNC-N.C. State game Sunday. It was painted before the game. The Daily Tar Heel regrets the error.

## Poster removal is wrong way to get involved

To the editor:

Yes, as Mary Emma Holleman wrote ("Take voting seriously," Jan. 25), campaigns for student offices are getting in full swing. With the barrage of posters, fliers and speeches also goes an incredible amount of work by both the candidate and his campaign staff.

As a hard-working volunteer for one candidate, I helped organize a large poster distribution for Friday afternoon, expecting the posters to be in the classrooms Monday morning. I was extremely frustrated and infuriated to find that, over the weekend, nearly every poster of the particular candidate had been removed from more than five of the largest classroom buildings.

I could understand this large-scale removal if all candidates' posters for all offices had been taken down. Perhaps then it would have been maintenance workers who had removed them. However, I noticed that many, if not all, of the posters

that were up on Friday for the other candidates were still up. No, this candidate's posters were not placed in overly conspicuous or offensive areas, but, in many cases, among posters that were not taken down.

These actions show an ignorance of the work and effort placed in a campaign by students. Not only was valuable time given up by the students to put up the posters, but these posters also cost money. Candidates are not given campaign funds to spend on their elections — the money comes out of their own pockets! Furthermore, each candidate has a strict spending limit. If posters are pulled down or defaced, the replacement cost of those posters precludes other spending by a candidate, and gives his opponents an unfair advantage.

Of course, those who would rip down posters probably would not be deterred to do so again by taking the interests of the

candidates to heart. For those driven by self-interest, it is also a violation of the Campus Code to deface or remove posters or other property of candidates placed in public areas. A violation of the code can result in a maximum penalty of suspension, with repeated violations even resulting in expulsion.

I am by no means accusing any individual. The act is done, and with a lot of late night work the posters have been replaced. I urge students, if not for the candidates, then for themselves, to please not rip down, mutilate or deface campaign posters. If you hold enough antipathy against a candidate to act in such a manner, then get involved in one of his or her opponents' campaigns. Put up posters, don't take them down.

TREY LOUGHRAN  
 Sophomore  
 Political Science