

The Daily Tar Heel

96th year of editorial freedom

JEAN LUTES, Editor

KAREN BELL, News Editor
MATT BIVENS, Associate Editor
KIMBERLY EDENS, University Editor
JON K. RUST, Managing Editor
WILL LINGO, City Editor
KELLY RHODES, Arts Editor
CATHY McHUGH, Omnibus Editor

KAARIN TISUE, News Editor
LAURA PEARLMAN, Associate Editor
KRISTEN GARDNER, University Editor
SHARON KEBSCHULL, State and National Editor
MIKE BERARDINO, Sports Editor
LEIGH ANN McDONALD, Features Editor
KIM DONEHOWER, Design Editor

DAVID MINTON, Photography Editor

Time out for sportsmanship

As Anson Dorrance left the field on Wednesday night, he had a deceptively innocent gleam in his eye, like he had never seen something like that in himself before. Holding his arm was a hardened Durham policeman, who stared at the fiery but bookish-looking coach in disbelief.

Spectators had witnessed the darker side of UNC's phenomenally successful coach of both the men's and women's soccer teams. Off the field, he is jubilant, especially when dealing with the media. But during a game, he's passionately involved in every nuance of the sport, whether it's the majestic arc of the ball or the absurdly sloppy timekeeping and officiating. On Wednesday, the latter finally caused our tragic hero to lose his grip at — officially — 89:54, six seconds before the end of the contest.

Briefly, the key facts:

■ 53:27 — Senior Forward Donald Cogsville scored the first goal after a sloppy pass by a Duke defenseman landed on the toe of UNC sophomore Derek Missimo. 1-0 North Carolina.
■ 83:48 — As the game got tighter, the Duke squad succeeded in keeping the ball in UNC's third of the field. This resulted in two goals, the first of which came on a corner pass to Steve Knoll, who headed the ball into the lower right corner of the net. 1-1.
■ 89:54 — Duke defenseman Joey Valenti then scored, on a miraculous

banana kick that curved right below the crossbar and stayed just above the arms of the Carolina goalkeeper.

Several times, the North Carolina bench tried to alert the referee that the clock was not being immediately restarted after stoppages of play. The coaches estimated that at least 20 and possibly 30 seconds of extra time was added, a factor which would have ruled out a Duke victory and sent the crucial game into overtime.

Said Steve Kirschner, North Carolina assistant sports information director, who was sitting next to the timekeeper: "Twice, the clock was not restarted on time. The second time came with 1:35 left after Missimo was given a yellow card. The clock was not started for another 17 seconds."

With six seconds left, Dorrance couldn't stand it any longer. He dashed onto the field and bumped the official with a combination of chest and pelvis à la Pete Rose. Mixed in also was a shove of a Duke player.

The official gave Dorrance the red card. In soccer, the red card is the symbol for an ejection from the game.

Dorrance was somewhat justified in seeking justice for his team, but the his methods caused more damage than a disputed loss. Though his team played well and deserved a better fate, he pushed the matter well beyond the limits of common decency. — **Dave Hall**

Pledge to debate only issues

Misleading rhetoric and mudslinging are common tools in modern-day political campaigning. Though frustrating to concerned voters, these strategies have become an accepted part of our political process.

Yet this year's presidential race holds one particularly disturbing example of rhetorical deception: Vice President George Bush's use of the Pledge of Allegiance to attack his opponent, Mass. Gov. Michael Dukakis.

The pledge issue was first raised at the Republican National Convention in New Orleans. Bush derided Dukakis for his 1977 veto of a bill requiring schoolteachers to lead their classes in the Pledge of Allegiance. By questioning Dukakis' commitment to the pledge, Bush questioned his patriotism by implication.

This kind of criticism, although hardly fair, is not unusual at political rallies. The Democrats did much of the same in Atlanta just a few weeks before. Some negative campaigning can be expected during the excitement of the conventions.

But the pledge controversy should have gone no further than New Orleans; portraying it as an issue of importance was Bush's true error in judgment.

Dukakis based his opposition to the pledge bill on two factors. First, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1943 that a similar law was unconstitutional and that "... no official, high or petty, can prescribe what is orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion" Secondly, Massachusetts' Supreme Judicial Court concurred with this decision in an advisory opinion to Dukakis.

So, in essence, Dukakis had little choice in the matter.

But Bush chose to exploit the issue to the fullest. In speech after speech, he blasted Dukakis for his stand. He forced the media to make it a front-page issue.

Dukakis has defended himself with a satisfactory explanation of the reasons behind his veto. He has shifted the attention back to Bush by bringing the vice president's judgment into question — and rightfully so.

George Bush does not need to resort to this frivolous rhetoric. If he can keep the campaign focused on the major issues, his chances of winning in November look good.

Continuing to pursue such a trivial issue makes little sense. Let's hope, for the benefit of the voters, we have seen the last of the pledge issue and all others like it. — **Louis Bisette**

Consolation trips for the procrastinator

Bill Yelverton

Notes from the Abyss

I live in a gameshow. Every morning at around 7 or 8 o'clock or whenever I get up, I hear Johnny Olson's voice yelling, "Hello America, welcome to Life in the '80s! The frantic race for accomplishment that everybody loves." The studio audience obediently erupts for the applause sign. Olson continues by introducing Bob Barker and today's contestants.

"Bob, meet Cyndi, a senior at the University of North Carolina." She looks harmless enough as she explains her favorite hobbies of balancing her checkbook and networking. Bob smiles at nothing in particular. Johnny continues, "and this is Bill. He's been with us for as long as I can remember. Just can't stay away, can you, Bill?" Canned laughter erupts from somewhere above my head. I'm always on the show. It's good for the ratings.

After reminding us to have our pets spayed or neutered, Bob explains the rules. We will each be given a huge to-do list to read for five minutes, then we must each perform the various tasks. The first one back to the studio wins a fabulous prize. Bob seems truly excited about this, as if he hadn't done it 3,000 times before.

My opponent graciously wishes me good luck in accordance with gameshow etiquette. However, behind those soft blue eyes lurks the unfeeling mind of a computer ready to prioritize any action and fit it into

a neat little 15-minute time period. She is the kind of person who annoys me, and she knows it.

Before I can respond to my nemesis, Bob jumps in once again to remind us to have our pets spayed or neutered. Thanks Bob. He says something else which I don't quite catch. Oh, he said go.

The audience has seen my list before I have. Those watching at home gasp in horror, "He'll never finish. No one can do all that. He'll kill himself." The thought excites them.

Cyndi has already made six entries into her all-in-one schedule-checkbook-calendar-calculator-party-planner-notebook thing. It has extra space for business cards so she won't miss a possible networking opportunity. For the first time I feel fear.

Taking my first steps, I scan the list to see if there is anything fun to do. Let's see, paper for English, pick up Mom at the Airport, meet Kevin for lunch, type column in at DTH, meet Sarah at library, go to class, pay phone bill, do homework problems. There are some possibilities. It'll be great to see Mom, and lunch should

be okay.

Cyndi and her camera crew have already set off for her 9:30 a.m. appointment. I know Mom's plane comes in sometime this morning, so I head to the airport. I get to class and turn in my paper. Only five minutes late. I could win this thing. I miss Kevin for lunch and my column isn't written yet. Oh well. I return to the studio feeling good that I got through half of my list. Cyndi had been there for two hours, and had asked for more.

Bob congratulates her and Johnny chimes in to tell her what she's won. "That's right, Cyndi, you've won a deluxe Rolodex." I struggle to contain my jealousy and wait sheepishly to hear about the consolation prize.

Johnny continues, "Bill, since you like to live on the edge, we've decided to send you right over it. Pack your bags for an all expense paid journey into the abyss. We'll fly you back tomorrow for another chance to win on 'Life in the '80s.' So long everybody."

The abyss isn't such a bad place after all. There were more people in here than I expected, and they don't get stressed out about too many things. I think I'll stay in here for a while. Don't worry though, I'll send notes out from time to time.

Bill Yelverton is a senior English major from Darien, Conn.

Readers' Forum

Just say no to legalization

To the editor:
Want to do a line? Got a joint? Want to get high? These are questions that most of us have been confronted with during our lives. Unfortunately, these questions are growing more and more frequent in our society. A greater misfortune is that many people in this country want these actions to be legal. I don't!

Trying to solve the drug problem by legalizing marijuana, cocaine, crack and other narcotics is like trying to put out the fires in Yellowstone with gasoline. There would be a sudden explosion of users, and the intensity of the epidemic would reach a new "high." People who favor legalization of these drugs argue, however, that violent crimes will decrease if these substances are made legal. Legalization will drive the prices of these substances down, and more people will be able to afford them. The users will not have to steal and kill anymore because they will have enough money to buy these cheaper drugs.

Wake up to reality. A drug can cost \$100 or \$10. Either way, when you need a fix and you're broke, you can't buy it. Do you think a junkie is going to rationalize the situation better because the life he is taking now is worth \$10 instead of \$100?

Okay. Let's just legalize marijuana. Pot doesn't hurt anyone.

Wrong. Almost all people who do hard drugs start out by smoking pot. That doesn't mean that all people who take on a joint become addicted to narcotics, but why lead anyone down a dead-end street? My biggest argument is, why



Dead Heat

give up? That is what legalizing these substances would amount to. Curing our country of this disease is not going to be easy, but neither is gaining our independence. It is going to take time and money. We must educate our children and show them strength through example. Support the awareness and prevention groups in our communities. Back our police and government. They need our help. If it takes tax increases, fine. An unwillingness to sacrifice for the sake of bettering our country is a very selfish attitude. "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

SCOTT LOGAN
Senior
Administration of Justice/
Psychology

Party with your parents

To the editor:
Although the weekend of

Sept. 23-25 is labeled "Parents' Weekend," it is more properly a family weekend. Without students, it wouldn't happen.

While other universities around the U.S. have attracted as many as 10,000 parents to such weekends, our first three tries at Chapel Hill have produced a small fraction of those numbers. Now, on our fourth effort, we've changed the date to a fall weekend and we've worked harder at making the program interesting to the whole family. It's not the kind of thing which will tie up a student's entire weekend. Indeed, it even allows for the fact that most students sleep in on Saturday mornings.

As both a University parent and an alumnus (Class of '51, and after 37 years I'm still enjoying the benefits of four years in Chapel Hill), I support the idea that parents can benefit from learning more about what student life in Chapel Hill is like. They'll be better parents for it.

I hope the DTH and the variety of student leadership

organizations will see the benefit as well and lend their wholehearted support. There is evidence that we're gaining. As of Sept. 12, we've got three times as many parents committed to coming than we had at last year's Parents' Weekend.

Did you invite your parents to come and share the experience?

H. TAYLOR VADEN
Chairman
Parents' Weekend '88

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 signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter.

■ Place letters in the box marked "Letters to the Editor" outside the DTH office in the Student Union.

Strong defense requires more than guns

Scott Syfert

Guest Writer

Theodore White once wrote, "all civilizations rest on myths but in America myths have exceptional meaning." The American myth, he continued, rests on a shared belief in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is this myth that binds us together: blacks, whites, Hispanics, Jews, Catholics and Protestants, into the only peaceful multiracial civilization in the world.

Just as there are myths that bind us together as Americans, however, there are myths that are detrimental to our appreciation and understanding of politics — especially partisan politics. Perhaps the most salient myth in this election year concerns our national defense and who is most capable of maintaining it.

Democrats have recently been accused of being weak on defense or otherwise not sufficiently concerned with national security. This myth is a castle built of sand, and even a brief look at contemporary American history should be enough to dispel it. Note that World War I, World War II, the Korean War, American involvement in Vietnam (sadly) and the Cuban Missile Crisis all occurred under Democratic administrations. Nevertheless, have been stigmatized by this myth of weakness in defense matters.

Why? Perhaps the myth has arisen in part because virtue is all too often confused with weakness. In contemporary politics, domestic liberalism is equated with international vapidity. Even in 1960, John F. Kennedy was accused of being "too weak" or "too soft" for the presidency. History tells us, through JFK, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, etc., that domestic liberalism and military strength are not incompatible. The myth remains, however, and now it is Mike Dukakis' turn to confront it.

Since the best way to destroy a myth is to examine it realistically, let us so examine Dukakis' views on defense. Since 1945, all previously held assumptions concerning the utility of war and the balance of power have been under reconsideration. The threat of nuclear annihilation is a grim specter which hovers over all of us — from the simple Asian peasant to the policy makers in Washington, D.C. It is a world that we as young adults have inherited and in which we must cope. We must choose a leader who can grasp the intricacies of global realpolitik while recognizing that the survival of the human race is at stake.

Dukakis is such a leader. He proposes to work toward a comprehensive strategic arms agreement with the U.S.S.R. that will result in deep reductions in the number of nuclear arms. He also proposes maintaining compliance with SALT II and ABM treaties, so long as the Soviet Union does the same. Perhaps most importantly, he seeks to prevent the proliferation of nuclear arms to other countries. Speaking at Georgetown University recently, Dukakis said, "The INF treaty was a good beginning, but it was only a beginning. Unlike Ronald Reagan, George Bush doesn't understand that." Under a Dukakis administration, the world would be a much safer place to live.

Defense policy transcends the stockpiling of arms or the firing of weapons, however. At the core of our defense is bureaucracy and paper shuffling at the defense department — a bloated institution rife with corruption. Dukakis supports the

creation of an independent Inspector General to investigate defense fraud — a move Bush opposes. As taxpayers or future taxpayers, we have a right to know where and to whom our money is going. I doubt any of us would have been inclined to contribute three years ago had we known we were arming the Ayatollah Khomeni. Accountability and responsibility would be paramount under Democratic leadership.

But what of Dukakis' other defense proposals? First, he proposes investing in strong, modernized, mobile conventional forces that will provide security and deterrence in Europe and elsewhere in the world. This is a proposal that conservative defense experts, including Henry Kissinger, have advocated for some time. So much for the myth. Dukakis also supports continued funding of the Stealth Bomber, as well as other aspects of the aerial leg of our defense. Finally, Dukakis supports investing in improved anti-submarine warfare capability and break-through anti-tank weapons technology. Defense under Dukakis would be an investment in protection for the U.S. and security for the globe.

What we must confront are the realities of our national security, as opposed to the contemporary American myth. Our judgment should be based on a rational appraisal of the facts and not on popular misconceptions. America under Dukakis would be well-defended, with accountability for taxpayers' money, and with no weapons for Middle-East fanatics. Would we be safer under such an administration as opposed to the Republican alternative? If you dispel the myth from your perceptions, you'll realize that we would.

Scott Syfert is a sophomore history and political science major from Charlotte.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Louis Bisette, Sandy Dimsdale and Dave Hall.

Assistant Editors: Jenny Cloninger and Justin McGuire, university; Staci Cox, state and national; Felisa Neuringer and Clay Thorp, managing; Dave Glenn, Andrew Podolsky and Chris Spencer, sports.

News: Lynn Ainsworth, Kari Barlow, Jenna Baxter, Crystal Bell, James Benton, Tammy Blackard, Charles Brittain, Brenda Campbell, Julie Campbell, Lacy Churchill, Daniel Conover, L.D. Curle, Karen Dunn, Laura Francis, Lynn Goswick, Eric Gribbin, Susan Holdslaw, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Chris Landgraaf, Jessica Lanning, Bethany Litton, Brian McCollum, Helle Nielsen, Beth Rhea, Cedric Ricks, Thom Solomon, Michael Spirtas, Larry Stone, William Taggart, and Amy Winslow. Elizabeth Bass, Laura Hough, Dorothy Hutson and Peter Lineberry, wire typists.

Sports: Neil Amato, Mark Anderson, Robert D'Arruda, John Bland, Steve Giles, Doug Hoogervorst, Bethany Litton, Brendan Mathews, Jay Reed, Jamie Rosenberg, Natalia Sekicky, Dave Surowiecki, Lisa Swicegood, Eric Wagon and Langston Wertz.

Features: David Abernathy, Cheryl Allen, Craig Allen, Jo Lee Credle, Jackie Douglas, Mary Jo Dunington, Hart Miles, Myrna Miller, Cheryl Pond, Leigh Pressley and Ellen Thornton.

Arts: Randy Basinger, Clark Benbow, Cara Bonnett, Beth Buffington, Ashley Campbell, Elizabeth Ellen, Andrew Lawler, Julie Olson, Joseph Rhea, Nancy Szakacs and Jessica Yates.

Photography: Brian Foley, David Foster, Tony Mansfield and Belinda Morris.

Copy Editors: Cara Bonnett, Yvette Cook, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Bert Hackney, Susan Holdslaw, Anne Isenhowe and Angelia Potat.

Cartoonists: Bill Brown, Jeff Christian, Adam Cohen, Pete Corson, Trey Entwistle, Luis Hernandez and Greg Humphreys.

Business and Advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Chrissy Mennitt, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Michelle Harris, Sarah Hoskins, Amy McGuire, Maureen McIntyre, Denise Neely, Tina Perry, Lesley Renwick, Amanda Tilley and Joye Wiley, display advertising representatives; Leisa Hawley, creative director; Dan Raasch, marketing director; Diane Quatrecasas, sales assistant; Diane Cheek and Stephanie Chesson classified advertising representatives; and Jeff Carlson, secretary.

Subscriptions: Cody McKinney, manager.

Distribution: David Econnopouly, manager; Cindy Cowan, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn, coordinators. Anita Bentley, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Leslie Sapp, assistants.

Printing: The Village Companies.