

# The Daily Tar Heel

97th year of editorial freedom

SHARON KEBSCHULL, Editor

WILLIAM TAGGART, Managing Editor

MARY JO DUNNINGTON, Editorial Page Editor  
 JUSTIN MCGUIRE, University Editor  
 KAREN DUNN, State and National Editor  
 TOM PARKS, Business Editor  
 DAVE GLENN, Sports Editor  
 MELANIE BLACK, Design Editor

TAMMY BLACKARD, Editorial Page Editor  
 JENNY CLONINGER, University Editor  
 JESSICA LANNING, City Editor  
 CARA BONNETT, Arts and Features Editor  
 KELLY THOMPSON, Omnibus Editor  
 DAVID SUROWIECKI, Photography Editor

JULIA COON, News Editor

## Rush without alcohol? Dry rush plan would benefit campus

In the past few weeks, University officials have been discussing the idea of trying to eliminate alcohol at fraternity rush functions. Although the proposal carries with it some obstacles to effective implementation, the concept of dry rush is worth pursuing.

### board opinion

The stereotypes that cast Joe Fraternity as having a drink in his hand are not completely unfounded. In most fraternities alcoholic beverages are available at a majority of events — social or otherwise. While Greeks are not the only people on campus who drink, the central role alcohol plays in fraternity life should be addressed, and rush is a good place to start.

Rush should provide an opportunity for fraternities to meet potential members and vice versa. It's difficult to get to know someone's true personality when he's drunk, just as it's difficult for someone who has been drinking to form a fair opinion of another. The emphasis during rush should be on people, and this should not be obscured by alcohol.

If that's not enough to convince fraternities, they should be convinced by the fact that the majority of students who rush are freshmen and sophomores, most of whom have not yet reached the legal drinking age. Obviously, it would be very naive to believe that fraternities are the only places where underage drinking occurs. But fraternities should not endorse that by serving alcohol at formal functions that are being held for people who are mostly underage.

Rush is also a time of pressure for rushees, who may be trying hard to "fit in" with and impress fraternity members. While pressure to drink may not be as overt as a brother handing a rushee a beer and telling him to drink, a rushee may still feel unwanted pressure to consume when he sees everyone else doing it. Pressure to drink is prevalent all over campus, but that pressure is even worse when it's associated with something people may want badly, such as membership into a fraternity.

As many fraternity leaders at UNC have already said, implementation of a campus-wide dry rush policy will be difficult. At many of the schools where dry rush is a reality, the policy works only because the fraternities enforce it for themselves, often through an interfraternity council. UNC's sororities already have a very strict dry rush policy, which is enforced by the Panhellenic Council, and alcohol is not a part of the black greek rush process. Thus, the University community needs to call on the UNC Interfraternity Council to implement and regulate dry rush in Chapel Hill.

In the coming weeks, University administrators plan to meet with leaders of UNC's various fraternities to discuss ways to make a dry rush policy stick. Given the points in favor of such a policy, as well as the anti-Greek movements taking place on other campuses (because of hazing, racial and sexual incidents that sometimes involve alcohol), it will be in fraternity members' best interest to do everything they can to work with the University on this issue.

## Reforms need boost Soviet changes in economic danger

In 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev initiated *perestroika* to restructure the Soviet economy with a focus on limited free enterprise and the promotion of private business. This restructuring is aimed at turning back the stagnation which seemed to immobilize the Soviet Union during the 1970s and early '80s. But now, Gorbachev's plans to improve conditions in his country are in serious danger due to economic stress, slow worker adjustment and a decline in public support.

While *glasnost* and Gorbachev's reforms are opening Soviet culture to the West, the changes have resulted in shelves empty of consumer goods. Shortages of meat, potatoes and consumer goods are rampant, and for the first time since World War II, Soviet citizens are carrying ration cards. These shortages have resulted in long lines at markets and growing discontent among the population. The black market trade's growth, promoted by a decline in food and consumer goods, reflects a flaw in Gorbachev's economic reforms. Gorbachev's reforms have produced areas of growth in private enterprise, but with growing discontent and confusion in the work force, whether he has enough time to let his programs run their full course is in doubt.

*Perestroika* disrupts established policies, and this sudden upheaval has resulted in disruption in the factories. Workers and managers trying to adjust to the rapid changes have only added to the confusion in the work force. The population has also been shocked to suddenly realize that, despite years of propaganda preaching the strength of communism and central planning, the Soviet Union has a \$160 billion budget deficit.

The increased openness within the Soviet Union and the relaxation of government censorship should be applauded by the West, but by allowing a free press during difficult economic times, Gorbachev may have damaged his political popularity. While "Gorbomania" sweeps across Western Europe and the United States, the economic problems within his own borders are leading to increased criticism of his policies.

Gorbachev's changes have resulted in increased trade with Western nations and this is the path that must be followed to ensure the success of Soviet reform. In 1985, United States banks lifted the lending ban to the Soviet Union and join the British in a \$400 million loan. In 1986, Gorbachev promoted new trade relations with Japan, South Korea and other capitalist countries in Asia. In 1988, European banks and governments provided the Soviet Union with \$10 billion in credit. To ease the food shortage and the decline in consumer goods, Gorbachev and the West must continue this trade policy to give the reforms of *perestroika* an opportunity to take root.

Continued trade with the Soviet Union would also improve East-West relations and open a broad new market for Western goods. A steady injection of Western consumer goods into the Soviet marketplace would end the problem of shortages, long lines and public discontent and would give Gorbachev enough breathing room to continue his reforms. These consumer goods should be considered an investment in Gorbachev and *perestroika*. After all, restructuring an entire economy is a difficult job and prosperity does not come overnight. — Charles Britain

While *glasnost* is opening Soviet culture to the West, the result is empty shelves.



## Readers' Forum

### Rec center not exciting to many students

To the editor:  
 In response to "An answer to rec center questions" by Lisa Frye (Sept. 26), I have a few questions about the statements she makes.

In her first paragraph, Ms. Frye states that "students are becoming more excited about the possibilities the facility promises." Well, I am not, and neither are quite a few other people I know. In fact, we are opposed to having another recreation center built because we feel that there are enough such facilities already.

Couldn't the demand for more space and new equipment be filled in some other fashion? For instance, Ms. Frye suggests paying the Fetzer staff for extra hours so that students will be able to use the SRC after Fetzer hours. Why not open Fetzer for longer hours? I'm sure it would be cheaper than building a completely new facility. Updating the current equipment in existing facilities would also be cheaper than a new center since equipment will have to be bought for the SRC when it is finished.

Ms. Frye later mentions that an alternate plan would result in a facility "very different from the concept the students voted for in February." I do not consider the vote taken in February to have been valid for the purpose of determining what students wanted. The vote

in favor of the SRC was only 54 percent of the people who voted; only rarely does more than 25 percent of the student body vote on an issue. That puts the total vote favoring the SRC to roughly 13 percent of the entire student body. I hardly consider that a majority.

Carol Geer (last year's Carolina Athletic Association president) told us that the actual raising of student fees is not due to start until three years from now. This means that the only people who will have to pay for the SRC who were represented in the vote were last year's freshmen. Generally freshmen are too busy adjusting to classes and other aspects of college life to be aware that their student fees will be raised by people who will not benefit from the raise. Current freshmen, who will also have to pay the \$13 per semester fee, did not get a choice either. The majority of voters were upperclassmen who will not be here when the bill for the SRC comes.

Last February, when we were to vote either for or against the SRC, we were only told about the positive aspects of the center. I expected this from the CAA. However, I think that the DTH should have printed less biased information and given us both the positive and negative aspects of the facility so that we could have made a more informed decision.

As for the vote itself, there have been sev-

ious instances in which Student Congress has discounted a vote passed by the majority of students who voted. In my freshman year, there was a referendum to defund the CGLA that passed in this manner. Student Congress overturned this vote, thus setting a precedent to nullify the vote on the SRC as well.

These are my questions to Ms. Frye. Why do we need a recreation center? Is it because there is a definite need for one, or is it because N.C. State University built one? Did the CAA explore other possibilities (such as extending Fetzer's hours), or did they concentrate only on the idea of a recreation center that many of us believe we don't need? (In fact, quite a few of us would rather have our \$13 increase go to the libraries or other areas of the University that desperately need funding rather than building yet another athletic facility.) And finally, why were you so opposed to a revote? Since there are precedents for both revoting and for discounting the original vote, I don't understand your opposition. After all, if students want the recreation center as much as you claim, the vote will pass with a landslide. Or are you afraid that we don't want the SRC?

EMILY KEYS  
 Junior  
 Linguistics

### Cartoon should have a different ending

To the editor:

The Cohen-Bishara political cartoon on Sept. 25 represents itself as a dialogue between a Jew and a Palestinian Arab. But the authors do not allow the Jew to say anything effective, of the sort that a supporter of Zionism would say in real life. He is both more honest and less passionate than his Arab opponent. He frankly acknowledges his stereotypes of the Arabs, while the Arab is allowed to trot out his own stereotypes of the Israelis ("murderers and thieves") as if they were established fact. He never thinks to make the point that Jews who came to Palestine in the 1930s and 1940s had nowhere else to go except death in Hitler's gas chambers. And, at the end, he allows the Arab to get away with the preposterous insinuation that the Arabs suffered their own Holocaust at the Israelis' hands.

I cannot help wishing that, at the end, the Arab and the Jew could have turned to each other and said something like this: "Both our people have suffered insanely;

we need to learn to share a land that will be a haven for both of us." Events of recent months, such as the informal peace conference of Palestinians and Israelis at Toledo (Spain) last summer, permit the hope that some people in the Middle East are beginning to say this. Perhaps the DTH will do the same?

DAVID J. HALPERIN  
 Associate Professor  
 Religious studies

### Congress not elected for moral beliefs

To the editor:  
 I am writing in response to a front page story "Congress to Debate Abortion" (Sept. 27).

To quote Jurgen Buchenau (Dist. 3), "It's important that we, as Student Congress of a major university of the state, let the general assembly know that we don't want them tinkering with them (the current N.C. abortion laws)." I did not vote for my Student Congress representative based on his position on moral, state or national issues and I do not appreciate the presumption of

several of the leaders to assume to be able to speak for us as students on issues not addressed in campaigns.

Todd Wyatt (Dist. 4) attempts to refute this argument by saying that on any issue facing Student Congress it may be argued that Student Congress is not representing the student body. This is true, but it is not the point. The point is that Student Congress would, in this case, be representing the student body concerning an issue on which they have no right to represent us. (It is necessary for me to find out where a future Student Congress member stands on controversial moral issues before I vote for him?)

Wyatt continues with, "If the students aren't pleased with the representation provided by congress, then next election they can vote the members they believe unsatisfactory out." In the meantime will the congress do as they please... forgetting those whom they pledge to represent?

Further, it is clear that sponsors of the resolution feel strongly about their pro-choice position. Their comments cause me to wonder whether they are thinking about the students they should be

representing or simply finding an avenue to push their own beliefs.

ALICE BENNER  
 Junior  
 International studies/sociology

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

- All letters must be typed and double-spaced, for ease of editing.

- Most letters run from one to two pages, but longer letters may be run as guest columns.

- Letters should include the author's year, major, phone number and hometown.

- The DTH will make every effort to contact writers to verify their letters, so please be sure that both a daytime and evening phone number are listed.

## Flag-burner said something to each of us

To the editor:  
 Last winter, I was invited to attend a press conference. The now infamous flag burning case, Texas v. Johnson, had been granted a hearing by the Supreme Court. In response, Joey Johnson, the defendant, and his lawyer, William Kunstler, decided to meet the press at the Phillip Mott House across from the court. I wasn't a reporter, nor did I have much interest in flag burning or people into that kind of thing. I did, however, want to meet William Kunstler.

When I arrived, I learned William Kunstler couldn't make it. Joey was there, though, looking much the way I expected. He had short, spiked hair, a Trotsky goatee and moustache and one of those black and white scarves Yasir Arafat used to wear. Disappointed, I left midway through the conference.

The story didn't make the news that night. The morning papers were slightly more generous, but then for the next two months Joey Johnson slipped into oblivion.

As anyone who didn't qualify for the Oliver North jury knows, there has been a lot of media focus on flag burning since then. The last piece I read was a letter by Hamlin T. Raney III ("U.S. soldiers fought to preserve the flag" Sept. 27). Mr. Raney, like others before him, argues that flag burning is so particularly unpatriotic that it threatens the stability of the nation. Anarchy in our military forces is the inexorable consequence of desecrating this cherished symbol. "If the govern-

ment will not fight to preserve the flag at home, what incentive is there for a soldier to fight to preserve the flag in a war on foreign soil?"

While a good start would be to stop preserving our flag on other people's soil, ultimately we must define what it is that makes burning the flag so different than other acts of protest.

Most everyone agrees that the problem isn't the physical act — some have even pointed out that incineration is the traditional way to dispose of a damaged or worn flag. Nor is flag burning a pervasive problem in America. Most people have never actually seen a flag burning. Such demonstrations don't occur frequently.

Mr. Raney believes the founding fathers wouldn't appreciate Joey's behavior. I'm not so sure he's right, since they were a radical bunch themselves. But if we're honest with ourselves, we have to admit that Alexander Hamilton isn't the problem either.

My guess is that we as Americans understand that we've taken advantage of a lot of people on this earth. We get a little sensitive when someone brings it up, too. At some level, we know that we've raped and ripped off whole nations at a time (most of them on the other side of the equator), while depriving entire races or genders of our own citizens their basic civil rights. So, we don't want to hear what Joey Johnson has to say.

Instead, we'd prefer to feel patriotic. We'd prefer not to have avowed communists like

Joey torch our national symbols. And so we search the Constitution to see if there are means within democracy to make him stop.

The basic principle underlying democracy is that it only works when the people do. Being a good citizen takes more than voting every few years and paying taxes in the meantime. It means getting involved in what our government is doing and being willing to speak out when necessary. But we don't do that, by and large, and when we do, it's seldom enough. Not surprisingly, most things in American culture don't make a lot of sense.

Ultimately (and Americans don't like to deal with ultimates), we must admit that each of us is accountable for the secret wars and dirty deeds our government sponsors all over the world. Each of us is accountable to our neighbors living on heat grates and in cars. Each of us must at some point admit that the destruction of our ecology is a collective problem we all face. The thousands of megatons buried throughout the Midwest belong to us all.

Our responses must be somehow proportionate to the risks involved. They need not be desperate, such as Joey's. Yet until we begin to act like good citizens, Joey has something to say to each of us. Even if he only knows how to scream.

JERRY JONES  
 Senior  
 Religious Studies

### the last word

copy editors, have headlines written and get pasted up.

Finally, when everything works as it should, the paper goes to press between 12:30 a.m. and 1 a.m. It takes our printer about 4 hours to get the paper put together, and longer than that when we insert ads or special sections, such as Omnibus, into the middle of the paper. When there are late stories, such as elections, late meetings that must go in the next day's paper or a very late, very important sporting event, the paper gets held up. And as hard as we try, as good as our distributors are, sometimes there's just no avoiding being late.

So if you can't find a paper, it's probably best to wait until about 10 a.m. before you give us a call. If the paper's still not there, call us at 962-1163 — we may not be able to get the paper right to you, but we do appreciate knowing what boxes are still empty — after all, we don't want to miss the comics, either. — Sharon Keschull

It's 8 a.m., you're stumbling to class, and you're ready to grab a copy of the DTH on your way in so you can wake up to Calvin and Hobbes — only it's not there. By the time you get out of class, there are copies of the DTH around parts of campus, but some boxes are still empty. What's going on here?

Well, we hope this doesn't happen too often — it gives DTH folk a collective headache. But there are times when we can't help but miss our distribution deadline, so, once again, I'll try to explain the deadlines at the DTH. This should also explain the time we need to get a story in the paper, so that if you have a story idea, you'll know how soon you need to get it in to us.

DTH news stories generally get assigned two days before they appear in the paper and are written the day before. We plan the next day's paper at 3:30 p.m. every day, and by 7 p.m., most of the stories are written and edited for the first time — they still have to go through