

Terrorist 'witch hunt' is reminiscent of Cold War U.S.

Individuals' rights being threatened by unchecked power.

Imagine you live in a country where government suspicion prevents you from free travel, where unpopular political views can add your name to a government list



Elizabeth Turnbull

EDITORIALS EDITOR

of "suspects," where you're followed by police and searched at multiple checkpoints.

Imagine you live in a country where prisoners are detained indefinitely with no charges filed against them, where the label of "non-patriot" is enough to blacklist you from society.

"I'm proud to be an American, where at least I know I'm free."

A few weeks ago, I started another column with this very same line ("One nation for all is the American way," Sept. 12). But just how free are we?

After the Sept. 11 attacks, President Bush declared a war on terrorism, a war we have been fighting since, a war with no immediate end in sight. After the "success" in Afghanistan, we are running toward armed

conflict with Iraq, no matter that the entire world, minus Great Britain, seems to think it's a bad idea. We know best.

The Oct. 14 bombing of a tourist-filled nightclub in Bali has the world again on edge as Bush and Indonesian officials link it to al-Qaeda.

Meanwhile, under the banner of this crusade against terrorism, this fight to keep our freedom, our civil liberties are weakening as we march on unaware. We make allowances for certain inconveniences, acknowledging that these are not typical times; we are grateful for the freedom we do possess.

Nevertheless, in this fight to protect our freedom, the government is returning to its McCarthyesque ways of the 1960s and creating a spirit of fear among would-be-dissidents.

Catch phrases such as "suspected terrorist" or "al-Qaeda link" have become household terms. And congressmen who want to avoid a war with Iraq are quickly branded "un-American."

Terrorism is becoming for our generation what McCarthyism was for our parents.

A federal "no-fly list," designed to keep terrorists off airplanes, is also hindering the travel of peace activists and broaching complaints of civil liberty infringements. Recently, according to an article from the *San Francisco Chronicle*, a detainment of a possible no-fly-suspect prevented a group of 20 Wisconsin anti-war activists

Meanwhile, under the banner of this crusade against terrorism, this fight to keep our freedom, our civil liberties are weakening as we march on unaware. We make allowances for certain inconveniences, acknowledging that these are not typical times.

from making their flight ("No-fly blacklist snares political activists," Sept. 27). The postponement forced them to delay their trip to meet with congressional representatives by a day, the article said.

"What's scariest to me is that there could be this gross interruption of civil rights and nobody is really in charge," Sarah Backus, one of the group's organizers, said in the article. "That's really 1984-ish."

Backus is completely right. Nobody could tell *San Francisco Chronicle* reporter Alan Gathright who is ultimately responsible for the no-fly list. Bill Carter, an FBI spokesman, said that the Transportation Security Administration manages the list. But David Steigman, a TSA spokesman, first told Gathright the agency did not have a no-fly list. Steigman later changed his comment, however, and said that TSA "does not contribute to the list" and simply "relays names collected by other federal agencies to airlines and airports," Gathright wrote.

According to Jayashri Srikantiah, an attorney with the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, "The problem is that this list has no public accountability: People don't know why their names are put on or how to get their names off." She said the ACLU has received complaints from people whose names triggered the list but were later cleared to fly, only to have the same thing happen all over again the next time they tried to fly.

Another problem is that several government agencies, including the CIA, FBI, INS and State Department, contribute names to the list, according to the *San Francisco Chronicle*.

Such free access without strict accountability and control leaves a wide window for abuse. This can't help but cause suspicion in cases such as that of Rebecca Gordon and Jan Adams, founders of *War Times*, an anti-war publication. They, like at least two dozen other activists, were stopped from flying. None have been arrested – yet. Gordon and Adams were cleared to fly, but their boarding passes, Gathright writes, "were marked with a red 'S' – for 'search.'" On the return leg, Gordon was also followed by a police officer and an airline official and searched again.

Should we be concerned that this a return to McCarthyism where suspected communists were fired from their jobs and blacklisted? Absolutely.

America has prided itself on its exemplary human rights, but we are blatantly violating those same rights. Currently, approximately 600 suspected terrorists are being detained indefinitely in Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, without charges. They are, essentially, prisoners of war without the protections of the Geneva Convention. We would never allow this dangerously unaccountable detainment of our citizens abroad.

The detention camp commander, Brig. Gen. Rick Baccus, "stepped down last week amid media reports that he had clashed with officers responsible for questioning detainees suspected of terrorist links," according to a *New York Times* article ("Detention Camp Commander is Removed," Oct. 15). According to the article, Baccus' resignation is part of an effort to streamline operations at the camp. Media reports indicated that Baccus had clashed with Maj. Gen. Michael Dunlavey, who oversees "the interrogation of prisoners and intelligence gathering." Dunlavey outranks Baccus. Military officials refused to confirm the reported clash, calling it "in-house stuff."

While many facts are still unknown, the situation cannot help but raise suspicion. The camp commander clashes with the interrogator of prisoners and suspected terrorists. The military's silence and the general distrust surrounding military practices and interrogation should make us

feel uncomfortable. Nobody wants terrorists on the loose, but what if some of the detainees are innocent? What methods are practiced to detract information? Is the military justified in its actions?

A U.S. marine was killed and another injured in Kuwait when two men opened fire on marines who were carrying out a training exercise. "U.S. military police chased down the two assailants, who were dressed in civilian clothes and driving a pickup truck, and shot them dead," the CNN online report said ("Shots fired at U.S. military units in Kuwait," Oct. 14). The men are believed to belong to "a suspected terrorist cell with connections to al-Qaeda." The fact that MP hunted down the assailants and shot them dead on the spot makes me very nervous. I agree 100 percent that the men should have been prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, but we cannot afford to lose human rights and due process.

The government has created a terrorist feeding frenzy in order to win American support, and we are gorging ourselves at a media-supplied buffet of sound bites and sensational images. We must not lose sight of the United States and its ideals. We must not let the War on Terrorism rob us of the liberties and freedoms that make us proud to be American.

Elizabeth Turnbull is a senior Spanish major.

Questions of sororities role on campus are often misdirected

Oppression by men needs to be addressed instead of blaming sororities.

What is feminism? The seminar led by Michelle Browers, an assistant professor of political science and sponsored by Women's Initiative for Support and Empowerment, was supposed to discuss answers to that question, but maybe it should have been called,

Derby Days is a valid fundraiser for cancer, but along the way, the fraternity reaps many less than philanthropic benefits, like food, alcohol, and worship from Greek women. More or less, these females "choose" to participate in such events, but pointing the finger at sororities is a form of women bashing, which is nothing close to feminism and does not help unite women in solidarity at all.

Is she just good-naturedly trying to fulfill her duty to attract potential new members into a genuinely strong, true sisterhood, or is this the result of a male-dominated society, objectifying herself by being clearly labeled to be worthy of men's attention? Or is it somewhere in between? I do not know. But to just harshly put down the jersey-wearers without trying to explore the reasons behind it is weak and unhelpful in making a constructive change. Pledge Night, which may be at the peak of inducing "disgusting" (as the professor suggested) behavior for some sorority girls, but is it at the height of actually self-oppressive behavior? Liberal feminists (not that I agree with them either) might be proud of the sassy sorority girl who goes all out for Pledge Night, because a woman is using her assets, in this case, sexuality, to assert power.

Secondly, it would be naive to think that a girl who wants to be promiscuous needs to wait around all year for Pledge Night to give her "permission" to act out; casual hook-ups are a norm. Instead, a worthwhile topic could have been examining this point as a result of a male-dominated society. Additionally, there are more subtle things than Pledge Night that go on in Greek life that expand the gap between empowering men and oppressing women.

For example, some sorority girls at the seminar had just come from "Pillow Fighting," a Derby Days event. Here we have women pitted against other women, aggressively hurting each other in hopes to win approval from a fraternity that is put on a pedestal. This is why it is so difficult for women to fight oppression; they are constantly in competition with each other and resort to oppressing each other as well as themselves!

Who motivates and ultimately profits from this struggle? It is often men. Yes, Derby Days is a valid

fundraiser for cancer, but along the way, the fraternity reaps many less than philanthropic benefits, like food, alcohol and worship from Greek women. More or less, these females "choose" to participate in such events, but pointing the finger at sororities is a form of women bashing, which is nothing close to feminism and does not help unite women in solidarity at all.

I also wonder why people blindly accept the inequalities in more regular aspects of Greek life, such as the rule that sororities must relocate to an off-campus venue in order to have social functions, whereas fraternities have the ease of hosting parties in their lounges. Wake Forest alumni will tell you that it wasn't always this way; female societies hosted five kegs in their Quad-based lounge every weekend.

Why have policies regressed, forcing women to move backwards and revolve around men if they want to party on campus? Many women complain about the rules being annoying, but the fact that they are sexist and oppressive is a bigger issue. This could have been addressed at the seminar instead of blaming the victims of oppression within the Greek system.

Little sisters of fraternities and coaches of sororities are another example of how a man's role of benefits somehow gets weighted down with burden when translated to the supposed female equivalent. Coaches get baked goods from the sorority while little sisters are the ones baking for the fraternity.

When was the last time you saw a pit banner boasting, "Sigma Sigma loves their little sisters!" And still, many girls would die for the position of little sister -- the honor of providing of homemade cookies, liquor and other tokens of affection.

Don't mistake this for an argument that giving and doing things for men is inherently oppressive; but inequalities between roles that are under the guise of being similar is.

I have asked many questions of myself as well as my audience now, but I am hard-pressed in finding answers. I am not above these issues, nor do I always act in the best interest of feminism -- that takes enormous discipline to constantly go against the grain.

But unlike the professor claimed, I can be Greek and support feminism at the same time; a good start is to identify oppression and injustices, question why, and try to find ways to deconstruct them, and that is what I invite you to do.

Jennifer Nylund is a senior business major and a member of Kappa Delta sorority.

Girls, eat up or ship out

The skinny on skinnies; weight worries are worthless.

As I do every month, when the latest issue of *Playboy* came out, I quickly stole it from my friend, who, unlike me, is not a cheap bastard and actually buys things. And, as usual, I took it into my room and went straight to the best part -- the health



Krys Mroczkowski

EDITORIALS EDITOR

section. As we all know, *Playboy* is the penultimate authority on health and fitness, second only to *Highlights for Children*. Therefore, when I read in one of the articles that 60 percent of Americans are overweight, I knew that it must be true. As astounding as this statistic is, what is even more incredible is the fact that with the majority of this country tipping the scale, Wake Forest remains a community of slim, trim and grim students.

While it is true that both males and females at this university are infatuated with their physical appearance, it is more punctuated with the gals. Don't get me wrong; Wake has its share of scrawny, self-conscious guys. Just look to the Sig Pi's for that ... oops, my bad -- Sigma Pi's (they just can't do anything without their ma). But the fact remains that girls on this campus seem much more concerned with their body image than the males. Unlike guys, you never see a girl bragging about her beer belly...well, maybe, if she is a Theta, but there are only 12 of them, so they don't count (since they never counted even when they were a 'real' sorority).

But allow me to get back to the point at hand. Females on this campus are overly obsessed with their weight. For instance, I overheard a conversation between two girls at the Pit the other day, and one of them actually said, "I can't eat this other Pop-Tart. I have to watch my weight since Rush is coming up." This disturbed me deeply for many reasons. First of all, it's called 'Recruitment', not 'Rush'. Panhellenic decided 'Rush' just didn't carry that homogeneous tone they wanted to portray. Get your terminology right.

Secondly, if you aren't going to eat that other Pop-Tart, can I have it? I hate to see toaster pastries go to waste, like in those Pillsbury commercials where the kids hide

The typical lunch for a female around here is three grapes and a Tic Tac.

It amazes me that they are able to maintain functioning organs, seeing as I drop more food than these girls eat.

all their Pop-Tarts in their garage or locker. Come on man, stop squandering them.

And finally, the sheer stupidity of her comment makes me weep for the future of this nation. If she actually believes that one Pop-Tart is going to be the deciding factor in whether or not she gets a bid, well then, she's probably right. But that just goes to show how out of hand this whole body image craze is getting.

The typical lunch for a female around here is three grapes and a Tic Tac. It amazes me that they are able to maintain functioning organs, seeing as I drop more food than these girls eat. Even more incredible is the fact that on the weekends, they consume twice their weekly caloric intake in alcohol. This combination of Kate Moss's and Kelsey Grammer's diets seems to be the protocol for 98 percent of Wake Forest females.

And lucky for them, Michelob has just made their diets much easier by introducing Michelob Ultra, the first low-carb beer. In case you haven't seen advertisements for this, they feature athletes running, biking, and swimming, with the marketing slogan, "lose the carbs, not the taste." Who was the genius behind this campaign? Michelob Ultra is as conducive to athletes as R. Kelly is to the Girl Scouts. And even if the low carbohydrate diet wasn't bogus, somehow I doubt that Michelob Ultra will replace Gatorade.

But again, I digress. The fact of the matter is that girls are abusing their bodies in an attempt to gain some unachievable image that they think is attractive. The problem is, most guys do not like hooking up with a girl who looks like Skeletor (except maybe Man-At-Arms). Although I cannot speak for all males, I like to live by the motto, "the bigger the cushion, the sweeter the pushin'." Sir Mix-A-Lot's anaconda had a good point. I hate it when I hug a girl and feel her ribs poking into me. I should be the one doing the poking. But anyway, there is nothing wrong with being a husky honey. So what if you are big boned? I'm big boned too (well, just in one area). Stop being so concerned about your looks and start worrying about your personality, because your beauty will fade in time, but your stupidity will stick around forever.

And there you have it, straight from the Horse's mouth.

Krys Mroczkowski, better known as "Horse," is a senior history major.