

JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor  
MICHAEL TOOLE, Editorial Page Editor  
FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor  
KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor  
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor  
VANCE TREFETHEN, Business Editor  
STUART TONKINSON, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor  
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
CINDY DUNLEVY, Features Editor  
CHARLES LEDFORD, Photography Editor  
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

## Support for the little guys

As the Campus Governing Council Finance Committee scurries to salvage the workings of campus groups that have taken, or will take, drastic cuts in their requested budgets, the danger that several smaller organizations will fall by the wayside becomes more and more real. Because they are perceived to either cater to a smaller percentage of students than other groups or serve a less integral campus function, many of these organizations have been dubbed "low-priority groups," and, as such, stand the chance of being cut altogether. Such a prospect is the understandable product of the severe financial restrictions faced by the CGC. However, there exists the possibility the CGC will use its financial burden as an excuse to sever groups it believes do not merit funding anyway, and that cutting off funds from these groups will set precedents difficult to overturn in years to come.

The ongoing argument pits "high-priority" groups against the aforementioned smaller ones. Student Body President Paul Parker and Finance Committee member Tim Newman ascribe to the theory that funding the 18 organizations required to exist by the student Constitution takes precedence over all else. Parker and Newman fear that if large cuts in the budgets of these groups are made to assure the existences of smaller groups, the quality and effectiveness of the constitutionally mandated groups will be rendered mediocre. Rather than have this happen, they would prefer to see "low-priority groups" have their funding cut altogether.

Theirs is a sound argument, an argument to which we initially allied ourselves. But it is an argument that contains some very dangerous pitfalls. First, the definition of "low-priority group" is ambiguous and subjective. Second the CGC could easily point to his argument as the reason to fund a group it simply doesn't want—and may never have wanted—to fund. In doing so, the CGC could skirt a direct confrontation with the issue of whether controversial groups, regardless of available funds, deserve funding this or

any other year. Moreover, without such a clear estimation, groups receiving no funding this year might, even during a less financially strapped year, have a hard time convincing the CGC to once again fund them. Or they might, under the burden of having to raise all funds they need, cease to exist altogether.

That is not to say that there are indeed groups now receiving funds that might not really merit money coming from student fees. Whether such programs as Victory Village, a day-care program, or the Toronto Exchange are really student services or simply luxuries enjoyed by a very small portion of the student body could make the subject of a very worthwhile CGC debate. But to simply cut these programs without advance notice would be to forbid them time to prepare for alternate avenues of fund raising. Moreover, such groups as the Carolina Gay Association, the Carolina Indian Circle and the Association for International Students—all somewhat controversial because of the small student base to which each appeals—only ask for small amounts of money. Funding these groups only puts a small dent in the money available to campus organizations. Likewise, not funding them only saves a minuscule amount, but might deal a fatal blow to the organizations themselves and to their laudable promotion of diversity on this campus.

Although many of the smaller, imperiled organizations have survived budget hearings thus far, some have yet to come up for review, and all stand the chance of losing funds when the entire CGC addresses the issue Saturday. For the financially beleaguered CGC, taking funds away from "low-priority groups" will undoubtedly seem the easy way out. But many of the organizations outside the constitutionally required 18 are the most integral to the promotion of diversity at UNC. To set a precedent by cutting altogether the funding of these groups without first assessing the validity of their claims to student fees would be grossly unfair.

## A shady ensurance of election

Democratic gubernatorial candidate John Ingram's recent fund-raising activities not only represent a serious conflict of interest, but they also raise questions about how Ingram defines ethical and unethical behavior.

Ingram, the state's insurance commissioner, acknowledged last week that he had asked several out-of-state insurance company executives to buy up to 40 \$100 tickets to fund-raising events. The conflict of interest in soliciting such contributions seems obvious: The people Ingram has asked for money are the same people who run the businesses that his office regulates. As commissioner, Ingram decides whether companies should be licensed to operate in North Carolina, whether their policies will be approved and what their rates will be. As one insurance executive told *The Charlotte Observer*, "That guy can put us out of business in North Carolina with the stroke of a pen."

What's most distressing about Ingram asking for such contributions, however, is not really the potential for him to use his

position for "blackmail" purposes, Ingram's term as commissioner expires in January, and there is too little time for him to take drastic action against a company should he want to. The larger problem is Ingram's apparent inability to recognize that a conflict of interest exists. Speaking to reporters last Wednesday, Ingram justified his requests by likening them to the contributions that other elected officials get. "Lawyers contribute to judges," he said. While that may be true, the parallel just doesn't work. A judge can make it difficult for an attorney to practice in his courtroom, but he doesn't have the power to disbar him.

Moreover, Ingram's shady solicitations could set a dangerous precedent. Other candidates in races where such conflicting interests may be more dangerous might be encouraged to participate in this kind of incestuous fundraising. Were that situation to develop, the end result could only damage the credibility of North Carolina politics.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant News Editor: Jo Ellen Meekins

Editorial Desk: Keith Bradsher and Kathy Norcross, writers; Susan Gaddy, assistant

Assistant Managing Editors: Dick Anderson, Lynn Davis, Glenn Peterson and Heidi Zehnal

News Desk: Richard Brooks, Bill Eyre, Steve Jones and Joy Thompson

News: Mike Allen, Diana Bosniack, Amy Brannen, Lisa Brantley, Matt Campbell, Caroline Compton, Tom Conlon, Dennis Dowdy, Katy Fridl, Ellen Goldlust, Mike Gunzenhauser, Lane Harvey, Heather Hay, Tracy Hilton, Jim Hoffman, James Holder, Melissa Holland, Reggie Holley, Kristin King, Myra Knight, Sallie Krawcheck, Georgia Ann Martin, Dora McAlpin, Jennifer Mooney, Marjorie Morris, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelley, Janet Olson, Beth Ownley, Ben Perkowski, Thomas Pinkerton, Ruthie Pipkin, Frank Proctor, Sarah Raper, Bill Rose, Liz Saylor, Deborah Simpkins, Allison Smoak, Lisa Swicegood, Dan Tillman, Jennifer Trotter, Scott Whitaker, Vanessa Williams, Jim Yardley, Karen Youngblood, Jan Zilliox and Jim Zook. Ross Chandler, wire editor. Steve Ferguson, assistant university editor. Bill Riedy, assistant state and national editor. Wayne Thompson, political editor.

Sports: Michael Persinger and Robyn Norwood assistant sports editors. Glenna Burress, Scott Canterberry, Kimball Crossley, Mike DeSisti, Pete Fields, Scott Fowler, Glenn Peterson, Lee Roberts, Kurt Rosenberg, Mike Sanders, Mike Schoor, Scott Smith, Mike Waters, David Wells and Bob Young.

Features: Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Clarice Bickford, Lauren Brown, Tom Camacho, Loretta Grantham, Marymela Hall, Charles Karnes, Jennifer Keller, Vanessa Orr and Sharon Sheridan, Kathy Hopper, assistant features editor.

Arts: Ed Brackett, J. Bonasia, Steve Carr, Louis Corrigan, Ivy Hilliard, Ned Irvine, Steve Murray, Arlene Rockey, David Sotolongo and Sheryl Thomas, assistant arts editor.

Photography: Larry Childress, Lori Heeman, and Lori Thomas. Zane Saunders, chief photographer.

Business: Anne Fulcher, business manager; Angela Boozie and Tammy Martin, accounts receivable clerks; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; William Austin, assistant circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman and Julie Jones, classified advertising staff; Yvette Moxin, receptionist; Debbie McCurdy, secretary.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Laura Austin, Greg Goosmann, Patricia Gorry, Terry Lee, Doug Robinson, Amy Schutz and Anneli Zeck, ad representatives.

Composition: UNC-CH Printing Department

Printing: Hinton Press, Inc. of Mebane.

## Euthanasia: a complex issue

By KAREN LENCHEK

Stuart Tonkinson is rightly horrified by recent statements by Col. Gov. Richard Lamm ("Unlike the leaves on a tree, man merits life when winter comes," *DTH*, April 5). In fact, Lamm's suggestion to the elderly that they "die and get out of the way" is so preposterous as to barely deserve response. Tonkinson goes beyond the repulsion felt by most people, however, to make attacks on "fans of euthanasia" and foes of "progress."

I do not know who has told Tonkinson that euthanasia involves forcing death on people who do not want it, even if they are terminally ill, that its fans scuttle around hospital corridors waiting to indiscriminately pull the plug. I am sure that there are those who hold this position—Lamm is certainly an example. But as a "fan" of euthanasia, I must say that in no case do I advocate inducing death in a person who does not want to die. An elderly person who wishes

to savor what he can of life, even while in pain, must be given all the support society can render. But I don't believe, either, that a person should always be denied a painless death if that is what he wants.

An admittedly extreme example from the hallowed halls of the ethics section of the philosophy department: You are a state trooper and come upon a semi-truck that has crashed and overturned. It is aflame and the heat so intense that neither you nor anyone else can get near enough to pull the driver out. You have radioed for a fire truck but know that it will be at least 15 minutes before help can arrive, and in this time there is no doubt at all that the driver will die of burns or smoke inhalation. If you have ever been badly burned, you may have an inkling of the fact that this would be an incredibly painful way to die. The driver knows the situation and shouts to you to shoot him so that he may die now, rather than slowly and tortuously. What do you do? I know that there are some who feel that even in this situation it would be wrong to

shoot the driver, and I respect their position. But I also know that to me, it would be wrong to allow the man to suffer.

As I said, an extreme example. Often, however, the suffering of a cancer patient can be almost as extreme as that of the truck driver, and he may ask to die quickly and painlessly. Here the issue is fuzziier, and each person involved must be guided by his code of ethics, with the patient's wishes being given primary consideration.

I must laugh at Tonkinson's evocation of the rights of the individual in the United States. Setting aside the wisdom of such an unqualified sanction for the moment, it is just this freedom of choice for the individual that "fans" of euthanasia advocate. An elderly person suffering with a terminal illness is now, under the law, not allowed to make his own, individual, choice about whether to live or die.

Tonkinson must also be careful not to confuse technological advances with progress, if that word must have the positive connotations he seems to

give it. "Progress" gave us cyclamates, acid rain and nuclear warheads. I would hope that progress would include advances in ethics as well as those in the sciences.

Finally, although I applaud the decision of Matthew Brown to be an organ donor and recommend this course to everyone, I do not see what his story has to do with Tonkinson's arguments. His sacrifice was made after he was dead and so does not enter into the question of euthanasia.

Once again, all fans of euthanasia do not advocate killing people who are seriously ill or in much pain. Some believe that a careful, measured choice about quality of life should be made by the person involved, guided by what he believes is right, and advised by his clergy and those who love him. This is the course that would preserve the "rights of the individual" of which Tonkinson is so fond.

Karen Lenchek is a junior religion major from Chapel Hill.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### You only think you couldn't be pregnant...

To the editor:

The major purpose of this letter is to gripe about the Student Health Services and the money students pay for these so-called "medical services."

This letter is from a female's point of view, as we do not know what goes on behind the closed doors of the infirmary for the members of the opposite sex. We know quite well, however, what goes for us girls.

To begin with, why is that so many of the doctors at SHS are so preoccupied with the thought that all the girls on this campus must be pregnant? Every time a girl walks into the infirmary, the first question asked is, "Are you sexually active?" If the answer is yes, the doctor, or nurse practitioner, or whoever, then attempts to find that their patient must indeed be pregnant. There have even been some cases of which we are personally aware, when the doctors insisted that their patient "must be pregnant," even when the patient must indeed be pregnant. There have even been some cases, of which we are personally aware, when the doctors insisted that their patient "must be pregnant," even when the patient honestly assured them that there was no possible way she could be. Of course, the Virgin Mary did have a child, didn't she? Too bad the SHS people weren't around then. They could have told her about it beforehand!

### Life's rough

To the editor:

Students who read Jay Leutze and Tommy White's letter ("Just when you thought it was safe," *DTH*, April 5) and are still reeling at the thought of filling those requirements all over again, you are not alone. Many people are worried, shocked and dismayed by the new curriculum. What's even more overwhelming, however, is the fact that there will be three different curricula at UNC next year. Seniors will be under the old curriculum, sophomores and juniors will be following the new General College and Arts and Sciences plan and freshmen will follow a further revision of the present plan. It could become next to impossible to keep all this straight, but Student Government has a plan to make understanding the new curriculum easier. In the fall we will initiate a Student Advising Service in the dormitories and in the Greek system. Students will be trained as advisers and counselors to serve as a resource for other students. We feel that students would often rather talk with other students for advice whenever possible.

Being a student adviser would be a very rewarding experience. Not only will student advisers have the opportunity to learn a great deal about academic procedures at UNC, but they will also gain valuable experience in counseling. If you are interested in counseling, anxious to get involved in your dormitory or just concerned about the present advising system at UNC, I encourage you to apply to be a student adviser. Advisers must be dormitory residents and maintain a minimum GPA of 2.75. Applications are available this week in the Student Government office, room 217 of the Union.

Jane A. Gordon

Chairperson Task Force on Academic Advising

### Defense possible

To the editor:

I found the articles on rape by Kathy Hopper ("Center exists to help sexually assaulted women" and "Men today can understand rape victim's feelings of fear," *DTH*, April 5) informative. I especially appreciate seeing a positive view of self-defense. I strongly object to the photo accompanying the articles. The photo presents a woman being grabbed from behind, with her eyes wide with terror. All that's visible of the assailant is part of a shoulder, arm and hand covering the woman's mouth. This photo does nothing more than reinforce the idea that women are victims. These images only serve to continue to terrorize women. It negates all the positive statements in the first article about women defending themselves.

I suggest that the next article on rape that has a positive viewpoint on women defending themselves be illustrated with that viewpoint. When women begin to see images of women as fighters then we can truly begin to believe that we are worth defending.

Kathy Hopwood

Self-defense instructor  
Triangle Women's Karate Association

### Letters?

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor and column contributions for the editorial page.

Contributions should be typed on a 60-space line and triple-spaced. They are subject to editing. Contributions must be submitted by noon the day before publication.

Column writers should include their majors and hometowns; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number. Letters that are not typed will not be printed.

Basically, what we don't understand is why the doctors automatically make the assumption that a girl is pregnant before they assume that there just might be something else wrong instead? It is our guess that those who work at the infirmary see many student pregnancies each semester. It is also our guess, however, that they treat even more female students who are not pregnant, than who are.

And now, about the money. If we understand it correctly, \$55 of every student's fees each semester are allocated to SHS. But what about those students who never use the infirmary, and more im-

portantly, those of us who have learned from experience that we have no desire whatsoever to make use of their "services"? We prefer our own private doctors to some of the quacks we've encountered at SHS. We think it's a shame that our money supports a cause that we so wholeheartedly oppose.

We welcome any response.

D. Evans  
J. Miller  
Granville

### Confusion over courses

To the editor:

Why in the hell doesn't someone in the administration at this lofty institute of higher learning let the students know what the hell is going on? Admittedly, college students must accept an increased level of responsibility. But it seems like the administration enjoys playing mind games with us students. If we have to sign up register for courses, why doesn't someone let us know?

I feel like an average UNC student and I don't even know who to address this letter to except the *DTH*.

L.C. and Brian Leuthner  
Hinton James



### Evangelism pitted against privacy?

To the editor:

After reading Michael Matti's article, "Born again, lost again?" (*DTH*, March 26) the frequent issue of evangelism in the Pit surfaces again. Undoubtedly, Michael Matti was only trying to help in an unpleasant situation, and it is unfortunate that the police charged him with a misdemeanor and for the cost of the ambulance.

The proper use of the Pit as a forum seems to be less controlled than it should be. Obviously, the Pit offers a convenient, central location on campus for students to gather, relax and socialize. Such use should be the primary purpose of a common area in the spirit of the Student Union itself. The Pit's function as a place to express varied opinions to large groups of people should be secondary.

No one would attempt to limit the freedom of any student to express his ideas, if he expresses those ideas in a reasonable fashion. In recent years, a variety of evangelists and other persons have used the Pit as a forum. The majority of those groups behave in an acceptable way. Recently however, the born-again evangelists are becoming objectionable. Most students use the Pit to relax, read the newspaper or talk to friends. The majority of

students do not want anyone screaming, shouting, or ranting about "depraved," "sinful" and "wanton, evil ways." They simply want to relax and get a little sun.

Perhaps it is time to restrict the use of the Pit only to groups who offer an organized, structured format to present their ideas. These groups or individuals should reserve the Pit through the Student Union reservations office—the current policy. Otherwise, offensive, spontaneous speakers should be removed by campus police.

Freedom of speech is a great right, but when it interferes with the general well-being of the students, it is time to have a closer screening of those who would like to speak in the Pit. This is not an advocacy of censorship by the University, the Student Union, or anyone else. It is a demand for reasonable presentations from the speakers in the same way that a student might make an oral report in a speech class.

Larry Raines  
Brandon Uttley  
Stacy

To the editor:

As a Christian, or one who professes to be, I also face issues expressed by Michael Matti ("Born again, lost again," *DTH*, March 26). I don't like to see a re-linkage with God turned into an arena of cannibals and philosophers' excuse the redundancy. I, too, get vamped by skirts and wait patiently for the peace of old men. I get ill when I hear some "minister" on TV digress on the spirit of man and other myopic debris, and I certainly don't see any reason for folks professing one way, one truth and one life to form separate denominations.

Matti and I might agree that piety without purity is obnoxious but, on behalf of all my manic relatives who are on fire for God, I say that have a child-like courage which risks everything native to this flesh, including approval of their peers, but risks nothing if it is the only way. They offer the

best they have to people who act like they don't want it. I was not present at the re-crucifixion scene depicted in Matti's article. It is hard to tell if it occurred, if it was hypothetical or if it matters.

Despite the fact that Ronnie and Vince et al tend to come across a bit strong for the tastes of most, I say that Ronnie and another friend were there praying during the minute when an affliction left my knee, a time when strength was needed. I hardly feel "hate-mongers" such as these should be ridiculed. They do good work through love and through a kind of wisdom which involves being willing to see, hear, feel, etc. I love him like the brothers and vessels of God they are and would suffer they not be harmed.

Max Spach  
Estes Park Apts.