

JEFF HIDAY, Editor

JOEL BROADWAY, Managing Editor  
MARK STINNEFORD, Associate Editor  
BEN PERKOWSKI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor  
VANCE TREFETHEN, State and National Editor  
MELANIE WELLS, City Editor  
DAN TILLMAN, Business Editor  
LYNN DAVIS, News Editor

FRANK KENNEDY, Sports Editor  
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor  
SHARON SHERIDAN, Features Editor  
JEFF NEUVILLE, Photography Editor

# The Daily Tar Heel

92nd year of editorial freedom

## For CGC, vetoes a no-call

Atop tonight's Campus Governing Council agenda are two bills which have been vetoed by the student body president, and which the council must decide whether to resurrect or let die. In both cases we recommend the latter course of, here at least, inaction.

One of the bills is an expression of dissatisfaction with the new food services plan. Its supporters want the Board of Trustees to know that they're not happy with the plan, which includes, starting next semester, a mandatory \$100-a-semester meal plan for on-campus students. As we understand it, though, this food service plan is not only prudent, but set in stone as well. So while complaining about the plan might increase student awareness of it, it will not change the Trustees' minds. Before overriding the veto of this bill, council members should consider the food plan's history, which includes ample evidence of student participation.

The other bill is even less worthy of revival. A plan for guaranteeing Student Legal Services 17½ percent of Student Activities Fees, the bill squeaked by a harried council last month — replacing a similarly intentioned bill passed earlier that night — and was vetoed by Paul Parker, he said, so the issue could be thought over and a compromise struck.

Last week the Rules and Judiciary Committee passed just such a comprom-

ise, a bill as adequate as can be expected in this complicated case. Council members tonight should see to it that this bill is passed, thus sending the matter to a campus-wide vote in February. Two elements make it especially worthwhile.

First, in guaranteeing Student Legal Services about \$44,000 (a buck a student twice a year), the bill provides SLS lawyers the job security they deserve. At the same time, in forcing the organization to petition the council for the extra \$30,000 or so it would need in a typical year, the CGC retains its role as watchdog — making sure money is being handled responsibly.

Second, the bill frees up that \$44,000 for the other 30 CGC-funded groups which, after having had to lop off \$150,000 from their budgets last spring, can use whatever money they can get. It should be noted that the plan does not call for a Student Activities Fee increase; in funneling money to SLS via a separate fee, it simply diminishes the competition among student groups for the activity fees.

Council members won't even see this admirable bill unless they first acknowledge the veto of their earlier, deficient bill. Then, if reason prevails, they will pass the compromise bill and let students decide next month whether to ensure Student Legal Services the stable future it deserves.

## Don't water the kudzu

Watered by good intentions, governing bodies have a tendency to sprout like kudzu into unwieldy, amorphous forms. Now, we don't think Student Government will ever rival the federal government as a bureaucratic menace, but a measure before the Campus Governing Council — designed to make the council a more representative body — could make the student legislature a more confusing and less accountable body.

Under a bill before the council tonight, CGC candidates would have the option of running with a "vice councillor." Vice councillors would attend meetings and vote when their CGC member could not come to a meeting. Rep. John Nicholson, a chief supporter of the bill, offers some attractive reasons for its passage. It would help ensure that all districts are represented at each CGC meeting. VCs would be especially valuable to graduate members who are sometimes forced to miss meetings because of their crushing work load and to upperclassmen called out of town for job interviews and the like.

As Nicholson points out, poor attendance is more than a matter for philosophical speculation; it often threatens to bring the CGC to a standstill. Lack of a quorum delayed CGC budget considerations during a full council meeting last spring. And, because so many members were absent during a meeting to consider the Nicaraguan invasion protest bill, opponents were nearly able to break up the meeting by walking out.

But, despite the positive points of the proposal, the CGC would do well to send the vice councillor plan to the archives tonight. Already, most student are more

likely to be able to name the capital of Albania than that of their CGC member. The measure would only increase confusion over who is voting for the students of a particular district. While it would be assumed that councillors and vice councillors would be philosophically compatible, there is no guarantee that a member and his alternate would vote the same way when issues come down to specifics.

Most importantly, there is the matter of accountability. Under the proposal, some members may be less likely to attend votes on controversial issues, leaving matters to their vice councillors. While we don't question the scruples of our dedicated representatives, student politicians — just like full-grown ones — often seek higher office. Dodging emotional issues is not always bad advice for an office seeker. If vice councillors were in existence during the current term, it is not inconceivable that some ambitious council members may have been conveniently absent for bills outlining Student Government contingency protest plans, increasing funds for the Carolina Gay Association and proposing constitutionally guaranteed funding for the Black Student Movement.

Even without vice councillors, the CGC is hardly powerless to fight attendance problems. Any member who misses two full council meetings in a row is required to appear before the council's Ethics Committee, which has the power to expel the representative.

While we applaud the intentions of those proposing vice councillors, we suggest they use existing rules and keep the kudzu fertilizer where it belongs.

# 'Random dousing' won't hold water

By KENNETH HARRIS

I am not surprised at the amount of support that the random housing proposal is continually gaining at this university. It is my opinion that this support is based on a misunderstanding of the potential negative effects of random housing at UNC. Allow me to clarify the reasons why, what I call the "randomized dousing" of black cultural presence at UNC, would be an ineffective, discriminatory program, affecting both the quality and quantity of black students at this university.

Recently, I read an article in the *DTH* that called for the "integration" of North Campus through the use of the "random dousing" program, which would force many black students to reside on North Campus rather than exercise their freedom to live where they choose (traditionally South Campus). The writer failed to understand a few very important circumstances.

First, forcing black students to live on North Campus, as well as South Campus would not create "integration." The fact that black students attend this university, have access to its resources, and, in addition, have the choice to decide between living on North or South campus, indicates that UNC is "integrated." The key problem is that while the University is, indeed, "integrated," there remains a significantly low percentage of black students at UNC, which is disproportionate to the black populations of both North Carolina and the United States. As a result, there are not enough black students at UNC to enable a situation to occur in which black students would live on all parts of campus (including North Campus) and, simultaneously, retain the degree of comfort present on South Campus. A solution would be for the University to increase efforts to recruit black students, and increase black enrollment to approximately 22 percent, which is proportional to the black population of North Carolina. Then, and only then, would "random dousing" become random housing, and the proposed changes would no longer have the profound negative effects on black student matriculation and performance that I anticipate.

Perhaps many students, faculty or administrators do not understand the problems faced by black students and other minorities at this university. Aside from adjusting to a new academic environment, blacks must adjust to a new social and racial environment as well. Many black students find it extremely difficult to adjust to the dominant white culture at UNC. Even with the relative "concentration" of black students on South Campus, many blacks still feel alienated among the large percentage of white students who live on South Campus. There are no real advantages presented by the "randomized



dousing" of black student initiative, motivation and comfort by removing black students from resources (friends, the Black Student Movement, cultural presence, etc.) that exist on South Campus.

In addition, "random dousing" would take away from each student the ability to choose where to live. It is my opinion that students select areas they feel will produce the greater degree of comfort. This sense of belonging or comfort has a direct effect on a student's performance. The less comfortable a student feels in his social or living environment, the more likely he is to be distracted from academics.

"Random dousing" is not a new issue at UNC. There have been numerous random housing proposals, and there was even a random housing-exploratory committee report that criticized the concept of random housing.

Let us not be idealistic. Random housing presents no significant gains for the University or its black population. If UNC desires a sound, responsive and consistent black population throughout the campus, they must recruit more

black students — not disperse those already here. To put it in understandable terms: if you want two good ham sandwiches, and you have only one slice of ham, you are going to have to get another piece of ham from somewhere else.

Random housing presents a severe threat to the performance and number of black students at the University. It would indeed be an ideal situation if black students were able to live comfortably on North and South campuses. But, the fact remains that blacks are an extreme minority at UNC and the majority of resources for blacks remain on South Campus.

Come on UNC! Get another piece of ham! Recruit more black students, or at least retain the present cultural presence of blacks at UNC. Let students decide where they want to live. Abandon "random dousing" and live up to the responsibility of providing all students, despite racial backgrounds, equal opportunity to achieve academic success at UNC.

Kenneth Harris is a senior political science major from Fayetteville.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### Conservatives deserve fair shake, 'DTH'

To the editor:

There you go again. Your Jan. 11 editorial ("When Jesse talks, people listen?") again showed your insistence on using Sen. Jesse Helms as a punching bag for your ever-present liberal bias.

The editorial was critical of Helms for urging conservatives throughout the United States to buy CBS Inc. to prevent future anti-Reagan newscasts. This is a large undertaking, to be sure. It would require conservatives to buy more than \$1 billion worth of CBS stock

to gain control of the corporation.

But many people agree with our senior senator. Since CBS Inc. is a public corporation and offers its stock for sale, what is wrong with conservatives buying it if they so desire? If conservatives heed Helms' appeal and purchase a large portion of CBS, maybe all major media would begin to strive for greater fairness and objectivity in their reporting. That wouldn't be so bad, would it?

Some people might believe that Helms' idea is a move to eventually

gain control of all major media.

However, I believe it is nothing of the sort. Conversely, it is an attempt to persuade Dan Rather and others who slant the news to stop deceiving the American public.

Conservatives have argued for many years that they have not gotten a fair shake in the major news media. Helms is a perfect case in point. For example, *The Charlotte Observer* and the *Raleigh News and Observer* clearly bend over backward to make Helms look bad in their editorials and news stories.

The editorial stated, "Sorry, Jesse, but we (the *DTH*) can't be bought." Well, I doubt if anyone in his right mind would want to purchase the *DTH* if it was for sale. Don't be surprised if UNC students eventually make internal reforms in the *DTH's* editorial policies to give conservatives a louder voice. Therefore, a "coup de Tar Heel" will not be necessary for conservatives to fairly share our views with our friends on the left.

Chris Sanders  
Granville West

### Here it comes, again

To the editor:

Why are we hearing demands to restructure and reorganize Student Government? As two seniors who are settling in for their fourth round of UNC student elections, we are preparing ourselves to witness the usual onslaught of cries that Student Government is ineffective, out of touch, and in dire need of reorganization.

Before nine candidates start trying to convince the student body how ineffective Student Government is in solving these problems, we'd like to point out that any of these candidates would be fortunate to compile a record as impressive as that of Paul Parker's administration. We're talking about the administration that lobbied for and won for us, the students, fantastic seating in the new Student Activities Center; we're talking about the administration that has kept our cars from being towed during football games; we're talking about

the student body president who has worked 80 hours a week in a successful effort to bring efficiency and effectiveness back into Suite C.

We're not saying that there's no room for innovation: new ideas, new issues, and new concerns will continue to demand the attention of those who choose to involve themselves with student politics. Paul Parker has built a flexible framework that can be readjusted and fine-tuned by each successive student body president. It would be a waste of time, energy, and talent to restructure a working government.

We hope the candidates will address their campaigns to problems that need solving, rather than sounding off weary battle cries that may have been pertinent in past campaigns but certainly aren't relevant any longer.

Sarah Hester  
Joey Hall  
Chapel Hill

### Fields' letter off-base

To the editor:

In *Roe vs. Wade*, the Supreme Court legalized abortion for women who lived everywhere in the United States, effectively generalizing laws that were on the books in states like New York and California. The court found, however, that a woman's right to "demand" an abortion depended on how far her pregnancy had progressed. During the first two trimesters, there are no restrictions. The state may regulate the procedure during the second trimester, allowing only hospitals to perform it. The third trimester is different, in the court's opinion, because of the growing viability of the fetus. At this time, an abortion is only legal when it can be shown that the mother's life would be endangered by carrying the pregnancy to term.

I hope this information clarifies some statements in Patrick Fields' letter ("Abortions and the right-wing stigma," Dec. 3), which imply

that a woman can demand an abortion at any time during her pregnancy. This is false.

As medical technology pushes back the onset of viability, the difference between a "premature baby" and an "unwanted fetus" will become semantic. While I support *Roe vs. Wade*, in the future we may need to refine the Supreme Court's crude balance between a woman's right to control her reproduction and an obligation to protect nascent life.

In the spirit of Fields' letter, here are the two points that are always rock bottom for me whenever I think about the abortion issue:

- Abortions will not end by making them illegal.
- The right to terminate a pregnancy is fundamental to the freedom of choosing to bear a child.

Doug Brewer  
Chapel Hill



### Ill-conceived issue

To the editor:

Russell A. Board's letter ("Sad date," Jan. 10) represents to me all that is wrong with philosophy - it's all theory, with no acknowledgment of practical reality.

To each of the concerns Board voices, I offer a counterpoint. First, he worries about "practicing quality control" on children. Does he feel that it is just to bring into the world children who will be raised in poverty — unwanted, unloved and neglected?

Second, how can one kill that which is not yet alive? This is the pivotal question over which both sides are still bitterly fighting, and my position has already been expressed. And what "more humane solutions" does Board suggest? He proposes none. He merely speaks of them in the abstract.

Third, Board suggests that current legislation deprives fetuses of their freedom to choose whether to be born or not. This is absurd. Since when did children have a choice as to whether they are to be born or not?

Fourth, the portrayal of doctors

who perform abortion as "hit men" is crude, and does the medical community a grave injustice. They are using their training and technology to the benefit, not the detriment, of society.

Finally, Board's demand that we want and love every child born is the ultimate example of avoiding reality. What a Pollyanna you are, Board! Do you really love everyone? If so, you are a better person than I, but I prefer to be a bit more discriminating.

Board's argument is not only faulty, but it misses the fundamental issue at stake. He speaks at length to the immorality of abortion, yet the alternatives are morally reprehensible. Isn't it kinder not to bring into the world children for whom the quality of life will be unacceptable?

I hope in the future Board will give more lengthy consideration to matters of such importance, before revealing more shortsightedness and selfishness in another "ill-conceived" missive.

Elizabeth Larschan  
Chapel Hill

### Not again . . .

Tired of abortion, apartheid, elections, etc.? You're not alone. But surely something's on your mind, and we'd like to hear about it. Typed letters and columns are always welcome, and may be placed in the *DTH* box located outside our office in the Carolina Union. Letters must be received before 2 p.m. for the next day's publication.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Assistant News Editor: Steve Ferguson

Editorial Writers: Dick Anderson and Karen Youngblood

Assistant Managing Editors: Amy Styers and Elizabeth Huth

News: Mike Allen, Lisa Brantley, Richard Boyce, Tim Brown, Matt Campbell, Joan Clifford, Tom Conlon, Katy Fridl, Mike Gunzenhauser, Beth Houk, Catherine Kury, Guy Lucas, Sallie Krawcheck, Georgia Ann Martin, Dora McAlpin, Andy Miller, Marjorie Morris, Brian Mullaney, Kathy Nanney, Janet Olson, Beth Ownley, Ruthie Pipkin, Mark Powell, Robbin Robertson, Karen Rogers, David Schmidt, Rachel Stiffler, Kevin Sullivan, Jim Surowiecki, Lisa Swicegood, Ray Tingle, Andy Trincia, Jennifer Trotter, Laura Van Sant, Kevin Washington, Leigh Williams, Lorry Williams, Laurie Willis and Jim Zook.

Sports: Scott Fowler and Lee Roberts, assistant sports editors. Tim Brown, Mike DeSisti, Paul Ensslin, David McCullough, Mike Persinger, Kurt Rosenberg, Mike Schoor, Mike Waters and Bob Young.

Features: Marymelda Hall, assistant features editor. Mike Altieri, Nancy Atkinson, Tom Camacho, Vicki Daughtry, Loretta Grantham, Bryan Hassel, Jennifer Keller, Anjetta McQueen, Mary Mulvihill, Darian Marbray, Tom Rose, Liz Saylor and Sonya Terrell.

Arts: Ed Brackett, Frank Bruni, Steve Carr, Elizabeth Ellen, Ivy Hilliard, Eddie Huffman, Steve Murray, and Virginia Smith.

Photography: Larry Childress, Nancy London, Jamie Moncrief, Stretch, and Lori Thomas.

Copy Editors: Angela Gunn and Carolyn Wilson.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Paula Brewer, advertising director; Tammy Martin, student business manager; Angela Booz, accounts receivable clerk; Terry Lee, student advertising manager; Alicia Susan D'Anna, Greg Goosmann, Patricia Gorry, Melanie Parlier, Stacey Ramirez, Doug Robinson, Amy Schutz and Scott Whitaker, ad representatives; Patti Pittman, classified advertising manager, Laura Bowen, assistant; Jim Greenhill, office manager; and Cathy Davis, secretary.

Distribution/circulation: William Austin, manager.

Production: Brenda Moore and Stacy Wynn, Rita Galloway, assistant.