

The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT
Editor

STUART TONKINSON *Managing Editor*
BEN PERKOWSKI *Associate Editor*
DICK ANDERSON *Associate Editor*
JANET OLSON *University Editor*
STEVE FERGUSON *News Editor*
VANCE TREFETHEN *State and National Editor*

LEIGH WILLIAMS *City Editor*
MARK POWELL *Business Editor*
LEE ROBERTS *Sports Editor*
FRANK BRUNI *Arts Editor*
SHARON SHERIDAN *Features Editor*
LARRY CHILDRESS *Photo Editor*

A job well done

Many student organizations fought long and hard for every dollar they could get during this year's budgeting process. When it all officially ended Saturday, the Campus Governing Council had earned just as much — in respect.

With two opposing sides of the council unwilling to budge on the issue of Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association funding — one wanting to give \$1,050; the other, nothing — strong leadership, difficult sacrifices and a tough compromise saved an important voice on campus.

And as it spoke up for minority rights, the CGC fortified its own voice on campus.

Some representatives with religious and moral beliefs opposed to homosexuality realized they had a duty to protect the rights of others, even those with beliefs different from their own. It wasn't an easy decision, but their exuberance after winning \$900 for the CGLA showed that the personal sacrifices were well-rewarded.

In addition, leaders of student organ-

izations made financial sacrifices to save money for the CGLA. Sue Kuhn, treasurer of a Campus Y devastated by previous cuts, lowered her organization's request for more money, as did *Cellar Door* editor Sally Pont. Their support inspired a united front against CGC conservatives trying to unload remaining student fees before the CGLA could come before the council with requests.

The conservatives deserve praise for the sincere attempts they made to compromise. They were in the minority, but they could have filibustered all night to wear out CGLA supporters on the council, some of whom had fast-approaching appointments. More importantly, they had chances to break quorum but refused, choosing to work it out instead.

The 3½ hours spent on the CGLA budget probably was the tensest and most exhausting situation this CGC will face. Dejected or jubilant, council members have left a hell of a battle behind them, and when the wounds heal, they will be a stronger body for it.

STUDENT FEES ALLOCATIONS

Organization	Recommendation	Allocation
Student Legal Services	29,664	29,664
Executive Branch	23,575	23,075
The Phoenix	20,526	20,526
Yackety Yack	19,625	19,625
Student Consumer Action Union	14,798	14,723
Black Student Movement	14,190	14,240
Student Television	8,494	8,494
Carolina Symposium	12,381	8,381
Judicial Branch	6,288	6,388
Carolina Course Review	5,203	5,203
Carolina Quarterly	5,060	4,060
The Cellar Door	2,630	3,630
Carolina Athletic Association	3,313	3,313
Summer Campus Governing Council	3,000	2,692
Carolina Forensics Union	2,500	2,500
Campus Y	1,634	2,134
Victory Village Day Care Center	1,850	1,850
N.C. Student Legislature	890	1,340
Campus Governing Council	1,300	1,300
Rape and Assault Prevention Escort	1,150	1,150
Toronto Exchange	1,000	1,000
Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association	0	900
Elections Board	825	825
Carolina Course Description	800	800
Carolina Indian Circle	679	679
Association of International Students	453	453
Korean Student Society	368	368
Media Board	301	301
Association of Women Students	0	0
Model United Nations	0	0
Student Part-Time Employment Service	0	0

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Organization	Recommendation	Allocation
Crew Club	3,500	6,000
UNC Band	2,000	2,000

This is how the CGC distributed about \$180,000 of your Student Activities Fees. Not included are constitutionally funded organizations: The Carolina Union, *The Daily Tar Heel*, the Graduate and Professional Student Foundation and WXYZ. The allocation for Student Legal Services is added to the separate fee already established for the organization, which will raise about \$53,000.

To the dth degree

A dangerous posture

The authors of a letter we printed on Friday, Apr. 19, cited and objected to three "unwarranted" comments made in recent *DTH* editorials — among which was our statement that Americans who fought in Vietnam were victims of a "corrupted cause," just as many German soldiers were victims of a corrupted cause in World War II.

The letter-writers at first objected on personal grounds, but then came to the following conclusion: "Not only have some of your recent comments (in editorials) been extreme, but you should ask yourself if they truly represent the prevailing opinion on campus. These statements may have been appreciated by the left-wings on campus, but with the conservative trend of the past few years there are many students on campus who have found them unrepresentative and irresponsible."

What disturbs me most about the posturing of such an attitude — not so much specifically within this letter, but rather as I have perceived the posturing elsewhere — is that the posturer refuses to stand still, and does not extend his attitude to its logical conclusion.

In such a case, the person's attitude itself remains indefinite and transient, the stuff that mists are made of. It is, in essence, a highly personal objection, something which eludes definition on a general level. For these and other reasons, the objection remains ill-expressed. Perhaps we do not stop to consider how we actually feel. Or maybe we do not consider how deeply we feel. And maybe that is the root of many of our problems.

But a person nevertheless seeks to express his attitudes, whether he has sought to make them credible or not, and what often results is a posture. The person seeks to impose a personal belief upon the faces and forms around him.

Throughout my four years at this University I have seen many a *DTH* editorial pommee by critical readers. There are always those readers who question the reasoning of an argument, point-by-point. And there are those who point out factual errors that have gone unedited or unobserved.

Then, on another level, there are those readers who pursue highly personal objections. They point out that they don't feel that way at all, that they are angered to see such statements in their student newspaper. And these are laudable expressions, to be sure, so long as they are heartfelt.

But what results next in many cases is the following allegation: that the *DTH* is not voicing the opinion that the students want to hear, or ought to hear. Editorials are then said to be "unrepresentative."

For example, the letter cited above says we should ask ourselves if some of our editorials truly reflect the "prevailing" opinion of "today's typical UNC student."

But to make such a request on any single issue is to make a request for the same treatment on all issues. It is to say, "all of your editorials ought to reflect the prevailing student opinion."

Yet we cannot mete and dole representation like a commodity. After all, this is a newspaper, not a newsletter, and not a propaganda sheet. To pattern ourselves after the evanescent politics of the "student body" would be to undermine every principle of the free press.

The fact that we have convictions does not make them right. But within the free press system, it means that they must be safeguarded in order to be heard.

Suffice to say, our convictions are as genuine as we expect the convictions of our readers to be.

— ARNE RICKERT

The fat report relies, falls on facts

By JONATHAN WILLIAMS

While students are protesting apartheid at Berkeley and Columbia, as rioting continues in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa, students at UNC have been rallying around the battle cry of "Hey-hey, ho-ho, the meal plan's gotta go." Though the contrast between campuses is stark, protesting a campus policy decision is not a bad thing when undertaken with good cause. But it is a bad thing when it seems to be the result of a simple exercise in negative campaigning. Negative campaigning works like this: You dig for anything that makes an opponent look bad, then misrepresent it as evidence of wrongdoing, then publish a fat report and finally go for maximum media coverage. The media coverage is the key, because with it no one figures there is any need to read the fat report. Evidence: Five students have bothered to stop by the Undergraduate Library to read it, while 200 stand chanting outside South Building.

What the fat report claims is that it "adequately documented that the current mandatory meal plan began as an idea in the minds of University administrators who were singularly bent upon its creation and implementation despite what studies and student opinion have said." But after reading the report and all the attached evidence, it seems to be that the true megalomaniacs are the report's authors, Fetzter Mills, Sherrod Banks and Tom Terrell, who undertook the project not to evaluate the wisdom of the meal plan, but to attack it with any tactics available.

One of the central arguments of the report is that the evidence in no way supports the creation of a mandatory meal plan to achieve goals of good food and low prices. They cite the following statement from the 1980 Campus Food Study Report, based on a comparison of UNC and eight other universities, as a central example of administrators' misrepresentation of "facts":

The evidence is irrefutable that food service costs to individual customers is substantially decreased when a mandatory board plan of some size is in operation . . . The evidence seems to suggest that both (excellent food and the lowest possible price) are more readily attainable with a mandatory plan.

Mills, Banks and Terrell absolutely deny these conclusions:

The report cites no evidence whatsoever that excellent food is more readily attainable with a mandatory meal plan. In fact, evidence suggests the opposite conclusion. At UNC-Greensboro, the only campus with a full mandatory meal plan, students expressed strong dissatisfaction with food quality.

They conveniently confuse the full mandatory plan with the partially mandatory plan here for the sake of argument; because what they do not tell us is that the two campuses that were regarded as having the best food had mandatory plans for some dormitories. Had the trio made an objective assessment, they would have concluded that a full plan did not promote quality, but that a partial plan did. Instead, they go on to note that at Georgia, where the plan was voluntary, students were satisfied. This appears to suggest that a voluntary plan ensures good

partial mandatory meal plan.

The best conclusion from the evidence cited in the fat Mills/Banks/Terrell report is not their conclusion. The best conclusion appears to be that some form of guaranteed revenue for a food service distributor, but not a full board plan, is the most promising route to overall food quality and lower prices. The first proposal offered was full room and board plans for part of the student body — freshman. That was rejected immediately. The second proposal was full room and board for a part of campus, which was rejected due to student pressure. Given that the campus deserves good food at a low price and that the evidence points to a guaranteed revenue as the best means of achieving both, the compromise of a partial meal plan is a good policy decision.

Mills, Banks and Terrell have acted in bad faith by ignoring or twisting evidence to stop the meal plan. They insinuate some sort of evil motivations on part of administrators, who presumably plot the harassment of students and the growth of the ARA empire in smoke-filled rooms deep within South Building.

The problem is that there is no reason to believe this interpretation. The findings of the Mills/Banks/Terrell report were reached before the evidence was reviewed, and it should be no surprise that they found exactly what they wanted. After all, Mills vowed to stop the meal plan long before he undertook the report, and Terrell was his campaign manager. The only issue is whether UNC is willing to take action to acquire a high-quality, low-priced food service, because an objective look at the evidence of the report is that both goals can only be achieved with a partial meal plan. High quality is beneficial to everyone, and low prices are of special interest to those of us with financial aid.

For anyone who is still interested, go to the Undergraduate Library and double-check the report's claims with the evidence attached. The only way to uncover negative campaigning is to take the time to check all the facts and read carefully, and the fat report that claims to be so thoroughly decimating unwisely included all the evidence. The report relies far more on convenient misinterpretation and rhetoric than on the facts presented. In the meantime, surely there are far more important matters that rate so much attention.

Jonathan Williams is a senior from Goldsboro.

'Mills, Banks and Terrell have acted in bad faith by ignoring or twisting evidence to stop the meal plan'

food. But they omit the fact that UNC had a voluntary plan (run by Servomation) that had terrible food.

That is an example of shady interpretation, but more amazing is the Mills/Banks/Terrell claim that

. . . evidence is not "irrefutable" that a mandatory meal plan will make lower prices more readily attainable. The one school with a full mandatory meal plan for dormitory residents did not have the lowest prices among the schools mentioned.

What they incredibly neglect to mention is that it had the second lowest prices! Furthermore, the two most expensive schools had 100 percent voluntary plans. One was Georgia, with good food (though not the best) at high places, and the other was UNC, bad food at the highest prices. The least expensive, Tennessee, had a

READER FORUM

Why some CGC reps opposed funding of CGLA

Editor's note: The following was introduced — by Dave Fazio in behalf of several others — to Campus Governing Council representatives and members of the audience during CGC budget hearings Saturday.

We are not voting to defund the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association because of discrimination. We believe everyone should be guaranteed all rights that are established in the U.S. Constitution. We do not believe the CGLA — nor any group — has special rights under the Constitution that would guarantee Student Government money.

We are not defunding the CGLA because we wish to stifle homosexuals or the gay perspective on campus. In a pluralistic society, we recognize all ideological viewpoints. Since financial resources are available in other sectors of society, in no way will a lack of appropriations prevent the homosexual viewpoint from being heard.

We are not voting to defund the CGLA because we feel that they do not deserve the same rights of other minority groups in America. We are not biased, narrow-minded or discriminators. We just do not believe the CGLA warrants Student Activity Fees money; however, we strongly support the existence of such a group in a pluralistic society.

We are voting against the CGLA

because of low qualitative scores. The Finance Committee had a job of cutting \$70,000 in order to present to the full council a balanced budget. Only in extremely exceptional cases did groups with qualitative scores under 21 (out of a possible 30) receive funds. The majority of CGLA scores were under 20 and were some of the lowest of any group.

We are voting against CGLA funding because of lack of support from the gay community. Robert Pharr, CGLA co-chair, stated that there were 2,000 homosexuals on campus. Jim Duley, CGLA co-chair elect, said the number was as high as 2,500. Only 71 of these students have joined the club in which dues are only \$2. It has been said that a reason for this is that some students are afraid that the membership rolls will become public information. This point is invalid because many times CGC members have tried to see membership rosters, but have been denied. If a student is afraid to join the CGLA, we recommend that he pay dues anonymously or under a pseudonym, thus preventing detection while still supporting the CGLA.

We are voting to defund the CGLA because an overwhelming majority of students do not want their money to fund such a group. We realize that some students feel this way because of existing prej-

udices; however, many students oppose the use of their money on the grounds of moral, religious, or personal convictions. Students feel that the gay perspective should have an outlet on campus but object to the use of their money for such an outlet.

Also, the CGLA does not provide a wide enough service for non-homosexuals to participate. Gay functions are not only attended by a small portion of the gay community, but an even smaller portion of the entire student body. On the other hand, groups like the Black Student Movement reach a lot of the non-black population on campus.

We believe that the CGLA divides homosexuals from heterosexuals. If anyone has ever monitored the Gay Awareness Week, they will note that there is more

resentment towards gays because they are trying to push their beliefs and sexuality on others rather than trying to educate the student body.

Our solution for funding the CGLA without the use of student government money is that every gay or gay supporter send, by mail or hand, \$1 to the CGLA office in the Union. This will provide, if the gay community is supportive of the CGLA, approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000.

- Dave Fazio (Dist. 19)
- Frank Whitney (Dist. 3)
- Robert Kevin Woodward (Dist. 20)
- Alan Ross (Dist. 6)
- Steve Griffin (Dist. 8)
- Charles Bryan (Dist. 15)
- Anna Critz (Dist. 12)
- William W. Peaslee (Dist. 9)
- Jimmy Greene (Dist. 9)

Cartoon, not beer, tasteless

To the editors:

We are writing in response to *The Man From Uncle* cartoon in the April 18 issue of the *DTH*. We were stunned and appalled at the inaccurate portrayal of our favorite golden lager. Of course, we are talking about that fine mixture of hops and barley — naturally light Goebel.

The kind folks at the Goebel Company have been working hard for years to supply us with a smooth and tasty lager while keeping their profits at a minimum. Any young lad or lass 19 or older, of course, with \$3 in his/her pocket can enjoy a cold and frosty 12-pack of this delightful draught anytime.

We must admit, there have been crazed moments in our lives when we were so foolish as to stray from our brand to save a few cents. Blatz, Schaefer, Maxx and Iceman Malt Liquor have all cast their spells on us in moments of weakness. But we invariably return to our friend and mentor, Goebel. Because *taste* is what counts.

Patrick Kent
Chapel Hill



The very idea that Goebel could induce sickness causes us to raise an eyebrow. So in future episodes we would appreciate it if you would present Goebel in its true light: a treat for the taste buds and an economically sound choice.

Dave Slagle
Grady Crumpler
Beer lovers from
Chapel Hill

The 'DTH' must be crazy

To the editors:

It surprises me that the *DTH* would print Steve Carr's review of the film *The Gods Must Be Crazy* ("The Gods Must Be Crazy," entertainment at its best," April 16). Such an over-simplistic and naive analysis of this film only reinforces ethnocentric and racial prejudices that seem so preponderant when dealing with Black Africa.

Carr begins by inferring that the "bushman" culture is one of blissful ignorance of a more "civilized" (white) society. There is an "ideal" way of life. "Ideal" indeed, for the white South African masters who can easily control these "uncivilized" little black people, and continue to illegally occupy Namibia raping its vast mineral resources. Carr talks of "a band of incompetent rebels," and yet fails to recognize the inherent analogy with the SWAPO freedom fighters that the director so subtly portrays. The fact is, that if

one is at all familiar with the economic, political and societal policies of the South African whites' quest for legitimacy (which evidently Carr is not), then it becomes clear that this film is much more than "slapstick anthropology" with a "wonderfully developed comedic style."

You are right, Carr; the film is not about races or social order, but rather a very feeble attempt to help the viewer acquiesce to the "civilized" view of poverty-stricken, exploited black Africans and their attempts to free themselves from their "benevolent" white masters. Carr, I suggest that you ask one of those black Africans who are the object of this film if they place the same confidence in its "sweet innocence" as you seem so easily to do.

Dale T. McKinley
Zimbabwe

Keep it up, 'DTH'!

To the editors:

Regarding the letter, "DTH" editorials too liberal, too extreme" (April 19): To quote a familiar person, "Here we go again." There are a few fallacies in this letter — let's take them one at a time.

- First, being an elected official does not necessarily merit respect; witness Richard Nixon. Furthermore, after the recent elections, I frankly cannot see that there is any basis for respect in our muckraking Sen. Helms! That is not to say that I do not respect any right-wing and/or Republican; I really admire and respect Sen. Mark Hatfield. So where's the difference? Simply this. Sen. Hatfield gets respect the old-fashioned way. He earns it!
- Second, editorials do not have

to be a "reflection of today's typical UNC student." Frankly, with the Reagan administration, the news seems to be constantly bombarded with the right-wing viewpoint. I find it refreshing, as one of the left-wing minority, to hear the other side on occasion.

• Finally, I think that the purpose of the editorial part of a newspaper is twofold. First, it serves to illustrate one side of an issue being debated. Second, it sparks responses and counter-responses. The *DTH* editorials seem to me to be fulfilling these requirements quite well. Keep up the good work; I, at least, am enjoying it.

Betsy Palmer
Chapel Hill