

The Daily Tar Heel

95th year of editorial freedom

JILL GERBER, *Editor*
 AMY HAMILTON, *Managing Editor*
 SALLY PEARSALL, *News Editor*
 KRISTEN GARDNER, *University Editor*
 KIMBERLY EDENS, *University Editor*
 SHARON KERSCHULL, *State and National Editor*
 LEIGH ANN McDONALD, *City Editor*
 MIKE BERARDINO, *Sports Editor*
 FELISA NEURINGER, *Business Editor*
 HANNAH DRUM, *Features Editor*
 ELIZABETH ELLEN, *Arts Editor*
 CHARLOTTE CANNON, *Photography Editor*
 CATHY McHUGH, *Omnibus Editor*

A campus, not a playground

The fifth-graders are back. Every year at this time, some UNC students are afflicted with a strange disease known in some circles as *behaviorus immaturus*. These sick undergrads slowly regress in age, moving back through high school, back through puberty, all the way to the days of recess and naps. And all because of a few campaign posters. Posters which are torn down or defaced for no other reason than good old malice, with a healthy dose of cowardice thrown in.

Why do normally rational college students suddenly act like playground bullies? A few plausible answers:

■ "I got a little drunk and a little rowdy." Why not just take out aggression by banging your head against a wall? That way, it's *your* face that's ruined.

■ "I don't like the candidate." He probably doesn't like you, either. But he'd have the guts to debate the issues with you, instead of finding your old yearbook photo and tearing it up.

■ "I want my friend, Joe Studbodpres, to win." Have enough faith in your friend to believe he can win without your guerrilla tactics. If he thinks the only way he can get elected is to have you tear down the opposition, then he isn't smart or confident enough to hold office, anyway.

The river of their discontent

Members of the Zeb Vance Memorial Debating Society of Asheville recently devoted an entire meeting to a controversial issue facing their neighbors in Canton.

The issue deserved their attention. Located in the western mountains near Tennessee, Canton is home to the 70-year-old Champion Paper Mill, located on the banks of the Pigeon River. The river, which flows through Canton into Newport, Tenn., on its way to the Mississippi, picks up extra baggage along the way. Champion Paper dumps gallons of blackish, murky waste into the tributary every night.

The river turns the color of black coffee, and a froth forms on the water around the plant. Newport residents are disgusted by the river's condition, and deserve to have the pollution stopped. Not only is the water unsightly, river life is suffering. The only fish that inhabit these waters are bottom dwellers such as carp. Even if someone is lucky enough to catch a fish, it's inedible and must be thrown back. For people in the mountains who enjoy hunting and fishing, the situation is unacceptable.

In Canton, where it's rumored that the contaminated water cures poison ivy, residents are bitter about Newport's complaints. They have become

Tampering with a candidate's poster is a violation of the student code, but it's more than that. Such vandalism is gutless, cowardly, malicious, spiteful, immature and plain stupid. On a political level, trashing posters violates the principles of democracy and smacks of censorship.

On an economic level, it is theft. The candidates own those posters — they and their supporters bought them with private funds. Ripping down a candidate's posters is the same thing as ripping up his money.

Most of the candidates this year have had some of their posters defaced or removed. The tragedy is that each candidate has a spending limit — lost posters are irreplaceable dollars.

Keith Poston, student body president candidate, on Thursday asked the Elections Board for additional funds to replace his destroyed posters, but was turned down. It is unfortunate that his money has been lost. However, the board cannot feasibly replace campaign funds — the logistics of figuring how many of those posters have been ripped down at what expense would be impossible.

And it is not the responsibility of the board to compensate for the vandals' malice. That responsibility lies solely with the vandals themselves, whose juvenile tactics will only disappear when they grow up.

accustomed to having a ready source of income in their back yard. Many people go to work at the plant right after high school, as their fathers and grandfathers have done. Champion Paper employs most of the town, and the laborers fear that a plant closing would irreparably damage the town's economy.

Champion officials say that if they had it to do over, they never would have put the mill on the river. Seventy years ago, nobody realized that the Pigeon wouldn't carry enough water or move quickly enough to dilute the waste before it reaches Tennessee. Now, it's too late to worry about poor planning.

Instead, Canton should develop a tourism industry. The town is located in a valley deep in the Blue Ridge Mountains and could attract many vacationers. Obviously, this would take time, and generations of plant workers are understandably reluctant to give up their economic security.

While Canton gains revenue as its paper mill continues to destroy the river, the people of Newport suffer. A town in a different state that receives no economic benefit from Champion Paper should not be subjected to the company's environmental abuse. — **Laura Pearlman**

Readers' Forum

PLO recognition key to regional peace

To the editor:

I would like to respond to Michael Schmier's letter ("Keep problem in perspective," Jan. 27) on the proposal of U.S. and Israeli recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Several issues were raised in this letter which I feel I must address.

First, I wholeheartedly agree with Schmier that we should "all read our history books" to avoid "looking at the present without remembering the past." Unfortunately, Schmier's idea of the past seems to begin in 1967, and even then his historical assertions are largely fallacious. The 1967 War, for example, did not begin after invasion by the Arabs; rather, it began with Israel's launching of a pre-emptive air strike, effectively crippling the Syrian and Egyptian air forces. As a result of the rapid Israeli victory in that war, the West Bank and Gaza have remained under Israeli military occupation. Consequently, the Palestinian people remain a nation without a state, and those Palestinian youths who have chosen to vent their anger and frustration in recent weeks have lived their entire lives as refugees under military occupation and in abject poverty.

Schmier's assertion that the PLO was not leading the rioting is testimony to the spontaneity and authenticity of these demonstrations in response to oppressive conditions. Yet it would be incorrect to assume from this that the youths involved do not support the PLO. It is well known

that the great majority of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza do indeed support Yasser Arafat and the PLO (much to the chagrin of both Israel and Jordan's King Hussein).

It is not for Israel, the United States, the Soviet Union, or even any Arab state to say who will represent the Palestinians. They alone must decide, and their will has repeatedly been made clear — the PLO must be recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Israeli refusal to do this follows Schmier's reasoning that "we shouldn't support terrorists." This objection to the PLO somehow loses its moral credibility when uttered by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzak Shamir, a former member of the Irgun, a terrorist organization responsible for killing British soldiers and civilians, among others. This is not in any way to justify terrorism, yet we do need to keep in mind that acts of terrorism and violence have been perpetrated by all sides in this conflict.

If Israel had any chance of negotiating with any other Palestinian leadership, this has been erased by the deportations and arrests of prominent Palestinian lawyers, newspaper editors, university professors, and, in short, the positions which might have provided an alternative leadership. The objective reality remains, then, that the majority of the residents of the West Bank and Gaza support the PLO. The

argument for PLO recognition is an argument for the recognition of the realities and necessities of international politics.

Israel has a right to exist, and its strategic concerns about the occupied territories are understandable. Yet the Palestinians have their right to self-determination as well, and this can be achieved without sacrificing Israeli security. The Israelis argue that they need the territories as security zones, as they had previously argued in regard to Sinai. Yet Israel and Egypt's mutual recognition and negotiated settlement, culminating in the return of Sinai to Egypt, resulted in greater stability and security on the Israeli-Egyptian border. This can be achieved in the remaining occupied territories as well. The only hope for Israel, the Palestinians, and the Arab states lies in mutual recognition and negotiation. Yasser Arafat has offered to recognize Israel in a proposed international conference on the Middle East.

Israel has a chance to grasp at the beginnings of a peace process for the long term. It will destroy this chance if it continues to search for short-term, hard-line solutions through deportations, military occupation and violent repression of a people's desire to be free.

CURTIS RYAN
 Graduate
 Political Science

Approach issue realistically

To the editor:

In his letter "Euthanasia legally, ethically unrealistic" (Feb. 1), Peter Doyle rightly points out that there are laws against euthanasia in all 50 states, and he is also correct to claim that it would put a great burden on our legal system to change those laws. But this is not a good argument against legalizing "active" euthanasia. Consider the argument someone could have made against changing slavery laws in the 1850s: There are laws that support slavery in many states; it would burden the courts to change those laws; hence, we should keep our slavery laws. But slavery is wrong, and it should not have been legal; hence, the argument about the "burdens on the courts" is irrelevant. The same conclusions hold for euthanasia. If euthanasia is permissible, or even required in some cases, then it doesn't matter if it is illegal in 50 states.

Doyle argues that pain is not a good reason for wanting to die, since pain can be treated. According to Doyle, "I suggest that if a person's pain is not being relieved adequately, that person seek an alternative health-care giver to change medication or alter dosage." Doyle fails to acknowledge the fact that many patients suffer terrible pain despite the best treatment possible.

Doyle also argues that doctors should not be burdened with assisting patients in a suicide. This kind of argument is also flawed. First, it might be less of a burden in some cases to assist in euthanasia than to treat a slowly dying patient. Second, even if it is a burden, if it turns out to be the correct action to take, then physicians should be willing to take it. Physicians have an obligation to do their best to take care of their patients. If it turns out that it is in the best interests of a patient to die in a certain case, then it should not be unreasonable for a physician to aid in death.



There are many sides to the euthanasia question. I do not pretend to have resolved anything with this letter. But neither did Doyle with his letter. I respect his views but object to some of his arguments.

DAVID RESNIK
 Graduate
 Philosophy

Poston has wide agenda

To the editor:

After reading Christopher Locklear's letter on Monday ("Student leaders must lead," Feb. 1), I was compelled to write a response. Locklear's comments on Keith Poston showed a total lack of thought. He tried to discredit Poston's campaign for student body president because Poston has said he will try to defund the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association.

Locklear writes, "Poston, don't you think that the students of this university are concerned with more important issues such as minority enrollment and retention, continuance of financial aid and

student parking?" These are issues which all candidates running for SBP (Poston being no exception) have included in their platforms. But it is Poston's stand on the CGLA that sets him apart from other candidates. Furthermore, Locklear obviously is out of touch with the students on this campus. The question of CGLA funding is very important to students. This is an undisputed fact, proven by the ease with which 2,500 signatures were collected to put the issue of CGLA funding on a referendum.

While all the other candidates basically have the same platform, Keith is willing to go out on a limb and represent the true attitude of the majority of students on this campus. Like

other candidates, Poston is interested in making Student Government more effective and in increasing communication. But while other candidates merely talk about representing the students, he has already shown that he is willing to back up his promises with action. Poston's statement that he will do anything within his power to defund the CGLA is anything but a "narrow-minded platform," as Locklear would have us believe.

DAVID LUTZ
 Sophomore
 Mathematical Science

BILL TAYLOR
 Junior
 Political Science

We goofed

Monday's editorial "Not such a great place to start" incorrectly said that Air Force ROTC scholarships pay for room and board. They pay only for tuition, books and lab fees. Also, the Air Force may break its contracts with ROTC members at any time if it is in its best interest to do so. The Daily Tar Heel regrets the errors.

Letters policy

■ All letters and columns must be signed by the author, with a limit of two signatures per letter or column.

■ When submitting letters or columns, students should include the following: name, year in school, major, phone number and the date submitted. Other members of the University community should give similar information.

University stalls on parking issue

The news that parking fees might rise by as much as \$125 per year to pay for the new parking deck comes as no surprise, given the University's history in these matters. However, before they submit to any new fees, employees and students should demand that the University respond to the following questions:

■ If employees are to be expected to pay for this new deck through their permit fees, why was it placed inconveniently for employees common to work, but conveniently for sporting events?

■ Why have University administrators told employees that they are prohibited from using state funds to build parking facilities when just the opposite is true? The University has passed the blame on to the legislature for years, but it turns out that the only reason employees and students have been expected to foot the bill is that the University has chosen to make them pay.

■ How can the University even consider such an increase in parking fees when lower-paid employees still do not make enough money to keep themselves out of

Peter Schledorn

Guest Writer

poverty? Many University employees cannot even afford to buy health insurance coverage for their dependents — how are they to be expected to pay an annual parking bill that could be larger than their biweekly paycheck?

■ Why has the administration already chosen to eliminate parking from the central areas of the campus and rely on fringe lots exclusively, thus adding the better part of an hour to every employee's workday? Why was this decision taken without even consulting University employees?

■ Why have University officials claimed they are not creating a system in which only favored groups are given parking permits, when trends make it clear that soon only senior faculty and administra-

tors will be able to afford University parking facilities?

■ Why does an institution that already suffers from ruinous turnover levels give employees such an inducement to leave?

The parking situation has turned into a parking crisis simply because the administration has chosen to ignore the needs and concerns of a large portion of the University community. Officials have gone on and on about "hard choices" and "limited options" on parking and transportation issues, but they have failed to take even basic steps to improve the situation. Any new fees will make a bad situation even worse, and quotes from officials give the impression that they are a foregone conclusion. Just as it did during the clerical pay crisis of last summer, the University is creating an atmosphere of distrust and dissatisfaction that will haunt it for a long time to come.

Peter Schledorn is a library technical assistant for the Collection Development Department of Davis Library.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Writers: Matt Bivens, Brian McCuskey, Laura Pearlman and James Surowiecki.

Editorial Assistants: Gary Greene, David Lagos and Mark Leeper.

Assistant Managing Editors: Cara Bonnett, Teresa Kriegsmann and Mandy Spence.

Layout Assistants: Ashley Campbell, Katherine Hortenstine, Peter Lineberry, Laura Ross and Amy Weisner.

News: Kari Barlow, Jeanna Baxter, Crystal Bell, Laura Bennett, Lydian Bernhardt, Patricia Brown, Brenda Campbell, Lacy Churchill, Jenny Cloninger, Staci Cox, Robin Curtis, Laura DiGiano, Carrie Dove, Laura Francis, Amy Grubbs, Lindsay Hayes, William Hildebolt, Kyle Hudson, Helen Jones, Susan Kauffman, Will Lingo, Barbara Linn, Steve Long, Lynne McClintock, Brian McCollum, Myrna Miller, Rebecca Nesbit, Helle Nielsen, Susan Odenkirchen, Laura Peay, Cheryl Pond, Amy Powell, Beth Rhea, Becky Riddick, Mark Shaver, Mandy Spence, Christopher Sontchi, Laura Summer, William Taggart, Clay Thorp, Amy Weisner, Jackie Williams and Amy Winslow. Mark Folk and Justin McGuire, senior writers. Juliellen Sarver, wire editor. Brian Long, assistant business editor.

Sports: Chris Spencer and Jim Muse, assistant sports editors. James Surowiecki, senior writer. Robert D'Arruda, Steve Giles, Dave Glenn, Dave Hall, Clay Hodges, Ginger Jonas, Brendan Mathews, Patton McDowell, Keith Parsons, Andy Podolsky and Langston Wertz.

Features: Jo Lee Credle, Grier Harris, Jim Mock, Corin Ortlam, Leigh Pressley, Carole Southern, Ellen Thornton, Laura van den Berg, Julie Woods and Holly Young.

Arts: James Burrus, senior writer. Scott Cowen, Stephanie Dean, Kim Donehower, David Hester, Julie Olson, Kelly Rhodes, Alison Russell, Richard Smith and Michael Spirits.

Photography: Christie Blom, Tony Deifell, Janet Jarman, David Minton, Elizabeth Morrish and Julie Stovall.

Copy Editors: Karen Bell and Kaarin Tissue, assistant news editors. Cara Bonnett, Carrie Burgin, Julia Coon, Whitney Cork, Bert Hackney and Sherry Miller.

Cartoonists: Jeff Christman and Greg Humphreys.

Campus Calendar: Mindelle Rosenberg and David Starnes.

Business and Advertising: Anne Fulcher, general manager; Patricia Glance, advertising director; Joan Worth, advertising coordinator; Peggy Smith, advertising manager; Sheila Baker, business manager; Michael Benfield, Lisa Chorebanian, Ashley Hinton, Kellie McElhane, Chrissy Mennitt, Stacey Montford, Lesley Renwick, Julie Settle, Dave Slovinsky, Dean Thompson, Amanda Tilley and Wendy Wegner, advertising representatives; Stephanie Chesson, classified advertising representative; and Kris Carlson, secretary.

Subscriptions: Tucker Stevens, manager.

Distribution: David Econopouly, manager; Billy Owens, assistant.

Production: Bill Leslie and Stacy Wynn. Rita Galloway, Leslie Humphrey, Stephanie Locklear and Tammy Sheldon, production assistants.

Printing: The Chapel Hill Newspaper.