

The Daily Tar Heel

98th year of editorial freedom

JESSICA LANNING and KELLY THOMPSON, Editors

JENNY CLONINGER, University Editor
JENNIFER WING, Forum Editor
CAMERON TEW, City Editor
MYRNA MILLER, Features Editor
JAMIE ROSENBERG, Sports Editor
EVAN EILE, Photography Editor
STEVE WILSON, News Editor
MELANIE BLACK, Layout Editor

JASON KELLY, University Editor
LYNETTE BLAIR, Opinion Editor
STACI COX, State and National Editor
CHERYL ALLEN, Features Editor
LISA REICHEL, Omnibus Editor
PETE CORSON, Cartoon Editor
JOANN RODAK, News Editor
ERIK DALE FLIPPO, Design Coordinator

JAMES CLAUDE BENTON, Ombudsman

Hildebolt for SBP

The better choice to clean up Suite C

Students will go to the polls today to put an end to the longest, dirtiest campaign season UNC has ever endured. Candidates' less-than-stellar conduct has left most students apathetic and disillusioned about student government, consequently creating more voter apathy than ever before. In light of the fact that so much time has elapsed since the initial election, the DTH editorial board offers its opinion to students who are now forced to choose a candidate based on the candidates' recent conduct rather than the issues, and on personality rather than accomplishments. The next student body president has some serious rebuilding to do, and the board unanimously endorses Bill Hildebolt to carry out that task.

Neither candidate behaved ethically in this election, which leaves some questions about the ability of either to run student government. Hildebolt's chalk incident and Bibbs' possible falsification of his financial statements indicate that both candidates confuse what is ethical and what is not. The simple fact that both candidates lost their campaign managers during the campaign would make anyone question their abilities to work with people.

Presented with two disappointing candidates, students now have to decide which candidate can redeem the soured reputation of student government. The future SBP will have to nurse the organization back to health not only internally, but with the administration. Hildebolt, with his experience and vision of a unified student government, is the better candidate to spare Suite C any further humiliation.

First, Hildebolt openly admitted his breach of ethics in the chalk incident and has prepared himself to handle future events with more regard for ethics and conse-

quences. Second, Hildebolt understands the importance of rebuilding a strong government staff. Not only does he encourage the other candidates and students from other campaigns to work in student government under him, but he seems genuinely interested in making amends within government to make the atmosphere in Suite C what it was before the election.

Most importantly, Hildebolt's experience far exceeds that of Bibbs. Student government can only survive at this late stage with a president who will not have to spend time learning how the office of SBP operates. Hildebolt has spent three solid years in the executive branch. This invaluable experience will only help the transition for student government — transition time which has now been cropped from one month to one week by the prolonged election process.

Furthermore, Hildebolt, in his experience with town government, has worked with administrators and city political figures as student liaison to the Chapel Hill Town Council. He is more in tune with how the administration and city officials have viewed student government and the election process since January. He has an advantage over Bibbs with this administrative experience that will allow him to quickly restore the credibility government has lost.

Hildebolt may be a lesser of two evils, but with his vast government experience, he will be able to accomplish more than a peg who merely fills the SBP hole until next year when more promising, honest candidates can surface. Student government faces several long years of rebuilding. Despite Hildebolt's mistakes in this campaign, he is the only candidate left who can clean up the Suite C mess.

Editor's note: Lynette Blair was unable to participate in this decision.

Board Opinion

Labs need testing

Failure to correctly diagnose causes concern

Over the past few years, the medical community has done a tremendous job in raising Americans' health consciousness. Campaigns advocating safe sex are curbing the spread of the deadly killer Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and diets low in saturated fats are helping reduce cardiovascular cholesterol levels. Unfortunately, these measures aren't enough; hundreds still die from AIDS because of intravenous drug use or unsafe sex each year, and heart disease is still this country's number one killer.

It's not a question of some people being too apathetic to take precautions, although they do exist. Many people do care enough to change their lifestyles and get tested for ailments such as high cholesterol or AIDS, but the conduct of some medical professionals in this country is sabotaging those efforts to live happy, healthy lives. Increasingly, people who underwent testing and were told everything was fine are finding out that they do have serious medical problems. These cases do not occur because we don't have the technology to diagnose ailments; they occur because the tests were carried out in a sloppy, careless manner. This is simply unforgivable.

Public cholesterol-screening programs — the kind in supermarkets and malls — are some of the worst culprits. Time magazine reported this month that these common "cholesterol checkstands" are becoming popular because the government recommended that all people should maintain a low cholesterol diet — even those not at risk for heart disease. This reliance on the programs' results is unfortunate because many of the testers have little or no training and are not doing an adequate job.

Time reported that out of a total of 71 sites critiqued, more than half were guilty of using unacceptable testing procedures. Fifty-eight percent of the patients tested were "milked" to obtain blood. This method of squeezing the finger dilutes the blood and results in a lower cholesterol reading. Furthermore, 50 percent of those tested said the staff did not change gloves when dealing with a new patient, and 35 percent said the staff did not wear gloves at all.

What's even more shocking is that some patients reported that the work area where they were tested was dirty.

But don't get the impression that mistakes and carelessness only occur outside the doctor's office. AIDS testing, although more accurate, has its problems, too.

During a special on AIDS that aired on HBO, an AIDS victim recalled the moment he noticed a large bruise on the back of his leg. He went for a physical examination, suspecting that he had AIDS. His lover had already died from the disease. According to his doctor, the results of the tests were negative. He did not have AIDS. The lab, however, had made an error. The slides of his bruise had been mixed up with those of an elderly woman's mole. The doctor called later to inform him that he did in fact have AIDS. Undoubtedly, the man was crushed. He went from the exultation of knowing that he still had a lease on life to possessing the death sentence of the most feared disease of modern time.

Other goof-ups included misleading information that accompanied some AIDS test results. Some forms incorrectly told patients that while their tests were positive, that only meant they had been exposed to the virus. In reality, the patients with positive results were infected. Not only does this information confuse patients, but it may also mislead some doctors.

The one good thing about this entire medical fiasco is that the problems are being recognized. In fact, stricter regulations on laboratory procedures are scheduled to go into effect this year. Officials also plan to evaluate 300,000 labs instead of the 12,000 presently inspected.

One can only hope these measures will become a reality. After all, the purpose of going to a doctor is not to subject yourself to a game of "now you have it, now you don't." Laboratory testing should serve its professional purpose by giving patients the accurate results of their condition. If medical professionals, cholesterol-testing stations and laboratory workers will not do it themselves, the government will have to do it for them. — Lynette Blair



READERS' FORUM

Column relies on stereotypes

To the editors:
I am writing in response to Ian Williams' column "The worst kind of sheep are white ones," (March 21). I have been a faithful reader of Williams' "Wednesday's Child" for the past two years and have often been amused by his observations and characterizations of various societal groups. Today, however, I was far less than amused.

As a Southern white, it has infuriated me all of my life to be stereotyped as a racist simply because of the history of the region where I was born. I think it is naive and terribly uninformed on Williams' part to assume that racism in the United States is confined within the boundaries of eight or so Southeastern states, and that the inhabitants of this area are all die-hard bigots. It saddens me to tell the woefully incorrect columnist that racism knows no geographic boundaries in our nation. I have known many different people hailing from all different areas of the U.S., and a Californian, an Iowan or a Pennsylvanian can be just as narrow-minded as any North Carolinian ever dared.

As for Williams' readiness to blame his recent surroundings for his new-found prejudices, I was born, raised and have lived in the South all of my life. I have always found racism, ignorance and bigotry sickening. I attribute this to my own integrity and moral fiber and not to my geographical locale. If Williams feels so influenced by the racist attitudes he comes in contact with, perhaps the fault lies with Williams and not with his surroundings.

DEL LANCASTER
Sophomore
Speech Communications

Entire ACC deserves support of UNC

To the editors:
I am writing in response to Kimberly Edens' editorial entitled "Duke Sucks" (March 26). While I am also unhappy about the fact that the Tar Heels will not be going

to the Final Four, I see no reason why I, as a Carolina fan and student, should undermine the success of Duke. For her to say that the Blue Devils do not deserve to be where they are is totally ridiculous. They defeated every opponent that stood in their way, including a very good Connecticut team which was seeded number one. Contrary to what Edens thinks, the Blue Devils of Duke have had a very successful season. I am not pleased about this, but it is fact.

Secondly, Edens writing such an editorial only demeans the students and faculty here at Carolina. She would fit in well at Duke with their childish chants of "King Rice sucks" and "J.R. can't Reid." Don't stoop to their level. Show some integrity and pride by accepting the fact that Carolina cannot always have the best team in the land.

Edens also lashes out at one Duke student for his description of celebrating the Blue Devils' trip to the Final Four. But Edens must be reminded that Carolina fans, myself included, were seen celebrating in much the same way after a victory over a certain team located in Durham.

I have one request of Edens, and that is to stop making me and the rest of the Carolina students look bad. Stop crying. You are merely exhibiting jealousy. The Duke faithful will undoubtedly get a kick out of your article. You do not have to like the fact that Duke has made the Final Four again, but journalism is no place to show your feelings. In short, Edens should grow up and become a true Carolina fan by accepting the fact that there will be years in which they are better than us.

BO HAWKINS
Senior
Economics

Lack of write-in candidates limits choice

To the editors:
I was upset by last Friday's disclosure ("Write-ins excluded from SBP vote: Candidates agree to restrict Tuesday runoff," March 23) delineating the Mark Bibbs/Bill Hildebolt agreement which effectively prevents students from

writing in the candidate of their choice for student body president.

By barring other candidates from participating, Hildebolt and Bibbs are drawing the election to a close, but they are also restricting (candidates) for whom the student body may vote. Considering the rather tarnished reputations of both parties concerned, the question arises: is the chance of an upset by John Lomax feasible? If so, then why do Bibbs and Hildebolt, the two people who stand to lose the most from an open election, have the right to determine whether or not other candidates are involved? Perhaps I'm just naive, but something is wrong here.

The student body has the right to elect the candidate of its choice, regardless of how long it takes. Bibbs' and Hildebolt's "decision to prevent further delays in the election process" could be interpreted as an efficient means of "sewing up" the election, which is not to insinuate that anyone's credibility is on the line. Reams of information have come out in the last few weeks concerning the character of these two politicians. How this information will affect the election is uncertain, but we shall never know if Hildebolt and Bibbs are the only candidates involved.

What is the true cause of your concern, gentlemen, defeat or a longer election? Facing your constituency is one of the burdens and pleasures of holding public office. The challenge is for both of you to stand up to that responsibility in an open election for student body president. The worst thing that could happen would be a final runoff, but that is a small price to pay for political and personal integrity. Win or lose, you will get what you deserve.

TRENTON MCDEVITT
Sophomore
Asian Studies

Cartoon's parallel shows ignorance

To the editors:
Alex DeGrand's political cartoon on March 21 depicting President Bush asking us to forget the horrors of Nazism while standing next to a demonic Nazi soldier is ignorant, bigoted and still more

ignorant to the point of buffoonery. To imply that embracing the reunification of a split country and people is somehow forgiving the Third Reich is ludicrous. The present West German government is democratic and successful, and to deny East Germany's chance to become part of this democracy goes against the ideas and foundations this country has built upon. If we truly believe that a country's people should choose their own system of government then we cannot but applaud the recent developments in eastern Europe. Furthermore, DeGrand has shown himself in previous cartoons to be decidedly liberal, yet it is the liberals that most widely accept German reunification. To criticize Mr. Bush for believing something that is nearly unanimously accepted by both sides of the political spectrum belies a desire to insult George Bush merely for the sake of insulting George Bush.

For a cartoonist so appalled at conservative bigotry and heartlessness, DeGrand shows shockingly little compassion for the German people, most of whom weren't even alive during World War II. If he truly thinks there is a danger of a reunified Germany starting another war, we suggest we make haste to partition the United States, England, France, Japan and all those other countries with a checkered past.

As liberals we are particularly ashamed of DeGrand's limp liberalism and knee-jerk conservative bashing, which does nothing but dilute our real complaints with Republicanism and which serves to further alienate the general populace from a liberal stance.

TODD SMARRELLA
Sophomore
RTVMP/Political Science

CHRISTOPHER KELLY
Junior
RTVMP/History

Letters policy

■ All letters must be dated and signed by the author(s), with a limit of two signatures per letter.
■ All letters must be typed and double-spaced.
■ Letters should include the author's year, major, phone number and hometown.

Student vote greatest loss of SBP election

To the editors:
All right, enough! The student body president elections should have ended a month ago with some minimal mud-slinging and nastiness. I can guarantee that I would not have been happy with the outcome, but at least it would be over and out of my life. Unfortunately, the candidates have proven themselves to be even less worthy of the office than I had presumed. Whereas, before, I simply disliked them as candidates, now I cannot even call them good people. The incredible amount of hypocrisy, back-stabbing politics and pathetic lies is probably no secret to anyone who is even moderately aware of the DTH or general campus gossip. Allow me to recap some of my favorite highlights:

■ Controversy arises surrounding an insignificant, yet moronic, action. Bill Hildebolt was seen defacing John Lomax campaign signs made of chalk.

■ The fun commences as the parties involved make their alibis. At this point, I already do not care what they have to say.

■ Serious disappointment sets in as excuses become attempts at reverse criticism based on a lame accusation. Candidates are clearly grasping at straws here. Not a pretty sight.

■ Someone gets the inspiration that the recent events may have an effect on students' opinions. Maybe there should be another vote. Of course, as expected, there is opposition.

Up to this point, things seemed to be fairly rational: nothing worse than what is expected from politicians. It was at this point, however, that the Student Supreme Court (duly appointed representatives that they are) decided to step in. All of a sudden, someone else is telling me

whether or not I want to vote again. Here is where my problem arises: I do want to vote again. I am extremely dissatisfied with both candidates.

I believe that many people are as unhappy as I am. How are these candidates expected to represent the student body when we do not even like them? Why can't I vote for someone who does represent me? Well, apparently it is because "the court thinks the student body does not want a re-election" (March 21 DTH). I wonder if it occurred to them to ask the student body. I have taken it upon myself to conduct an informal survey of public voting opinion. I found that every student that I spoke to felt as apathetic to the candidates. Granted, these are my friends and acquaintances, but the fact still remains that we are rational, thinking people and, hopefully, not too unusual in that respect.

Part of my frustration stems from the fact that I feel that this election is completely out of my hands; it is as if I were simply an inconsequential by-stander observing this terrible excuse for a judicial system. I was insulted, primarily, by Hildebolt and company's response to the conflict. An intelligent and innocent person would be expected to simply answer the accusations without jumping into a defensive-attack mode as Hildebolt did. I am additionally disappointed with the Elections Board and the Student Supreme Court. All I know is that I did not in any way choose the students which serve on these committees and simply do not feel that they are accountable to the student body for their decision. Finally, I have been mistaken for someone who cares by

The Daily Tar Heel. Wednesday's article claimed that the "Runoff pleases SBP candidates." I simply do not care what it does for the candidates. However, I would be much more interested in the feelings of the candidates that are not in the runoff, or the opinions of anyone else, for that matter. I am not alone in being tired of hearing the irrational rantings of those two.

The worst consequence of this insanity is that no one is going to vote. It is not even possible here to choose the "lesser of two evils," and, furthermore, why should one bother? The candidates simply inspire such a huge lack of confidence that it makes absolutely no difference to the student body who wins. I never thought that I would say this, but I am going to vote. Unless I can write in the name of the candidate of my choice, there is simply no point. This is the reason that there needs to be a true election; not a runoff. A runoff in this situation further restricts the already limited choices of the voters.

In closing, I will just say that I find that the 1990 UNC student body president election has been an immense embarrassment to the students and their "representatives." Thus far, it has been a complete disaster and has reflected terribly on everyone involved. After such confusion and political hysteria as we have seen in the past month, not only is a re-election in order, but new candidates would also be appreciated.

RUBY JI SINREICH
Freshman
Environmental Protection