

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

The day of reckoning (Part II)

Chapel Thrill was once a popular spring concert that brought big-name bands and, usually, big-time money to the University. Such was not the case last year, however, when a thunderstorm not only ruined the concert, but dreams of financial success as well. The event lost more than \$50,000 — an unexpectedly enormous sum — but the effects of the loss never really sunk in until this week, as the CGC Finance Committee finds itself only half way through the annual process of allocating money to student organizations — but already out of money.

This year the committee has \$210,000 to allocate (\$340,000 was requested); last year the committee had \$272,000 to allocate (only \$314,000 was requested). Those figures have prompted (often pleading) questions. Why was there so much money to allocate last year? Conversely, why is there so little to give out this year?

To answer those questions, one must examine what became of the "General Reserve," a surplus fund. In February 1983, there was \$160,000-170,000 in the reserve. Of that, \$100,000 was allocated for the fateful spring concert (which in previous years had always returned the \$100,000 and then some), leaving \$60,000-70,000. That money was then taken from the reserve by the CGC and distributed among the student groups. In retrospect, the allocation proved excessive and disastrous.

Even so, the CGC's action, while inexcusable, is understandable. Also, only weeks earlier, the UNC student body had

said in not passing a increase that it wanted money from the reserve to be spent. In lobbying against the fee increase, critics had cited a general surplus "nearing \$200,000" as a reason for defeating a fee increase. And as Brent Clark, then student body treasurer, said in a *DTH* column, a fee increase would only increase that surplus.

That argument wasn't leak-proof then, but it holds no water whatsoever now. Students last year were fortunate to be able to discuss what to do with excess funds. It made talk of a fee increase lively.

Lately, though, talk of a fee increase has taken on a quality of despair and deadly earnest. There is serious talk, both in and out of Suite C, that established groups like the Carolina Gay Association, the N.C. Student Legislature and Toronto Exchange might get no money this year. As Student Body President Paul Parker put it, "Basically, there are just so many excellent organizations that will simply cease to exist. They have to, because there's just no money."

Words of gloom, indeed. Will they be enough to interest students in a fee increase — again? Apparently so. A petition was started up yesterday that reads, in part, "(W)e, the undersigned, request that the Board of Trustees of UNC-Chapel Hill enact this (\$1.50 per semester) increase for the 1984 fall semester."

We'll be interested to see if the prospect of losing vital student organizations wakes this campus up.

Cruel to be kind

With the end of the budget hearings for student organizations drawing near, Campus Governing Council members are facing the difficult decision of how to trim the Finance Committee's initial allocations to existing funds. Should everyone be given a little of what they asked for, as CGC Speaker Reggie Holley and SEEDS member Marshall Mills advocate? Or should certain "high priority" groups be given full funding, forcing other organizations to share the slice of pie that is left?

While both approaches have merit, the second philosophy adopted by the student body president and a Finance Committee member, is more realistic and ultimately more fair. Undoubtedly, this approach will cause a number of organizations to be cut entirely. After the CGC provides money for the 18 organizations that the student Constitution requires to exist — and that Parker says should receive top priority — there will be precious little for organizations like the Carolina Committee on Central America and the Model UN Club. But when faced with such a bleak financial picture, the CGC is forced to take such a utilitarian approach. As Newman said, it is better to "have 25 organizations that are worth the students' money and are well-run than have 35 organizations that are marginally run."

Speaker Holley calls that reasoning in-

sensitive, but by taking such a cruel approach would not the CGC actually be acting more kindly? With only minimal funding, would it not be worse to give a group a token sum that could hardly cover the programs it wished to pursue? Instead of being able to jump in head first, the members of the group would have to constantly watch their finances and would continually be frustrated with how little its paltry allocation could achieve.

By cutting those organizations that do not have wide appeal, the Council would be able to serve as many students as possible and give those groups the incentive to seek alternative funds from such sources as Carolina Annual Giving. Of course, Holley says that such money would be difficult to obtain if the CGC did not make some sort of allocation. Any type of funding is a sign of encouragement to the organization and a sign that the organization is worthy to potential contributors, the argument goes.

All this may be true in any other circumstances, but in such a tight year, cutting an organization cannot be construed as meaning the CGC believes the group unworthy. The CGC has shown in past years that it is committed to supporting as many groups as possible. It just can't do it this year if any program is going to be effective at all.

Cruise are planning on teaming up to endorse a new line of costly sunglasses. Jane Russell, eat your girdle out.

Gaudy is fine

Real men don't eat quiche. Real women don't pump gas. And real people wear fake furs. Glitter-prone pianist Liberace must have realized this when he made plans to wear a \$300,000 12-foot-by-16-foot "Norwegian blue shadow fox coat" for a stage entrance at Radio City Music Hall.

He knows now. The Animal Protection Institute awarded him the first 1984 presentation of the Cock and Bull Award, an honor bestowed upon people "for conduct unbecoming a human with a desire for animal survival."

The API declined how Liberace could escape this disgrace. "You are advised to regard this as a deserved slam which can only be withdrawn by a suitable comment from yourself, a change in your wardrobe to exclude animal furs, and a new favorable attitude toward the victims of human fashion."

Apparently, Liberace was not humiliated by the award. "What's the response?" "We cry all the way to the bank."

API President Belton P. Mouras said he would be glad to give Liberace some goody ideas for recycled garments that didn't require skinned animals.

"Gaudy is fine," Mouras said, "if it just promotes box-office, stirs up some fun and nobody suffers. But foxes are somebody." And that's the bottom line.

Did Hart study history?

By ALLEN A. TAYLOR

I was interested and surprised to see Thad Ogburn's story ("Hart student group no longer just idealists," *DTH*, March 16) which attempted to explain the increased popularity of Gary Hart's on-campus organization — UNC with Hart — following Hart's primary and caucus wins in the Northeast and South. Larry Katzin, the co-chairman of UNC with Hart, is quoted in the article as being "really proud right now," which is no surprise. After all, Hart has risen from a dark horse candidate to the frontrunner for the Democratic presidential nomination in only six weeks.

His charisma, good looks, and resemblance to John F. Kennedy all have contributed to his rapid rise to the top. He is an attractive alternative to Walter Mondale's "politics of the past." Sen. Hart's "new ideas" will no doubt propel him to the Democratic nomination in San Francisco this summer and finally to the presidency with a smashing victory over Ronald Reagan in November. Or so Katzin hopes.

But just what are these new ideas of Gary Hart? Hart says he is neither a liberal nor a conservative, that his new ideas avoid classification. But if one looks at his past and present record, Hart is easily recognized as a true-blue liberal McGovernite.

For Central America, Sen. Hart proposes to end the "imperialist" activities of the United States by cutting off military support for El Salvador until the civilian attacks from rightist "death squads" end; by withdrawing all American military training forces from Honduras; and by ending U.S. aid to Nicaraguan rebels.

There are no words about communist imperialism in Cuba and Nicaragua or about left-wing death squads, which undoubtedly have committed human rights violations that have gone unblamed and unnoticed. No mention of Soviet military aid to Cuba being 20 times larger than the U.S. aid to all of Latin America. No talks of 74 million Americans being in range of Soviet nuclear aircraft, missiles and submarines.

Hart's plan for Central America, in his own words, "lies in seeing (that) the entire region is not totalitarian or totally anti-American." This is a sharp contrast to the Monroe Doctrine.

On the subject of the defense budget, Sen. Hart, as one writer put it, has taken a pro-defense stance by favoring weapon systems unlikely to be funded while opposing any and all measures in or near production.

What does Hart oppose? The MX missile, the B-1 bomber, the AWACS radar system, the F-15, 16, and 18 aircraft, the Minuteman III missile, the Bradley armored vehicle, the Apache helicopter, the Nimitz-class aircraft carriers, the Patriot surface-to-air missile, a radar-guided air-to-air missile, a new class of destroyers, reactivation of battleships... I'd mention the other programs he's against, but the keys on this typewriter wouldn't last that long.

While the senator may oppose some of these programs because he thinks they're wasteful, unnecessary, or too expensive, all good reasons, he threatens the maintenance of a solid deterrent force for the United States with his position. Perhaps he should consider the expense of a greater risk of war.

I know that Hart received a law degree from Yale, but I wonder what education in history he had. If he had studied hard, he would have learned that wars can not be prevented by having a strong deterrent force.

I honestly cannot understand how he can be against so many weapons. He seemingly doesn't acknowledge the threat of the Soviets' 20-year buildup, which is especially destabilizing in the face of the United States' scaling down of its own forces in the same period. Consider recent moves:

- Since 1969, five new nuclear submarine classes have been introduced in the Soviet Union; we developed two.

- In the same period, the Soviets deployed five additional types of ICBMs while we built one and dismantled another.

- The United States is now producing the B-1 bomber, to be deployed in the 1990's. It will replace the B-52, which was first designed in 1944 and is the only bomber we've had since 1962. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has five strategic bombers and will begin deployment of another in 1986.

The U.S.S.R. is not a risk-taking action. It will only attack the U.S. or western Europe if no significant harm would face the Soviet people in a counter-attack. Therefore, it is the United States' obligation and moral duty to supply such a threat. Gary Hart, it seems, is trying very hard to deny our ability to do so.

On other issues, Hart is similarly ignorant. In New Hampshire, he promised never to send American Marines to protect the Strait of Hormuz, a critically important Middle East sea-lane, even if



Iran, Libya, Syria or the terrorists they support decide to bring more anguish to an already unstable area. In addition, Hart has expressed support for forced busing, federally-funded abortions, and affirmative action while opposing the death penalty, tuition tax credits, merit teacher pay, a balanced budget amendment, and voluntary school prayer.

On some occasions, Hart's views do show some substance. One cannot fault him for criticizing labor unions and their push for higher import tariffs. He also seems to notice the need for a less complex tax system, perhaps even some form of a flat-tax. But for the most part, Hart shows no talent in facing issues realistically, sensibly, or intellectually. Indeed, the public has yet to recognize that Hart is even more liberal than Mondale, that his "new ideas" are merely aesthetic variances of the radical stances taken by his former boss, George McGovern. But all these truths will become more and more clear as the campaign goes on.

Allen A. Taylor is a sophomore political science major from Wilmington.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Just when you thought it was safe ...

To the editor:

Junior-Senior General Education Requirements. What is this crap? Another natural or mathematical science (what a great choice), another social science, another Western/non-Western historical, another philosophical and another aesthetic perspective course. What are they trying to do to us now? Being the naive

sophomores we are, we thought General College would end someday. Much to our disbelief, we were wrong.

Yes, we thought as rising juniors at our outstanding University, we were finally old enough and responsible enough to select our own courses outside of our newly declared majors. But no, the administration now tells

us that we need their guidance and therefore have cut down on our choices of classes for the remainder of our college careers. We feel that we are being "screwed by" this so called "New Curriculum."

Here are our reasons why we feel this way:

- Many of us who have planned future courses in the "old curriculum" now realize that we may not be able to combine our major requirements, our Junior-Senior General Education Requirements and the courses we wanted to take for our own personal enjoyment and interest (we're such hedonists).
- The courses offered in the Junior-Senior General Educational

Requirements are intended to broaden our education but in reality they limit our flexibility in course selection and in scheduling freedom.

- The "New Curriculum" makes the prospect of a double major next to impossible. Consider the idea of filling the requirements of two majors in addition to the five new perspectives. I always wanted to graduate in four years

For those sophomores who thought General College was over, look again. The administration has done it to us again.

Tommy White
Jay Leutze



April foolishness

To the editor:

Well that does it. I'm mad now. I told myself last semester that if Chancellor Fordham did one more screwy thing I was gonna do something drastic. Well that day has come.

First it was the Star of Bethlehem. Who does he think he is? That was enough to make me dislike him. Then there was that business with *Everybody's All-American*. Two strikes, Fordham. C'mon. Let's be serious. At first I couldn't believe he wouldn't let that movie be made here, but God forbid that we should let the Star of Bethlehem impede our atheism or *Everybody's All-American* disrupt academics so heavily assessed during the ACC basketball season.

And now this — this trashy little trickery with the naming, of all people, Jesse-Saves Helms as a Trustee

("Helms appointed to UNC Board of Trustees, The Daily Winstead, April 2). I'd love to know the terms of that deal. Have you ever noticed how much Fordham resembles John East anyway?

What a pair. Sen. No and Chancellor No. I think Fordham should have gone with another leading candidate whose time has come for a Trustee position. Frank (Winstead) could have done so much more for us than Helms. Seriously, all you die-hard Congressional Clubs, can you call Helms anything close to ubiquitous?

Three strikes, Fordham. I want your resignation on my lab table by tomorrow morning.

Jay Rones
Avery

To the editor:

Or was she born from an ad in Esquire, hanging over the shoulder of a man modeling a wool sweater? Is she the person who told our mothers to dress to please men, to modulate our voices, to be lady-like so as not to drive a future husband away?

Has Keller ever been in the job market, sat in a restaurant and been approached by a man uninvited? Has she ever walked down a dark street alone or been hassled by a construction crew?

It is possible to imagine a boy growing up in today's society not noticing the subtle oppression of women — being referred to all of your life as a "girl" (child), never being able to achieve economic parity with men, being continually interrupted by men, hassled on the streets and in restaurants and expected to be a "good sport" about it. But how could a woman never notice these things? And how could men or women never realize the implications of the more obvious oppression: rape that is never reported by the local press, songs and videos portraying women in chains or as animals being

stalked and the fact that an overwhelming percentage of missing and murdered people are women and children?

Why is Keller concerned with "turning men off"? Women cannot look to men for approval when they are speaking the truth about their situation. Women must look to each other for strength and get used to the idea that to talk about oppression, even in circles of "radical" men, is to say what most men and some women don't want said. Keller should note that we "radicals" are taking her more seriously than she is willing to take other women.

She seems to be a victim of internalized oppression — that is, attitudes of the oppressors in society taken on by the oppressed groups to keep themselves in line. Breaking through the barrier of thinking the way that men want us to is the first step in affecting worthy and important changes.

R.J. Frieriks
M. Wall
Chapel Hill

To the editor:

I wish to express my disappointment in the article "Fanaticism Unhealthy and Offensive" (*DTH*, March 23). What began as a somewhat reasonable criticism of a particular group of over-generalizing feminists, degenerated into a diatribe against those who do not share Keller's conception of the elements that should characterize one's faith in God.

I found one of Keller's statements particularly distressing: "Unfortunately, I have a very low opinion of 'born-again,' they are too often weak, depressed or misguided individuals who don't want to face reality."

This is curiously antithetical to a proposition to which she dedicates a large portion of her column. To be sure, born-again Christians possess the same shortcomings which pervade the human race as a whole; however, to consider depression, weakness

To the editor:

I was pleased to read your article reporting that Sen. Jesse Helms is to become a new member of the UNC Board of Trustees (*DTH*, April 2). Other than your obvious misquote of a statement about a zoo for liberal residents, the article was surprisingly unbiased for such a liberal paper as yours. We will be very fortunate to have an advocate in Washington, and perhaps Helms could be persuaded to offer a course in Governmental

Ethics. His idea for prayer before class may meet resistance, but people who do not wish to participate in prayer could wait in the hall while those who felt led to could join in prayer. It may seem to some that his proposals for escorted visits in dormitories are extreme, but some of us are tired of being the Moral Minorities. Our nation's loss is our school's gain.

Paul Austin
Chapel Hill

Sorry, but the rent's due

To the editor:

I am writing to request the *DTH* stop putting commercial inserts into our papers. In case no one has noticed, most of these pantyhoose, pizza or other sales gimmicks are not picked up because most of us don't want them. They are left in piles at the Y-court and other places to be blown

around campus or turned into a mush by rain. This creates a campus-wide eyesore that someone (not on the *DTH* staff, I presume) must pick up. How about it?

Scott Madry
Graduate student

John Buckley
Carrboro