

The Daily Tar Heel

98th year of editorial freedom

JENNIFER WING, Editor
MATTHEW EISLEY, Associate Editor

BETH TATUM, Features Editor
DAVID KUPSTAS, Sports Editor
GRANT HALVERSON, Photography Editor

JOANN RODAK, News Editor
DOUG HOOGERVORST, Sports Editor
ALISA DEMAO, Arts Editor

Moore than bargained for

Student Congress Speaker Tim Moore has a few lessons to learn about UNC.

This is not Campbell University, a Baptist-affiliated school with conservative leanings where Moore spent his first college years. At UNC, students value diversity and foster acceptance. And although Chapel Hill may be a little more urban than Buies Creek, where Campbell is located, UNC students can still smell a skunk from a mile away. And something sure does smell about the resolution Moore sponsored last week to end funding for the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association.

Moore must think pulling the wool over the eyes of UNC students is a simple task. He would have everyone believe that the timing of his resolution was purely coincidental. The full congress was too busy to review the resolution in the spring session, Moore insists, and so he waited to introduce it until the summer. Never mind that he just happened to have five appointments to the summer congress. He wasn't thinking of that at all. Yeah, right.

Isn't it a trifle odd that four of the resolution's six sponsors were summer appointees? No, Moore would probably answer, he just appointed every student who asked to be on the congress. There was no way he could know they would back his efforts to homogenize the University, he would probably say. With that much malarkey flowing from Suite C, students should be getting pretty good with a shovel by now.

The resolution passed 8-5 with one abstention. And although it will only serve as

a recommendation to the full congress to end funding for the CGLA, it has a little more bite than if it had just remained one of Moore's pet peeves. Moore knew full well what he was doing when he waited to introduce the bill in the summer. Attempts to make students believe otherwise are an insult to their intelligence.

Moore has tried to brand the CGLA as a special interest group with little support from the University community. But the fact is that groups such as the CGLA benefit all students in their efforts to break down stereotypes and provide education on other cultures and alternative lifestyles.

Moore also has hinted at cutting funding for the Black Student Movement and other campus groups, so students should not be surprised if Moore uses his puppet congress to pass all sorts of frightening resolutions this summer. After all, who's going to stop him? CGLA's offices are closed for the summer, and other student organizations have skeleton summer staffs at best. Of course, Moore didn't think about this either when he saved his perfectly innocent resolutions for the summer. No one could be that devious, could they?

Regardless, students can only hope that the full congress will straighten out the mess of resolutions that are sure to come with Moore's blessing this summer. And one would hope that the full congress also would rescind the power of the speaker to appoint summer congress members. It would be better to have no summer congress than to have one that answers to every whim of a single power-hungry politician.

Aborting women's freedom

Rust vs. Sullivan: The plunge down the slippery slope toward abolition of reproductive freedom begins.

Last week, the Supreme Court voted 5-4 to prohibit about 4,000 federally funded family planning clinics from providing any information about abortion to women seeking help.

The decision forbids the clinics from listing abortion as an option for pregnant women and forbids counselors from providing any information about abortion to women who request it, even if a woman's physician believes abortion is the most medically safe alternative for her.

If asked, clinic counselors must now tell women that abortion is not considered an appropriate method of family planning.

The damning decision inflicts two principle wounds upon women seeking reproductive advice while it simultaneously begins to strip them of their freedom of choice — a move that appears to portend the outcome of future court decisions on the legality of abortion.

First, once again, freedom and rights come with a price tag — one that only those the largest pocketbooks can afford. Those people who can afford going to a private clinic will know all their options — not just those alternatives deemed morally appropriate by five men sitting on a bench in Washington, D.C. The 5 million low-income women who must choose a public clinic dependent on federal funding are left in the dark. Younger patients without the years of experience to help educate them about their medical options will suffer the worst loss of all.

Said one S.C. nurse to The Charlotte Observer: "I don't believe in using abortion as birth control, but we have 11-, 12-year-old girls coming in here. Some of them have been raped. That option should be there for them."

Note that clinic officials normally do not encourage women to have abortions (unless for health reasons). They only fulfill their jobs by offering three options to pregnant women: continuation of maternity care, adoption and abortion. If they withhold information about one option, abortion, as

the new ruling mandates, these officials shirk their responsibility to these women.

Abortion is legal, and therefore it is an option. By tying clinics' hands with such a resolution, the court jumped ahead of itself and passed a moral judgment by eliminating abortion as a program "it believes to be in the public interest." (Majority opinion, Chief Justice William Rehnquist)

Which leads to the second wound. Thursday's ruling indicates the mindset toward abortion of the newest member to the court, Justice David Souter, who voted with the majority opinion. The other eight justices are believed to be split 4-4 on whether to overturn the 1973 Roe vs. Wade ruling establishing a woman's right to an abortion. Decision on this issue will most likely come in a year's time, and it appears Justice Souter will side with those judges ready to strip a woman of her right to choose what will happen inside her own body.

Pro-choice advocates are left with precious months to launch an all-out campaign for their cause. They have begun with intense lobbying asking Congress to pass an amendment to overturn Thursday's ruling. The amendment would require family planning clinics dependent upon some \$140 million in federal funds to offer "non-directive" counseling on abortion as well as birth control. No option would be preferred, but all would be listed.

The timer is set for about 60 days before this bomb set by five justices explodes, and before the government is able to put the regulations into action within the clinics.

Two months in which leaders of family planning organizations must shift attention away from the women seeking their help and turn their time to convincing Congress to pass the amendment with a two-thirds majority in each House so the president cannot veto the measure.

With women's reproductive rights now rolling toward certain obliteration, support should fall behind the fighting clinics as they position themselves against the odds, struggling to protect females by giving them all their options, not just a pre-determined select few.



Qualified Asians shunned in college admissions

Eric Longely

The Noise of Folly

In the days when Frank Porter Graham was UNC president, a Jewish student applied to the medical school. The student was informed, in effect, that, although he was well-qualified, he could not be accepted, since the school had already filled its quota of Jewish students. Many Ivy League schools at the turn of the century had set up quotas for Jews, under the theory that, if Jewish students were admitted solely on the basis of merit, they would crowd out the less-qualified Gentiles. President Graham would not permit this sort of thing to happen at UNC, however, and he insisted that the student be admitted.

Tell this story to illustrate how unenlightened we were at the beginning of the century. Nowadays, of course, universities do not discriminate against Jews. They discriminate against Asians.

In his excellent book, "Illiberal Education," Dinesh D'Souza examines how the University of California at Berkeley, through its affirmative-action program aimed at increasing the number of black and Hispanic students, managed to discriminate against Asians. Berkeley noticed that the proportion of students who were black and Hispanic was less than the proportion of the general population who were black and Hispanic. The university decided to remedy the situation by making the proportion of different ethnic groups in the freshman class proportional to their numbers in the population as a whole.

But setting aside a proportion of the limited freshman places for members of favored racial groups insured that there would be fewer places for people who do not belong to those groups. Asians consistently make higher grades and test scores than whites, blacks and Hispanics. If Asian applicants were admitted purely on the basis of merit, Asians would have a representation in the freshman class which was greater than their share of the general population. A race-based quota system, then, would result in fewer

Asians being admitted.

The Berkeley administration eventually had to concede that Asian applicants were being turned down while whites, blacks and Hispanics with less impressive academic records were being admitted. As D'Souza rightly puts it: "It is mathematically impossible to achieve ethnic proportionality without decreasing 'overrepresented' groups" such as Asians. This is the problem that confronts Berkeley and other colleges which seek to increase black and Hispanic enrollment through affirmative action.

Advocates of affirmative action have long conceded that preferential admissions discriminates against whites. But this can be defended by pointing out that whites are merely paying the inevitable price for oppressing minorities for so long. Complaints about discrimination come with an ill grace from members of a race that has for centuries maintained legal supremacy and discrimination. As long as the burden of affirmative action falls on whites alone, its supporters can defend it as a painful but necessary program of compensation.

But how can affirmative action be justified if it results in discrimination against Asians — a group that does not share responsibility for the treatment that whites have meted out to minorities in the United States — a group that has itself been victimized by discriminatory naturalization laws and restrictive state laws on land ownership? Asians have not been associated with the oppressors in American history — they have been victims. It is supremely ironic that they now face discrimination in the name

of racial justice.

What is the solution to this situation? It's times like these that I wish Harry Golden was still around. Golden was a newspaper editor in Charlotte during the civil rights era. A staunch opponent of segregation, he came up with several tongue-in-cheek "Golden plans" for abolishing Jim Crow laws while doing the least offense to white Southern mores. In the spirit of Harry Golden, I wish to offer my Longley Plan for Asians who wish to avoid being discriminated against in college admissions.

First, any Asian applying for college should legally assume a non-Asian name. He should also lie on the "race" section of his college application. This will make the college think that he is either white or a member of one of the favored minority groups. He will thus have a chance of getting his application considered on the basis of his academic record, and he need not fear that he will be rejected because the Asian quota has already been filled.

In other words, I am calling on Asians to commit massive civil disobedience by concealing their race. But, you say, this involves fraud and deception. Yes, but such deception is a necessary counter-weapon against a deceptive system that engages in discrimination while professing to uphold the principles of equal opportunity. Colleges have no business setting quotas for Asians. Why should Asians cooperate with an iniquitous quota system by furnishing the very information without which that system would be useless?

Perhaps Berkeley is an extreme example. But the difficulties I have described arise whenever a college adopts an affirmative action policy for favored minorities. The unfavored Asians get treated unfairly. When discrimination is promoted in the name of equality, it is time to ask some serious questions.

Eric Longely is a junior international relations major from Durham.

READERS' FORUM

Student Congress well lacking water

To the editor:
"You never miss your water 'till the well runs dry." This is how I feel about the 73rd Student Congress. For the past two years, I served on Student Congresses that were both criticized by The Daily Tar Heel for our radical behavior and bureaucratic game playing (71st congress), and alternately accused of our do-nothing acquiescence (72nd congress). However, I am proud to have been a part of two congresses that never trampled upon individual student's rights in the manner that occurred during last week's Summer Student Congress meeting.

Previous congresses have entertained the motion to restrict or curtail the CGLA in years past, but luckily those motions were defeated and exposed to be basically rooted in homophobic intolerance, not representative student government. The facts remain that UNC has enough students interested in the CGLA to maintain its functioning as a viable and fundable student organization. CGLA programming is open to all students. For example, those of us who attended last year's CGLA-sponsored lecture by The Independent's Esther Carp can attest to the entertainment, intellectual, and cultural value of CGLA-sponsored programs.

Unfortunately, there are those who will not open their minds to new or different ideas. Social pathology is not my sub-specialty; therefore, I will not attempt to offer up reasons as to why this closed-minded mentality exists. However, I will demand that discrimination not be practiced by any student leaders.

As students interested in the free interchange of ideas at all levels, we cannot depend upon Andrew Cohen to defend our rights single-

handedly in Student Congress. This fall the full congress must approve everything that was done in the summer. Find out who your congress representative is and let them know you are disgusted by what the Summer Student Congress has done. And remember, the Student Government Code provides a mechanism for the impeachment of a speaker or representative whose well has run dry.

TODD WYATT
Graduate
Pathology

CGLA educates about homosexual issues

To the editor,
I am writing in response to the recent machinations of our own Tim Moore and his congressional cohorts who managed to pass a resolution to defund the Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association. This took place conveniently enough when CGLA members were out of town for the intercession. I for one was never contacted — my answering machine never recorded a message from Mr. Moore, who incidentally claims his proposal was not based on any "moral" judgment. That's right, Tim. Your timing is unethical, even immoral. But then, "politics is politics," and I can appreciate political savvy as much as the next person.

I can also appreciate Mr. Moore's concern for "the letter of the law." I would love to be a law-abiding citizen, but find North Carolina's sex laws woefully antiquated. If Moore is leading a law-abiding sex life, then he is a paragon of virtue. Only people with a draconian morality fortified by ice water baths, hair shirts and flagellation with birch switches after long sauna sessions could possibly abide such laws as this state has concerning sex.

As anything but the missionary position is strictly prohibited (and

then only in the bonds of matrimony), of course Mr. Moore would abhor same-sex relations. After all, what else is the CGLA if not a veritable sea of flesh bathed in hot oil, performing acts of unspeakable lewdness?

In reality, CGLA is nothing more or less than an oracle, a source of information for interested members of both the gay and straight communities: (1) CGLA provides phone numbers and addresses of gay-friendly physical and mental health services, gay-friendly clubs, religious organizations, and gay and lesbian political action groups; (2) CGLA publishes the newsletter Lambda four times a year as a venue for diverse opinions among gays and lesbians; (3) CGLA sponsors weekly meetings on gay and lesbian issues, as well as a weekly luncheon and reading group; (4) CGLA conducts numerous outreach sessions to inform UNC students about the gay and lesbian community; (5) CGLA sponsors Gay Awareness Week, and assists with fund-raising for AIDS projects and other gay and lesbian concerns.

Instead of distracting Student Congress from more pressing concerns (like the disintegration of the education system in North Carolina), Mr. Moore and his cronies

should come by the CGLA office this semester and see what we're all about. You might make friends with the very people you thought were your enemies. (And CGLA gives out free condoms with every visit!)

KELLY CANNON
Graduate
English

Letters policy

The DTH welcomes reader comments and criticisms. When writing letters, follow these guidelines:

- If you want your letter published, please sign and date it. No more than two signatures, please.
- All letters should be no longer than 400 words. Remember, brevity is the soul of wit.
- All letters must be typed and double spaced.
- Please include such vital statistics as your year in school, major, phone number and hometown.
- Because The Daily Tar Heel publishes Thursdays, all letters should be submitted Monday by noon for publication that week.
- If you have a title that is relevant to your letter's subject, please include it.
- The DTH reserves the right to edit letters for space, clarity and vulgarity.



The Daily Tar Heel

Business and advertising: Kevin Schwartz, director; Bob Bates, advertising director; Leslie Humphrey, classified ad manager.
Business staff: Allison Ashworth, manager; Michelle Gray, assistant manager; Becky Marquette, receptionist.
Classified advertising: Angela Spivey, assistant manager; Scott Blankenship, Laura Richards and Thi Vu, assistants.
Display advertising: Milton Arts and Chad Boswell, account executives.
Advertising production: Bill Leslie, manager.

Staff writers: Laura Baum, Robert Brown, Lauren Chesnut, Stuart Chisam, Ashley Fogle, Sidney Gaskins, Patty Greene, Michael Grogan, Tabitha Logan, Eric Longley, Robin Lowe, Amber Nimocks, Melissa Palmer, Winifred Pease, Catherine Owens, JoAnn Rodak, David Rosen, Kay Stallworth, Brooke Tyson and Jennifer Williamson.
Photography: Kathy Michel and Keith Nelson.
Copy Editors: Kenyatta Upchurch, assistant; Melanie Bailey, Chris Battista, Lauren Chesnut, Leslie Gilbert, Patty Greene, Chris Shuping and Rick Twomey.
Cartoonist: Chris DePree.
Editorial Production: Stacy Wynn, manager.
Distribution: RDS Carriers.
Printing: Village Printing.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the DTH Publishing Corp., a non-profit North Carolina corporation, Monday-Friday, according to the University calendar.
Callers with questions about billing or display advertising should dial 962-1163 between 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m. Classified ads can be reached at 962-0252. Editorial questions should be directed to 962-0245/0246.

Office: Suite 104 Carolina Union
U.S. Mail address: P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-3257
Campus mail address: C#8 5210 box 49, Carolina Union