

Apathy over documentary was appalling

By TIFFANY PAGE
and CECILIA CASEY

Four children are murdered, a father shot to death, an old man faces a vicious mob to protect the body of his slain teenage nephew: this happens every Monday and Thursday night on Wesleyan's campus. What is shocking is that there are no witnesses even though all these events occur in one room.

The room is 105 Gravelly where for the past few weeks the Black History Month Committee has been showing a documentary about the Civil Rights Movement

called "Eyes on the Prize." This series shares the struggles that individuals have had battling for equal rights. It was hoped that many students would attend the series, and a few did. However, over the past month the numbers have dwindled down to two students.

We are appalled by this. Where are the history majors? Where are the sociology majors? Where are the JPP majors? Where are the professors of these subjects? Where are the beneficiaries of these struggles?

Not only are we appalled, but Dr. Watson, who has been run-

Opinion

ning the series, is disappointed by the turnout. "I'm not terribly surprised," he said, "for two reasons. First, it is a busy time of the year right before midterms, and secondly because it is hard to publicize something like this well."

Some students have learned about the lack of response and been upset by it. Sophomore Lynn Lassiter said, "Civil rights affects all of us. The series could help to

inform students about the problems of racism. Now that I know about the series, I will be sure to attend."

Her opinion was shared by freshman Kevin Crane, who said, "Anything that brings awareness to civil rights is beautiful and should be recognized."

We realize that students may

be too busy to attend all of the episodes of the series, but attendance at one or two of the showings will introduce you to a struggle still occurring today. The crimes of history cannot be changed, but our attitudes and outlooks can be. If these crimes continue to go unnoticed, the next victims could be Wesleyan students.

The pitfalls of painting

(Continued from Page 2)

decided I needed another break. I dried the floor, hung the drop cloth out to dry, and wondered why?

Once again set up, I carefully poured paint into the rolling pan and proceeded ... to take out the vent covers, the light switch cover, and the light fixture. Now I was really ready.

I stepped into the paint and slipped into the bathtub only once, so I was rolling right along. I should have started with the detail work, of course, but I rammed my roller as far as I could get it into the corners, hoping for the best.

My clothes were sticking to me in gobs, my hair was plastered to my face, I changed the color of my sink, but I was through with the first coat.

Only twice in the next 24 hours did I forget and put my hands on the walls. I mean, how often are we consciously thinking about what we are doing when we go in

there, anyway?

Early the next afternoon, I was ready for my second coat.

I had forgotten to wash out the brush and roller, so I had to revisit my local paint supply store, but I was hard at it soon. Now I knew I would get a smooth roller action like they do on television; I wanted to be amazed at the aesthetic difference my work would create.

How do people paint ceilings without dripping paint? After all, I worked for a painting crew one summer. I know that no paint should drip from the brush, over the rim of the can, on the wall, or into the mouth. But I just can't seem to master the clean paint job. I looked like the abominable snowman. My hallway was marked forever with splatters, my bathtub was speckled, and my socks were soaked in paint from when I stepped into the rolling pan.

But, by gum, my bathroom was painted. And spring break was over.

Congressional Democrats blocked education reform

(Continued from Page 2)

public school education, so virtually any private school would be available to any student who could gain admittance. Private schools have proven that they can do the job better than public schools for less money, so we not only get better education but the government gets to keep the surplus. The best of both worlds — better education and less cost to taxpayers.

What kind of person would oppose that? Virtually every Democrat in Congress. The attack was led by Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.), who has nothing to worry about in dealing with public schools — his kids go to a \$16,000 private school. The Democrats had little choice, I suppose. After all, they have to keep their special interests happy.

Labor unions tend to stick together under the Democratic banner, and the National Education Association would be horrified at this bill. Imagine what would happen to the teaching union if public schools were no longer the monopoly. The NEA couldn't sit around screaming for more money for this program and that program. The NEA would have to try to make real improvements in their system.

Ted Kennedy said that the federal government has no business sending money to schools it doesn't run, particularly not religious ones. I happen to have federal scholarship money sending me to a privately-run Methodist

school now. All we want to do is apply the same system that has given us the best higher education system in the world to our primary and secondary system, which is one of the worst in the industrial world. At the college level, schools have to compete, whether public or private. That's what we want in the early years.

The pilot program for the parental choice in education would have cost \$30 million to set up. This would have started the program in several communities, mostly poor ones, to see if it would work. This would have been added as an amendment to the \$850 million education bill recently passed. The Democrats won this one, but the students lost.

The federal government has two paths from which to choose. One would let the government decide what will be taught and have the government establish the curriculum. That means education will be done by special interest groups and dictated by a bunch of congressmen who can't balance a budget. The other choice is to get the government out and let the private sector do a job that it has proven it can do.

The choice is clear. In general, when you think of anything run by the government, do you ever think of it as effective and efficient? Probably not. With the government's track record, why would we want government involved in anything as important as education? That's what President Bush asked when he sent down the proposal. I'd like an

answer.

W. Kenneth Leonard

Article on abortion debate showed bias

Dear Editors:

I wish to complain about Holladay's article, "Students debate abortion," published in the Feb. 7 issue of *The Decree*. I object to the pro-life bias prevalent throughout the article but most obvious in two sentences in the next-to-last paragraph.

"The opponents of abortion used a variety of facts, many based on religion," she wrote. While one might incorporate a number of facts into a religion, religion is by definition a system of beliefs based on faith. It is therefore impossible to have a fact "based on religion." Holladay is trying to elevate religious beliefs to the level of fact.

Also, Holladay wrote, "Pro-choice supporters portrayed themselves as pro-Constitution." The clear implication here is that the pro-choicers were pretending to be something that they were not. This borders on slander.

In short, Holladay showed a clear bias in favor of the pro-life side in her report. Holladay is certainly entitled to her own private opinion, and also entitled to express that opinion, as are we all. But the appropriate forum for that expression is the editorial page. It is inappropriate and unprofessional for a reporter to bias a supposedly factual account with her own beliefs.

D.A. Lentz

Flik piks...

If you have any suggestions of what movies should be shown on campus, please call 5230 (the SGA Hotline) and leave us a message.

