

SHARIF DURHAMS  
EDITOR  
Office Hours Friday 2 p.m. - 3 p.m.

# The Daily Tar Heel

Established 1893 • 106 Years of Editorial Freedom  
www.unc.edu/dth

ROB NELSON & LESLIE WILKINSON  
MANAGING EDITORS

Nahal Toosi  
EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR  
DeVona Brown & Ashley Stephenson  
UNIVERSITY EDITORS  
Jon Ostendorf  
CITY EDITOR

Trisha Dabb & Courtney Weill  
STATE & NATIONAL EDITORS  
Jonathan Cox  
SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS EDITOR  
Brian Murphy  
SPORTS EDITOR

Kaitlin Gurney  
FEATURES EDITOR  
Will Kimmey & Erin Wynia  
ARTS/DIVERSIONS EDITORS  
Carolyn Haynes  
COPY DESK EDITOR

Cara Brickman  
PHOTOGRAPHY EDITOR  
Thomas Ausman  
DESIGN EDITOR  
Brad Christensen  
CARTOON EDITOR

Kyle Hanlin  
ONLINE EDITOR  
Amy Cappiello  
WRITING COACH  
John Sweeney  
OMBUDSMAN

BOARD EDITORIALS

## Bill the State, Not Us

A recent report found that the UNC system needs about \$7 billion in repairs. The money should come from taxes, not tuition.

It's going to cost the UNC system approximately \$7 billion to prepare for an increase of 48,000 new students in the next 10 years. Any wagers on possible sources of that funding?

You got it. Tuition increases, right out of students' pockets. They keep coming and coming - but their typical justification could soon surface in a sleeker, more svelte version guaranteed to please the folks at home.

The UNC system must pay for repairs - stuff like removing asbestos from buildings and fixing leaking dorm roofs. Plus, the system must expand to meet future needs.

That's it. That's the argument. You weren't expecting a good one, were you?

Obviously, tuition can't carry the \$7 billion burden. The state's tax coffers can and should. But logic might not stop legislators and University officials from raiding students' bank accounts.

One must wonder where state lawmakers - those charged with the system's upkeep - were for the last few decades, when today's looming structural problems slowly festered.

Taxes are the key to adequately funding the system - but tax hikes aren't the answer. In principle, the money should come from taxpayers. In practice, the money already comes from taxpayers - state lawmakers just need to spend it better.

Corporate incentives, such as the \$155 million tax credit that brought Federal Express to Greensboro, and write-offs for

wealthy citizens, such as the low limit for luxury taxes that makes taxes on a Porsche the same as taxes on a Buick, all cost the state incredible amounts of money every year.

Meanwhile, lawmakers have gotten away with under-funding the UNC system for years. Suddenly, they have a \$7 billion damage bill on their hands, and no way to justify refusing to honor it. Of course students don't want to live in a leaky room. Nor do parents want their children attending class in an asbestos-infested environment. Legislators are going to have little choice but to fund the repairs - they just can't raid students' pocketbooks to do it.

Lawmakers must obey their constitutional duty to provide cheap education for residents, though. Tuition increases are sometimes necessary - in extreme situations.

Otherwise, legislators must find the money elsewhere. They are obligated to keep tuition low, not low in comparison to Duke University or the University of Virginia, but just low. Current UNC students won't be here in 10 years. They won't reap the benefits of University growth or better living conditions. Consequently, they shouldn't be asked to shoulder the grind of steep tuition.

Taxpayers will benefit, though, because the UNC system serves residents well. It gives citizens a great college education, and it keeps high-paid professionals in the state.

Raising tuition is a cop-out of momentous proportions.

## Ballooning Vanities

There are more important things the filthy rich and famous can do with their millions than float around the world in a hot-air balloon.

The Biblical book of Ecclesiastes describes the recent ballooning feat perfectly: "vanitas vanitatum" ("vanity of vanities").

In recent months, countless millionaires have attempted to write aviation history by circumnavigating the globe in a hot-air balloon, none finding success until Bertrand Piccard and Brian Jones landed in Egypt last week. Even then, they were disappointed - they had dreamed of landing near the pyramids. Maybe next time, fellas.

At least these two had enough sense to know that their trip around the world was indeed nothing more than mere vanity. As Piccard noted, it was "heartbreaking that people were suffering on the Earth" while his enterprises carried him above it. Too bad he didn't notice until he was airborne.

The information age has provided countless forums for people both to spotlight their personal achievements as well as to compare them to the victories of others around the globe. It seems everyone wants to be the best in the world at something. And rightfully so. We enjoy the benefits of manufacturers who want to create the finest products and doctors who hope to find a cure first. Without such competition we might still live in caves or rely on horses for transportation.

But ballooning is quite a different story.

Worse than its vain nature are the comparisons between this "accomplishment" and that of the Wright brothers. The Wrights struggled for years to realize one of man's oldest dreams with nothing more than a bicycle and a hammer. These balloonists, on the other hand, sailed a multi-million dollar tank for 20 days with the entertainment of compact disc players and the convenience of satellite communications.

Why are we so quick to praise these joy riders? Certainly the time, money and efforts of these self-proclaimed adventurers could have been better spent voyaging into the labs of medicine in search of a cure for cancer. Or maybe the rich and famous could invest in an exploration of the too-often uncharted territory of the inner-city and its crime, homelessness and sub-standard way of life.

The same goes for the rest of us. It's fine to enjoy life and pursue dreams, but we shouldn't presume that such self-aggrandizing activities make the world a better place. Only those who successfully realize dreams that capture the imaginations and fulfill the hopes of both themselves and society earn respect, and they're the only ones who deserve it.

We ought to set our aspirations above the clouds towards improving this earthly life. There's no vanity in that, only admiration.



## Students Must Push for Full Code

Let's start with a simple premise: North American consumers have power. When consumers wanted no-fat potato chips, they were invented. When consumers wanted makeup not tested on animals, we got that option.

Now, consumers want clothes not made by exploited workers: it can happen.

Another simple fact: North American students have power. When students didn't want universities to support apartheid in South Africa, universities divested.

Now, some students want to make sure UNC clothes aren't made in sweatshops, and we are patiently working with the University to make that happen.

The anti-sweatshop movement has been revived in the last five years by North American and international labor activists who exposed brutal working conditions in Asia and Latin America, including forced overtime, poverty wages and physical and sexual abuse endured by workers making some of our favorite brand names.

The combination of public pressure on high-profile companies like Nike and the Gap, combined with a teary-eyed Kathie Lee Gifford on national television confronted with the reality that 13 year-old Honduran girls were sewing her label, contributed to the formation of President Clinton's Apparel Industry Partnership in 1996.

When Nike and UNC signed a major endorsement contract, student and faculty activists questioned the ethics of dealing with a company notorious for labor abuses overseas. UNC recognized the potential scandal of a revelation that malnourished children were sewing our beloved Tar Heel for 14 hours a day.

That motivation, combined with a genuine concern about the allegations, prompted UNC to set up a task force to explore the problem and subsequently adopt a Code of Conduct for its licensees.

The Code of Conduct sets out minimum standards for companies manufacturing UNC licensed products, that is, anything that bears the UNC trade mark. It includes provisions

### MARION TRAUB-WERNER GUEST COLUMNIST

dealing with freedom of association and prohibitions against labor, forced labor, forced overtime, discrimination and sexual harassment.

A coalition of student groups, led by Students for Economic Justice, sees two major flaws with the code adopted by UNC.

First, the code calls for wages that meet the basic needs of workers, either the minimum wage or the prevailing industry wage. To attract direct foreign investment, countries often set minimum wages well below what is needed to live.

According to the U.S. State Department's 1997 Human Rights report, for example, Indonesia sets its average minimum wage at 95 percent of living needs.

Students believe that as a progressive institution, UNC should be spearheading the effort to establish and to enforce a living wage for the workers who make their products.

The second flaw of the code deals with its implementation. It does not require the full public disclosure of factory sites.

If we do not know where factories are, how do we know what the conditions are?

Companies have claimed they can't disclose because there are trade secrets involved, but there isn't much of a secret to making sweatshirts (or mugs or pens for that matter).

One company even argued that factory sites would become new spring break destinations for student activists, putting them at serious physical risk. (I am not kidding.)

Public disclosure is the only way to ensure accountability in the process of monitoring and verification of the Code. With public disclosure, students would be able to pass information on to local labor groups and non-governmental organizations in the countries of manufacture, thus enabling an extensive network of monitoring to develop.

Students for Economic Justice has been told numerous times by the chancellor and

the task force he appointed that these demands seem reasonable. The chancellor even signed his name to a petition calling for full public disclosure and a living wage. So what's the holdup?

For now, we have started picketing outside of South Building every Friday at 1:15 p.m. just to remind him of his commitment. Do we really need a media-frenzied event so that the University agrees to do what they have been saying is right and realistic for months?

Public disclosure is especially important in light of the decision last week of 17 major universities to join the Fair Labor Association created by Clinton's Apparel Industry Partnership.

UNC has not decided to join yet.

After announcing the code, labor and religious groups left the "partnership" because they felt the agenda had been co-opted by industry. The Code is weak and the proposed monitoring is even weaker. Companies choose which sites get monitored, there are no unannounced visits and the entire process is almost completely confidential. Universities, whether or not they are members of FLA, still have the power to require public disclosure as a condition of licensing. If FLA is the monitoring mechanism UNC chooses, public disclosure will be the only way to balance corporate interests.

Once you wade through the acronyms and the legalese of labor codes, the reason we should care is simple. We support the employment of thousands of workers overseas and in the U.S. UNC alone sells over \$70 million of merchandise annually. This isn't about guilt.

It's not about whether you love Nike or you love to hate Nike. We should care because as consumers and students, we have the power to help stop sweatshops and improve the lives of the workers who make our Tar Heel gear.

As consumers and students we have the power to convince our University to pick up its feet and lead the way.

Marion Traub-Werner is a senior Latin-American studies major from Toronto. Reach her at mtraub@email.unc.edu.

## READERS' FORUM

### DTH Editorial Trumpets Dairy Products' Benefits, Fails to See Drawbacks

TO THE EDITOR:

I am writing in response to the March 15 Board Editorial promoting the consumption of dairy products.

Contrary to the Dairy Council's claims, dairy products do not prevent osteoporosis. In one study (sponsored by the Dairy Council!) women consuming three eight-ounce glasses of cow's milk per day still lost calcium from their bodies and remained in negative calcium balance. High protein diets, including heavy consumption of meat and dairy products, deplete the body's calcium stores and cause osteoporosis. Calcium is readily available in other foods, such as leafy green vegetables, nuts, figs, dates and prunes.

Moreover, dairy products are laden with artery-clogging forms of animal fat. Eating diets that contain high amounts of animal fats has been conclusively linked with heart attacks, strokes and cancer growth.

Dairy products contain casein, which can contribute to allergic/inflammatory reactions, such as chronic runny noses,

recurrent ear and bronchial infections, eczema, asthmatic bronchitis and inflammations of the skin and bowels.

I suggest that the DTH and the University promote the public interest, rather than commercial interests. How about an editorial promoting water consumption? Or an editorial listing the benefits of breast-feeding over bottle-feeding in order to counteract the advertising and the free samples that the dairy industry provides to new mothers? No one sends out press releases or plans promotional events to promote noncommercial products.

The Dairy Council doesn't need the extra free advertising - the noncommercial products do.

Ron Lugbill  
Third-Year Law Student

### Guthridge Should Stay, Upholds UNC Tradition Of Honesty in Recruiting

TO THE EDITOR:

In Wednesday's Daily Tar Heel, Franklin Hurley called for Coach Guthridge to resign "for the good of UNC

and the state of North Carolina."

Not only do I think Coach Guthridge should stay, but I fail to understand how a University coach affects the welfare of the state. Perhaps Mr. Hurley takes basketball too seriously, evidenced by his admission that he came to UNC "just for tickets."

I am proud of the players and coaching staff for their accomplishments this season. How many thought UNC would wind up third in the ACC, win the preseason NIT, make it to the ACC Tournament title game and win 24 games this season? Quite impressive considering the personnel losses. Don't forget that Guthridge had his top eight players available for only a few games due to injuries, illness and the NCAA. Hurley claimed that a six-man rotation has no chance of winning a title in the modern era. I believe there are many coaches out there who would be happy to take their chances with Duke's current top six players.

The recruiting assertions Mr. Hurley made were ludicrous. Elton Brand is a sophomore, meaning that Coach Guthridge was not head coach when Brand signed with Duke. As for Jason Williams, he would enter as a freshman with Cota a senior and Curry a sophomore (who was

one of the top point guards of the 1998 class). Would a talented player want to sit on the bench as the third option? At the time of Williams' recruitment, no one knew that Curry would end up as starting quarterback after Davenport's injury and would have less time for basketball.

Coach Guthridge could have told Williams what he wanted to hear and promised him playing time, but I am glad that he has upheld the tradition of being honest with recruits. If a recruit is not promised playing time then, he does not have to worry that his place is being promised to a high school player a few years down the line.

Anybody in coaching will tell you not to place much stock in rankings. UNC "fans" griped when Shammond Williams was signed and when Duke got Joey Beard, Ricky Price and Greg Newton. Jon Holmes has played well for Bloomington South, one of the top teams in the country. He was quite effective playing against top recruit Jason Gardner and is regarded as a great passer and excellent shooter.

Debbie Stengel  
School of Medicine  
Class of 2001

### Rinehart Impacts Lives, So Why Is Department Asking Her to Leave?

TO THE EDITOR:

Because I love my University, I must ask why students should be denied superb teaching. As a student taking Susanna Rinehart's Dramatic Art 16 class, I have learned to truly appreciate and enjoy drama. She has made such a profound difference in my education and my life.

Rinehart has opened my eyes to theater and, in effect, achieved the goal of her profession. Having said this, why is the Department of Dramatic Art asking her to leave at the end of the semester? If the members of the University community truly care about education, personal growth and inspiration, then we cannot afford to lose such a valuable educator. Because of her teaching, I have learned, I have grown and I have been inspired. I am heartbroken to think that future students will be denied this opportunity.

Katherine Schaffer  
Sophomore  
Psychology and French



The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments and criticism. Letters to the editor should be no longer than 400 words and must be typed, double-spaced, dated and signed by no more than two people. Students should include their year, major and phone number. Faculty and staff should include their title, department and phone number. The DTH reserves the right to edit letters for space, clarity and vulgarity. Publication is not guaranteed. Bring letters to the DTH office at Suite 104, Carolina Union, mail them to P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, NC 27515 or e-mail forum to: dth@unc.edu.