

The Daily Tar Heel

Established 1893 • 107 Years of Editorial Freedom
www.dailytarheel.com

BRIAN FREDERICK
EDITOR
Russ Lane
MANAGING EDITOR

Matt Viser
CITY, STATE & NATIONAL EDITOR
Geoff Wessel
UNIVERSITY EDITOR

Karen Williams
DESIGN EDITOR
Jonathan Harris
EDIT PAGE EDITOR

Brent Clark
PHOTO EDITOR
Jonathan Miller
ONLINE EDITOR

KATE HARTIG — EDITORIAL NOTEBOOK

Fleecing the Yankees

An amendment in the state budget includes a tuition increase that places an unfair burden on the University's out-of-state students.

As if the proposed 9 percent tuition increase isn't enough, legislators have found another way to drain students' and their parents' bank accounts.

An amendment to the state budget proposed by Rep. Cary Allred, R-Alamance, and passed last week by the House, 66-50, directs the UNC-system schools not to raise tuition for in-state students in the next two years, but to shift out the costs onto out-of-state students.

What Allred and the supporters of this amendment don't realize is that this proposal is not a just way to help mend the budget.

No student — in-state or out-of-state — should have to pick up the slack of state budget problems. This is especially true, however, for out-of-state students, who have not contributed to the inflation of the budget deficit caused largely by the funding for Hurricane Floyd clean-up and relief.

Also, since final state budget work takes place in the summer, many students who may be affected by this amendment are unaware of the recent proposal.

Allred says it's not fair for N. C. taxpayers to subsidize UNC-system out-of-state students, proposing that those 19,000 students pay an additional \$1,200 a year to go to school.

Allred and his supporters need to understand that by making it more financially difficult for students to attend N. C. schools, students are going to start looking elsewhere for

comparable higher education.

The national standing of the UNC system could be affected as well by an unfavorable out-of-state student policy because the schools will become less financially accessible.

Graduates from UNC-system schools often teach in our state, work in Research Triangle Park and open businesses in North Carolina. If the state adopts this policy, the number of incoming students will drop, affecting the future growth, prosperity and diversity of North Carolina.

Right now, every UNC-system student is facing a tuition increase in the fall. North Carolina prides itself on the notion that its schools offer top-notch, affordable education.

Tuition has been on the rise over the past several years. It's becoming difficult for even in-state students to continue to absorb the increases.

Out-of-state students already pay a great amount to attend school in the UNC system. And while the amount is less than some other highly ranked public and private schools, the system keeps its numbers and reputation high partly because of its affordability for in-state and out-of-state students.

State legislators need to keep working to find the best way to mend the budget, while at the same time watching out for taxpayers and maintaining the state's reputation for having affordable and respectable higher education institutions.

JON HARRIS — EDITORIAL NOTEBOOK

Stop Global Hype

President Bush has taken the correct approach to the issue of global warming by combining economic and scientific aspects.

On Monday, a meeting between President Bush and Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi resulted in another overdue victory for the president's environmental policy.

The prime minister decided to not sign the Kyoto Protocol or any other agreement that limits the amount of greenhouse emissions without the participation of the United States.

President Bush's opposition to the Kyoto treaty is a great boost to the president's environmental platform, which is taking a meticulous path of scientific studies to make sense of the often exaggerated and misunderstood issue of global warming.

In the past month, though, the president has been met with unwarranted criticism at home and abroad for his unwillingness to sign the Kyoto Protocol.

This criticism stems from a conditioned worldwide knee-jerk reaction to cry foul over valid arguments against any attempt — no matter how ineffective — to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

But European and domestic critics of Bush's global warming policy have not tried to look past the generic headlines of "Bush Won't Sign Kyoto to Reduce Global Warming" to the rather rational reasons why the president would never sign an agreement so detrimental and unfair to the United States.

First of all, signing Kyoto (which no industrialized country has yet to ratify) would legally bind the United States to cut its emissions to a level 7 percent below 1990 levels by the years 2008 and 2012.

On the surface, such a cut does not look so bad — until the economic costs to the country are factored in.

The cut required by Kyoto would mean an

enormous 30 percent cut in present emissions. The U.S. Energy Information Administration estimated that this cut would increase electricity prices 86 percent and gas prices 53 percent. With energy prices already running high, a drastic cut in emissions would be the last thing the country needs.

Bush's critics in Europe often cite the fact that Europe will remain far ahead of the United States in terms of reducing greenhouse emissions.

But of course Europe will be ahead of the U.S. — the European population should grow a frail 6 percent compared to the 20 percent growth the U.S. population will see by the year 2010.

And with a growing population comes a larger economy, which eventually leads to more greenhouse gas emissions.

Another drawback to the protocol is the fact that developing countries — which include China, Brazil and India — would not be limited in their emissions, even though India and China among the world's ten biggest polluters.

President Bush has repeatedly stated that he is committed to exploring different methods to reduce greenhouse gas emission.

With studies still unclear about how much of the Earth's temperature increase is due to natural increase or due to greenhouse gases, Bush is taking the right road in approaching the issue based on proper scientific studies.

The Bush approach is exactly what the country needs to combat and limit the effects (if any) of global warming caused by greenhouse gases.

Arbitrary, politically motivated percentages in conjunction with environmental propaganda and scare tactics are no way to combat the alleged problem.



DeCSS Ruling Threatens Freedom

Screw the First Amendment. So long, soapbox speeches on the town square. Farewell, petitioners of the government. Adios, freedom of the press. Before it's too late, I'd better get this out there:

```
2)}$_%8)|(16..271);if(@a=unx"C*",$_)[20]&
48){$h=5;$_unxb24,join"",@b=map(xB8,un
xb8,chr($^a$H+84))}@ARGV;...$1/$&/:
$d=unx.v,xb25,$_;$e=256|(ord$b[4])>8^$f
```

What you are looking at is a small segment of a computer program that will decode a DVD, making it possible to copy your digital movies on your home computer. The big deal with this seemingly nonsensical string of numbers and letters is that I could go to federal prison for publishing it.

Like I said, so long, First Amendment. The trouble started last year when 2600, a hacker 'zine, tried to publish a similar DVD-decoding program, called DeCSS, on its Web site. Almost immediately, the Motion Picture Association of America hauled 2600 into court. The MPAA's first step was to get a preliminary injunction against 2600, barring it from publishing DeCSS or even linking to another Web site where the program was posted.

Next, during the hearing before U.S. District Judge Lewis Kaplan, the MPAA tried to have the proceedings sealed. The MPAA asked the judge to forbid members of the press from reporting on some aspects of the trial. The MPAA wanted to make sure their dirty work went down in secret. Luckily, in his sole concession to free speech during the trial, Judge Kaplan ruled against the MPAA's request to hide their actions from the media.

The basis for MPAA's day in court was a controversial law, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) of 1998. This law has many provisions, the most oppressive of which center on the control of copyrights. According to an article in The New York Times, the DMCA "not only makes it illegal to photocopy and sell a copyrighted book, but also to simply tell someone how to open and read the book without the publishers authorization." In other words, while the consuming public can't steal copyrights — nothing new with that — now they can't own, possess or distribute any device that will evade copyright measures.



BILL HILL
STREET NAME = GRAPPA BOY

This provision raises legitimate concerns about the "fair use" ramifications of the act — imagine if students had to pay a fee every time they wanted to use a quote from a book in a research paper just because the book was on a CD as opposed to paper. Sound far-fetched? Not under the DMCA.

Preliminary injunction in hand, the MPAA then sought to permanently bar 2600 from discussing DeCSS. Under the MPAA's nightmarish and hysterical scenario, consumers would merrily download any movie they wanted for free off the Net. The MPAA didn't seem to care that a recent Google search turned up almost 100,000 links to DeCSS on the Internet.

The MPAA's lawyers have refused to answer if The New York Times, Wired Magazine and many other "mainstream" news outlets that had linked to DeCSS on their Web sites would eventually be sued. The MPAA doesn't like to talk about the fact that one of their main witnesses took more than six hours to copy a DVD. It never occurred to the MPAA that the decision in this case was essentially useless.

Carnegie Mellon University computer science Professor David Touretzky testified for 2600 at the trial. He claimed that computer code should be protected speech because as a computer scientist there are some ideas that he is able to express only through the use of code. He also pointed out that DeCSS could be expressed in many different ways. There's the Windows executable code that's the subject of the trial, but this is not the only way a DVD could be de-scrambled. It is possible to copy the source code for the program onto a T-shirt, type the code into your computer and

run the program. It is possible to write the same de-scrambling program in the perl programming language, an excerpt of which is printed above. A knowledgeable computer scientist could write a plain-English version of the program, or he could draw up a flow chart of program's routines and structure.

Would the court ban T-shirts, hauling kids off to jail for dressing in violation of federal law? Would Judge Kaplan burn flow charts in his courtroom? Touretzky argued that outlawing DeCSS would in no way prevent the copying of DVDs, only harm the legitimate speech rights of the press and computer scientists.

Judge Kaplan was unmoved. Comparing the DeCSS program to an epidemic, Kaplan granted the MPAA's permanent injunction against 2600 in April of 2000. Not only was 2600 forever barred from publishing DeCSS, it was banned from linking to other sites that distribute DeCSS. 2600 appealed with help from the Electronic Freedom Foundation.

Last month, the 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals began hearing the appeal. In perhaps the biggest joke of the case so far, the Justice Department and the Bush White House are now claiming that DeCSS should be banned because it presents a terrorist threat to the safety and welfare of the United States.

Exactly how copying part of a DVD to use for a class project could destroy the American way of life was not made clear, but that didn't stop the Justice Department from comparing DeCSS to software that could "crash airplanes, disrupt hospital equipment and imperil human lives." The movie studios are still claiming that DeCSS will bankrupt them. On the other side of the courtroom, 2600 has claimed that the DMCA is unconstitutional, DeCSS is similar to a cookbook or a book about car repair, and that computer code is just as legitimate a form of speech as a newspaper article.

As for me, I'll continue to challenge the First Amendment until the FBI hauls me away.

The MPAA can email Bill a copy of his lawsuit at whhill@unc.edu. You can download your own copy of DeCSS at <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~dst/DeCSS/gallery/index.html>.

Editor Seeks Readers' Feedback

I'm glad to be back on the editorial side of The Daily Tar Heel. When I took over the reins as editor this summer, my year long stint as DTH ombudsman (I later called myself the readers' advocate) came to a close. And I'm a much better editor after my tour of duty.

To remind you of the position, technically, I'm no longer the intermediary between the newsroom and the readers. I am no longer the paper's chief internal critic.

This summer, if you have a question or comment about the paper, you have no ombudsman to call. You can call me, but this is easy enough only because it is the summer.

During the school year, the DTH is a whole different animal. Writers come and go depending on their class schedules; editors are so busy they're even harder to reach.

Fortunately, we have enlisted a second-year M.A. student from the School of Journalism and Mass Communication to serve as ombudsman next year. Josh Myerov will be an excellent ombudsman.

Here is my concern: When I started as ombudsman last fall, I had very little understanding of the position, thanks to the lack of literature on the subject. The position is rare



BRIAN FREDERICK
EDITOR

among newspapers, even rarer at college newspapers. I am aware of only five ombudsmen that worked at college newspapers this past year.

Professional ombudsmen have the Organization of News Ombudsmen to turn to for peer support and discussion.

There is no Organization of College News Ombudsmen.

Josh will have to rely on the examples set by the DTH's previous ombudsmen and the various ombudsmen at professional dailies.

I would like to help him by providing a better understanding of the position.

This is where you come in: I'd like you to email me your thoughts on the position —

brifred@email.unc.edu.

Some of you may have filled out our readers' survey. The survey showed that 75% of those who responded thought it was important for the DTH to have an ombudsman.

This time around, however, I'm not looking for numbers. Rather, I'd like your thoughts on the subject.

Please be as thorough as you'd like in your answers and feel free to stray from the questions. This is very informal.

Is it important for the DTH to have an ombudsman? Why or why not?

What differences do you see between the DTH, a student newspaper, and the other daily newspapers in the area?

Are problems like factual errors, spelling mistakes and editorial biases any more forgivable at the DTH because the staff consists of students in training? Why or why not?

Finally, what comments or questions do you have for Josh?

I thank you for your input and I'm sure Josh will, too. I will also share my conclusions with other college newspaper ombudsmen.

Email your thoughts on ombudsmen and college newspapers to brifred@email.unc.edu.

The Daily Tar Heel

Professional and Business Staff

Business and Advertising: Janet Gallagher-Cassel, director/general manager; Christy Beck, director of marketing; Melinda Heien, classified/customer service manager; Lisa

Reichle, business manager.
Display Advertising: Erica Lundberg and Sarah Mobley, account executives.

Advertising Production: Penny Persons, manager.
Classified Production: Sheila Lenahan.

Editorial Staff

Arts/Features: Jamiyla Bolton, Adrial Dale, Daniele Eubanks, Sarah Kucharski, Jonathan Miller, Allyson Shaffer and Jennifer White.
City, State & National: Haywood Alexander, Emily Canaday, Sally Francis, Demetrius Goringolaya, Ashley

Williams and Patricia Wright.
Copy: Tim Lawson and Laurie Osborne.
Design: Sifton Jock, Jamie Schumaker and Hayes Simpson.
Edit Page: Bill Hill, Scott Rooker and Evann Strathern.

Graphics: Torise Battle, Zoe Mickle and Evann Strathern.
Online: Sara Martz.
Photography: Kara Arritt.
University: Ama Soaten, Ashley Davidson, Emily Drum, Natalie Harrison, Emma Merritt, Matt

Minchew and Meredith Nicholson.
Editorial Production: Stacy Wynn, manager.
Printing: Triangle Web.

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 call 962-1163 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Classified ads can be reached at 962-0252. Editorial questions should be directed to 962-0245.



ISSN #10709436

Office: Suite 104 Carolina Union
Campus Mail Address: CB# 5210 Box 49, Carolina Union
U.S. Mail Address: P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, NC 27515-3257