

BOARD EDITORIALS

A CONTRARY STANCE

N.C. Senate leader Marc Basnight has been friendly to education, but his support for campus-based tuition hikes is bad for students.

The words of state Senate President Pro Tem Marc Basnight carry a lot of weight in North Carolina.

As the leader of the state Senate, Basnight practically controls the legislative activity of the body and is considered one of the most powerful Democrats in the state, if not the most powerful.

On March 10, Basnight, a Democrat from Dare County, exercised his considerable influence in a letter to the UNC-system Board of Governors. In the letter, he expresses strong support for the continued viability and quality of the University system.

Unfortunately, Basnight views the proposed tuition hikes as the best way to accomplish this.

In his letter, Basnight states that revenue from the proposed tuition hikes will help maintain the high quality of education that, combined with low in-state tuition, make UNC-system schools such an appealing college destination for many North Carolinians.

"To ensure success for all students, we must continue to pair affordability with quality," Basnight wrote. "The campus-initiated tuition proposals before you are critical to reaching both those goals."

He also cites the steady decline in university funding provided by the N.C. General Assembly and subsequent required budget cuts.

However, the proposed increase for out-of-state students at UNC-Chapel Hill — \$1,500 for the 2004-05 academic year — would create a financial barrier for nonresidents without money to burn.

Not all out-of-state students come from well-to-do families, and many middle-class nonresidents don't qualify for vital financial aid packages.

While nonresidents constitute a minority on campus, this policy betrays the philosophical legacy of the University by placing an undue burden on a subset of students. Instead of recklessly targeting students that aren't mentioned specifically in its mission statement, the UNC-system should do more to protect the abil-

ity of all students to attain a UNC-CH education.

Basnight's letter represents the first statement by a member of North Carolina's political leadership in favor of current tuition proposals.

In February, Gov. Mike Easley wrote a letter to the BOG asking it not to support the campus-based tuition increase proposals. He stated that tuition hikes in the context of a poor economy place an unfair burden on students and their families.

Easley's stated position is admirable, considering that the proposals had been well on their way to being passed.

In his letter, Basnight points to mold at N.C. Central University and major computer deficiencies at Western Carolina University as burning indicators of the need for increased funding.

While these are important priorities that demand the attention of state lawmakers, Basnight's mention of these problems highlights the quantitative approach that he has taken in his position on tuition.

He seems to want to shore up the foundation of the system without acknowledging the burden that campus-based hikes would place on the shoulders of students, rather than the legislature.

Marc Basnight has a strong record of supporting education in North Carolina. Even in this letter, he continues to show his support for the state's public university system by pointing out many of the pressing issues that UNC-CH and other system schools must address to maintain their high levels of quality and affordability.

But on this rare occasion, The Daily Tar Heel Editorial Board must respectfully disagree with the N.C. Senate president pro tem.

Tuition hikes, campus-based or otherwise, don't increase affordability. In this case, these increases in the cost of education and lagging support from the General Assembly risk decreasing access to this campus and other UNC-system schools.

ON THE DAY'S NEWS

"Kites rise highest against the wind, not with it."

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL, BRITISH PRIME MINISTER

EDITORIAL CARTOON

By Andrew Stevens, crazyaj@email.unc.edu



COMMENTARY

Republicans support blacks more than Democratic Party

A couple of weeks ago I was told about a book titled "Unfounded Loyalty" that details the "blind love affair between blacks and Democrats."

The author, Wayne Perryman, details how the black population has been manipulated into thinking that the only party concerned with the needs of the black community is the Democratic Party.

However, before blacks blindly concede their support to the Democratic Party, they should be aware of the Republican Party's history when it comes to protecting civil rights as well as the departure from the "Christian Community" and what Perryman calls the "benefaction of faith-based programs."

First, Perryman doesn't endorse either party, but instead provides historical truth as to which is responsible for certain actions.

It goes without saying that some Democrats are quick to label Republicans as bigots or racists although Perryman provides some interesting historical facts.

Did you know that Republicans were primarily responsible for passage of the following:

"The Emancipation Proclamation, the 13th Amendment, the 14th Amendment, the 15th Amendment, the Reconstruction Act of 1867, the Civil Rights Act of 1866, the Enforcement Act of 1870, the Forced Act of 1871, the Ku Klux Klan Act of 1871, the Civil Rights Act of 1875, the Freedmen's Bureau, the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 and the U.S. Civil Rights Commission."

Moreover, they gave bi-partisan support for the following pieces of legislation:

"The Civil Rights Act of 1964,



BRENTLEY TANNER
FRESH FROM THE OVEN

the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the 1968 Civil Rights Act, the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972, goals and timetables for Affirmative Action Programs, Comprehensive Employment Training Act of 1973, Voting Rights Act of Amendment of 1982, Civil Rights Act of 1983, Federal Contract Compliance and the Workforce Development Act of 1988."

Democrats, on the other hand, haven't been so kind to the black community in the past.

According to Perryman, the Democratic Party "formed the Ku Klux Klan, fought and died to expand slavery, burned down African American towns such as Rosewood, Fla.; Tulsa, Okla.; Wilmington, N.C.; refused to pass anti-lynching laws; supported Jim Crow laws; closed black schools; created black codes; murdered, tortured and intimidated black voters; elected many Ku Klux Klansmen, including the raking U.S. senator of the Democratic party today, Robert Byrd; wiretapped Martin Luther King Jr.; fought allowing poor minority children better quality education in private and religious schools and fought to keep them enslaved in failing governments schools."

Perryman also stresses that the black community needs to return back to the foundation of their culture: a Christian upbringing that promotes strong family val-

ues instead of compromised values that suit the Democratic Party.

A vivid example of this can be found in a book titled "It All Starts at Home: 15 Reasons to Put Family First," by Larry Harris. The book stresses that moral support via the family and Christian rearing ensures success where the government constantly fails.

Also important is the reliance on faith-based programming and schooling, which have brought about such pivotal black leaders as Booker T. Washington and the Revs. Martin Luther King and Jesse Jackson.

By integrating strong religious values with an educational background, you create the drive and moral fortitude necessary to be successful.

This type of nongovernmental programming would create the atmosphere of dignity policymakers can't achieve.

Lastly, it's important to mention that being black does not mean you have to be a Democrat, automatically. The Republican Party has some of the best black leaders in the world including General Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, Ward Connelly, Reginald Jones and Shannon Reeves.

However, instead of receiving accolades for their achievements, these people are labeled "Uncle Toms" or "traitors." I am sure that there are many black students here at UNC who are Republicans or at least conservative but afraid to admit it.

However, know that the Republican Party is inclusive and will continue to promote true equality instead of providing lip-service with no results.

Contact Brentley Tanner
at gtanner@email.unc.edu.

WATCH YOUR WASTE

UNC officials need to ensure that something as harmful as 25 gallons amount of toxic waste doesn't go missing from under their guard.

No one likes toxic waste. It can be harmful as well as useless to people, hence the "toxic" and "waste" descriptions, respectively.

Unfortunately, the University might have had more than just a little bit of it sitting around. Twenty-five gallons of unidentified toxic waste were taken from a construction site at UNC's Medical Science Research Building in January.

University officials will not disclose where they recovered the waste, although The (Durham) Herald-Sun reported that the demolition firm Southern Site & Environmental Corp. had taken the toxins.

The waste is believed to be composed of mercury and arsenic, but definitive information about the contents hasn't been released.

The firm thinks that almost 20 employees working on the contract were exposed to the toxins, according to The (Raleigh) News & Observer. But UNC officials have stated that no workers have been exposed to harmful elements or chemicals.

While Southern Site & Environmental acted irresponsibly by taking the waste without proper notification, the University needs to ensure that construction workers under contract do not become exposed to hazardous materials.

In addition, UNC officials should ensure that contractors have access to proper equipment to deal safely with any toxic substances found when gutting older buildings.

How do five-gallon and 20-gallon drums of toxic waste go missing? If the materials are hazardous to humans, perhaps there should have been better security at the construction site.

University officials told the Herald-Sun that the waste was sealed behind closed doors. That method obviously was not much of a deterrent to taking the waste. Perhaps any person or group could have stolen 25 gallons of harmful substances to use as

they saw fit.

As it is, it might have been taken only in protest. According to the Herald-Sun, Southern Site & Environmental said it sent samples of the waste to an independent laboratory in New Jersey several months ago.

If true, this means that UNC hasn't accounted for the material for a significant amount of time. It also means that a private company felt compelled to seize toxic waste and without notifying anyone or properly disposing of the toxins.

However, if Southern Site & Environmental is concerned about the safety of its workers, the firm should not have had its workers remove the waste from UNC's campus. Obviously, handling the waste likely would increase the possibility that workers would become sick from exposure to the toxins.

Eventually, UNC called in the appropriate state regulatory agency to settle the dispute. The North Carolina Department of Environmental and Natural Resources quickly appropriated the waste in question.

The public can rest assured that the proper authorities will dispose of the toxins, as clearly neither UNC nor Southern Site & Environmental has shown enough responsibility to take care of the problem.

Questions about toxic waste are not limited to the UNC campus. The Associated Press reported that N.C. State University recently was fined about \$10,000 for improperly handling hazardous materials.

This highlights a need for greater scrutiny of both public and private institutions by NCDENR. In order to keep people safe from harmful substances, more stringent guidelines on storage and disposal of waste are needed.

This example on UNC's own campus illustrates what can happen when toxic waste that threatens the public is involved in a private dispute.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The above editorials are the opinions of solely The Daily Tar Heel Editorial Board, and were reached after open debate. The board consists of seven board members, the editorial page associate editor, the editorial page editor and the DTH editor. The 2003-04 DTH editor decided not to vote on the board and not to write board editorials.

COMMENTARY

Men should do more to prevent sexual violence

During the Super Bowl this year, millions of us were shocked to see Justin Timberlake rip Janet Jackson's shirt and expose her breast.

Angered and offended, citizens and institutions such as the Federal Communications Commission reacted quickly, criticizing this public display of nudity.

While critics lambasted Ms. Jackson, few people spoke about the disturbing simulation of sexual assault passed off as entertainment.

"Wardrobe malfunction" or not, what America witnessed was a violent performance of a white man ripping the clothes off of a black woman.

Why was no one outraged about this enactment of sexual assault? Why did critics ignore Justin Timberlake's involvement in the stunt?

The American public's silence about the issue of sexual assault definitely speaks volumes about how we view women and men in our culture.

Unfortunately, when we do talk about sexual assault and rape, we consider them "women's issues."

It is true that these issues affect all women.

But they affect men, too. Most men think that are

MATT EZZELL
GRADUATE STUDENT

BOB PLEASANT
GRADUATE STUDENT

not affected because we're not targeted as victims in the ways that women are.

A man might worry about being mugged in a parking lot at night, but this is vastly different from a woman's fear of being raped.

Why, then, should men care about sexual assault and rape?

Three reasons why sexual assault and rape are men's issues, too.

We care about women

All of us have mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, friends, girlfriends or other women in our lives.

Sexual violence affects them. The threat of assault is a constant reality in their lives.

Because of that, it is a reality in our lives, too.

If we care about women, we must speak up against men's violence against them.

Men are rapists

The overwhelming majority of

rapists are men.

This does not mean that the majority of men are rapists.

In fact, the majority of us are not.

The majority of us are, however, silent when it comes to sexual violence.

Men who rape give the rest of us a bad name.

We should speak out because we aren't rapists.

Men have voice

Men have more access to social, political and economic power than women in our culture.

This isn't right or fair, and it is a result and an example of inequality between men and women.

For that very reason, we can and should use the voice we are given to speak up for equality.

Martin Luther King Jr. said, "We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the virulent words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people."

It's not enough to forgo violence ourselves; we must also strive to end the violence done by others.

This does not mean only speaking out about individual acts of sexual assault and rape, but also

about the culture of sexism that enables these actions.

This is not easy to do.

Men who challenge sexist comments and events that devalue women are often met with homophobia and doubts about our masculinity.

These reactions are attempts to keep us silent.

In truth, it takes courage, strength and leadership to stand up and to ensure that our voices heard.

All men in the community are invited to participate in a workshop on strategies for speaking out this coming Friday, March 19, from 4:30 to 6 p.m. in 204 Peabody Hall with the Chapel Hill-based Men's Anti-Violence Leadership Education (MALE) Project.

As individuals, we can find creative ways to speak out against sexual assault.

Collectively, we have the opportunity and the responsibility to stop men's violence against women.

Too many of us remain silent about sexism because we think our individual actions are insignificant; yet all change begins with individuals.

In the words of William James, "Act as if what you do makes a dif-

ference. It does."

Contact Matt Ezzell,
graduate student in
the Sociology Department,
at ezzellm@email.unc.edu.

Contact Bob Pleasants,
graduate student in
the School of Education,
at bpleas@email.unc.edu.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The Daily Tar Heel Editorial Board encourages students to attend Friday's meeting of the UNC-system Board of Governors, as the body will be discussing the campus-based tuition increase.

TO SUBMIT A LETTER: The Daily Tar Heel welcomes reader comments. Letters to the editor should be no longer than 300 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 them to editdesk@unc.edu.

Established 1893
111 years of editorial freedom
The Daily Tar Heel
www.dailytarheel.com

ELYSE ASHBURN
EDITOR, 962-4086
OFFICE HOURS 2:15-3:15 PM MON, WED.

DANIEL THIGPEN
MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750

JENNIFER SAMUELS
PROJECTS MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750

NATHAN DENNY
EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR, 962-0750

BROOK R. CORWIN
UNIVERSITY EDITOR, 962-0372

EMMA BURGIN
CITY EDITOR, 962-4209

CLEVE R. WOOTSON JR.
STATE & NATIONAL EDITOR, 962-4103

BRIAN MACPHERSON
SPORTS EDITOR, 962-4710

MICHELLE JARBOE
FEATURES EDITOR, 962-4214

NICK PARKER
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR, 962-4214

ALEX OBREGON
COPY EDITOR, 962-4103

BRIAN CASSELLA
PHOTO EDITOR, 962-0750

MICHELLE KUTTNER
DESIGN EDITOR, 962-0750

KRISTEN OLIVER
ONLINE EDITOR, 962-0750

JOHN FRANK
PROJECTS TEAM LEADER, 962-0246

ERIC GAUTSCHI
OMBUDESMAN

If you have any concerns or comments about our coverage, please contact Ombudsman Eric Gautschi at gautschi@email.unc.edu or 918-1311.