

SPECIAL READERS' FORUM

Columnist misled readers, took quotes out of context

TO THE EDITOR:

My name is Sherief Khaki. Yes, the same Sherief Khaki who was interviewed for that horrendous Jillian Bandes column about her wanting to strip-search Arabs if they are in or near an airport.

That honestly might have been the most disappointing article I've read in my life.

Aside from the shaky diction, the article was done in such an unprofessional and deceptive manner that I am forced to take action. Last week, I — along with a fellow Arab-American UNC junior, Muhammad Salameh — was interviewed by the columnist, whom we had previously not known. Bandes said she wanted to interview us about being Arab-Americans in the post-9/11 era.

She interviewed each of us for about 15 to 20 minutes as we discussed our feelings about terrorism and 9/11. Toward the end of the interviews, she asked about our opinions on racial profiling in airports. Muhammad and I both agreed that it was not a huge issue and that other, more important concerns should be emphasized in order to eliminate potential terrorism.

We did not agree that we wanted all Arabs to be sexed up or strip-searched in airports. I'm also pretty confident that UNC's Arabic teacher, Dr. Nasser Isleem, does not agree with that either.

If you look midway through the column, Bandes writes, "I want Arabs to get sexed up like nothing else. And Arab students at UNC don't seem to think that's such a bad idea." Wow, Jillian, you have just reached a new low. Action is being taken throughout many organizations on campus, and also off campus, to respond to this malicious article. I am also extremely disappointed in the DTH for agreeing to publish that highly insulting work.

Jillian, you are free to have your opinions, but don't try to make it look like I share your disgusting and radical views. This sadly reminds me of the awful Iraqi prisoner abuse scandal. When I saw those horrible pictures from the Abu Ghraib prison scandal, I was shocked to see that men and women soldiers were taking part in the sexually humiliating abuse. Perhaps when Jillian saw those pictures, she became fascinated with the idea of having all Arabs sexed up. Or perhaps the DTH should not let employees with poorly hidden agendas write such unprofessional opinions that anger and deceive readers.

Salam Shalom, or Peace.

Sherief Khaki
Junior
Information Science

(Editor's note: The length rule was waived.)

Racial profiling not a good solution to terrorist attacks

TO THE EDITOR:

Ms. Bandes argues that racial profiling is a good idea because all 19 of the terrorists on 9/11 were Arab. Most terrorists, she claims, are likely to be Arabs and thus for safety reasons, all Arabs should be examined. However, there are several difficulties with this argument:

- It presumes a clear-cut understanding of what an "Arab" is. Yet the 19 terrorists deliberately avoided "Arabic" clothing and hairstyles and came from different countries. In fact, some "Arabic" skin colors are rather close to Latino skin colors.

- It presumes that al-Qaida only uses Arab terrorists.

- It presumes that the only threat to the U.S. comes from Arab terrorists. Yet prior to 9/11, the worst acts of terrorism on U.S. soil were perpetrated by white men from middle America.

We need to protect ourselves against terrorism. Using racial profiling, however, only provides a false sense of security.

If Ms. Bandes seriously wants flights to be safe, she should volunteer to be searched and then buy the official that cup of joe she mentioned.

Bethany S. Keenan
Graduate Student
History

Bandes is short-sighted in her approval of profiling

TO THE EDITOR:

After reading the first three lines of Jillian Bandes' commentary on racial profiling, I thought she was surely joking. As I finished the article, I was nothing short of embarrassed and extremely disappointed.

Bandes pointed out that "most terrorists are indeed Arab ... responsible for almost every act of terror committed against the West." Before I even had a chance

to refute her idea, she did so herself, naming Timothy McVeigh, the Unabomber and the events at Columbine. So, why again are white males not part of racial profiling? I'll let you sort that out yourself.

Bandes also included in her shock rag that many Arab Americans agree with racial profiling. Do they really have a choice? Perhaps the only reason why I am writing this is because my chances of getting tossed into Guantanamo for writing this "terrorist-loving" reply are slim because I am a white female.

And considering that Bandes has an appreciation for the woman-hating Ann Coulter, please pass along to her two of my favorite Coulter quotes: "My only regret with Timothy McVeigh is he did not go to the New York Times Building" — and also the ever-popular, "Women really aren't that smart. Sometimes we are just given way too much credit."

Ellen Penninger
Junior
Journalism

Racial profiling will lead to abuse of power by the law

TO THE EDITOR:

I was deeply disturbed by Jillian Bandes' piece on the issue of racial profiling. Apparently, the one lesson we are supposed to take from the tragic experience of 9/11 is that our fear justifies racist policies.

But giving discretionary authority to law enforcement to use ethnicity or race as criteria for interrogating someone can only lead to harassment and abuse of power. Rather than looking to Ann Coulter quips, we should look to the experiences of minority groups that have been historically targeted by law enforcement with the justification that statistics show that they are more likely to be the perpetrators of certain crimes.

Would their experiences match Jillian Bandes' naive level of trust in U.S. law enforcement?

Sarah Hench
Senior
International Studies

Discrimination isn't the same as domestic security

TO THE EDITOR:

While I can appreciate the sentiment in Jillian Bandes' Tuesday column, she overlooks the problems created by racial profiling. Yes, profiling works for a brief period of time, but eventually things will begin to break down — just ask the Israelis.

When young men began to be stopped with great frequency at border crossings, the al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade began recruiting women into their ranks. The biggest terrorist attack prior to 9/11 was committed by Timothy McVeigh, a man who outwardly appeared to be the All-American boy next door.

To think that a highly motivated group of individuals, such as the terrorists of al-Qaida, could be thwarted by something so easily planned for and circumvented as racial profiling is sheer fallacy. We've already seen that they plan to exploit weaknesses in the system — using the seemingly innocuous box-cutter as their primary weapon in the hijackings of Sept. 11.

Sure, racial profiling is the easy solution, but the easy solution isn't always the best one.

Rory Haggard
Senior
Philosophy

Column gave no answers — just more fearmongering

TO THE EDITOR:

Jillian Bandes' Tuesday column brings up feelings to which we can all relate. We were all scared on Sept. 11, we all grieved, and even now, we want answers.

On behalf of myself and 13 other students who studied in Amman, Jordan this summer, I would like to say that racism is not the answer. There are nearly 1.3 billion Muslims in the world, only 18 percent of whom are Arab; Muslim and Arab are not synonymous.

It isn't a huge leap from Bandes' suggestions to suggesting that they are put on a leash and photographed. The fact is neither Bandes nor those performing the searches know what a terrorist really looks like — all they see is a scapegoat for their fear.

Monica Yungeberg
Senior
Religious Studies

Columnist was breath of fresh air in stuffy debate

TO THE EDITOR:

Perhaps it is just me, but I fail to see why Jillian Bandes' latest column has caused such a stir. As one

of maybe about 10 Orthodox Jews in the Triangle, I always find myself pulled aside at RDU — along with every other airport I've ever been in — by security due to the fact that my religious dress means I resemble someone from the Middle East. Instead of complaining and cursing "the man," I rather welcome it, since I recognize that it is done not out of maliciousness or hatred but for safety purposes.

The existence of profiling may come as a surprise to some of this university's more sheltered students, but to a member of a minority it surely is not.

Frankly, I welcome Ms. Bandes calling a spade a spade and explaining why she feels the practice is necessary, rather than being forced to hear the ramblings of a half-wit on the virtues of accepting others' differences while ignoring the issue completely.

Mordechai DeLuca
Sophomore
Political Science/History

Responses to columnist are just more rabid liberalism

TO THE EDITOR:

First off, the opinions that UNC students view as acceptable and "mainstream" are anything but mainstream. In fact, UNC students stand on the far, far left of the political spectrum.

Secondly, many students of the leftist perspective refuse to be quiet even when they know they are wrong.

The first point is highlighted by the fact that, as I heard through the grapevine, the DTH has received mostly criticism on Jillian's piece. The second point is illustrated perfectly by the Muslim Students Association's letter to the editor.

In this letter, they admit that Jillian's view has been "echoed even through the hallowed halls of the most liberal elite." And yet, a large number of UNC students find the expression of this "sentiment" appalling.

Furthermore, Uzma Khan and Bushra Bhatti of the Muslim Student Association declined from commenting on racial profiling specifically. Instead, they were resigned to write a letter longer than the original column on why Jillian's piece was rude.

It seems to me that either Jillian's polemics are so strong that no liberal can refute her or they simply cannot argue against racial profiling in general. Either way, Bandes' conclusions were correct, and that is what matters in political debate.

Brian Sopp
Junior
Journalism/Political Science

University only issues warnings when safety is at risk

TO THE EDITOR:

I am writing in response to a story that ran in The Daily Tar Heel regarding the University's responsibility to provide notice to the campus community of unsafe conditions.

The University strives to create a safe environment for all those who work, study, and visit UNC-Chapel Hill. When criminal activity or other situations on campus appear to pose a threat to the safety of the University community, the University's Emergency Warning Committee quickly assesses the situation and, when appropriate, informs the campus community.

The same approach is used when a noncriminal campus emergency occurs that could significantly affect students and employees — for example, an outbreak of meningitis or anticipated hurricane conditions.

The decision to issue a warning to the campus community is made on a case-by-case basis. All relevant factors are weighed by a multi-disciplinary group, including representatives of the Department of Public Safety, Student Affairs, Human Resources, the Office of University Counsel and University Relations.

Great care is taken to issue warnings only when the University's best judgment is that an ongoing threat to the campus community exists. To issue a warning when the available evidence indicates no threat to the University community dilutes the value of the message.

The University places a high priority on quickly sharing facts about genuine safety threats. If no warning is issued after an incident, you can be confident that it is the University's considered, professional judgment that, based on the available evidence, no ongoing threat to the University community is present.

Leslie Chambers Strohm
Chairwoman
Emergency Warning Committee

FROM THE DAY'S NEWS

"Let him finish his answer, Senator Kennedy."

ARLEN SPECTER, SENATOR, AT THE CONFIRMATION HEARING OF JOHN ROBERTS

EDITORIAL CARTOON

By Philip McFee, pip@email.unc.edu



COMMENTARY

History paints a bleak picture for our future tuition battles

And now, settle in for a history lesson from your Auntie Em.

I know about 18 percent of you folks come from outside the great state of North Carolina, so y'all listen real closely. The rest of you can recite with me as we go.

In 1997, a man named Paul Fulton was leaving his job as dean of UNC's Kenan-Flagler School of Business. He decided to leave a parting gift with the N.C. General Assembly: A request for a \$5,000 tuition hike for in-state students.

Fulton, who now sits on the UNC Board of Trustees, proposed the hike to deal with the disparity between in-state and out-of-state rates, which were about \$3,200 and \$14,330, respectively.

No one who's paying attention in 2005 should be surprised to hear that:

A. Democratic Senate leader Marc Basnight immediately put the idea on the legislature's budget, and

B. No one bothered to tell then-Chancellor Michael Hooker or the Board of Governors.

Sound familiar? Yeah, I thought it might.

Basnight, along with his good friend Senate Majority Leader Tony Rand, is the man who brought you one of the summer's hottest pieces of legislation. He was the instigator of the tuition autonomy idea, whereby UNC-Chapel Hill and N.C. State University would have been able to set their own tuition rates.

To my relief, the House refused to pass the legislation, even after Speaker Jim Black, D-Mecklenburg, added the UNC system's other research schools to the list. Turns out UNC-Charlotte wanted nothing to do with the legislation, and it all went downhill from there.

That's sort of like what went down in 1997, when newly instated UNC-system President Molly Broad put a stop to Fulton's tuition measure before it went too far.

But that wasn't enough for the responsible and thorough Board of Governors, which sprung into action even though University officials and legislators have tried time and time again to keep the governors out of the loop.

The board conducted an investigation of systemwide graduate school tuition. Those findings led to the 1998 approval of a tuition policy that was supposed to set the tone for increases for the next several years: System schools would bring reasonable increases before the BOG, which then would approve them or deny them based on the quality of the request.

But the state hit a snag in its budgets during the next few years, campuses saw an opening, and boards of trustees across the state worked with the BOG to approve unprecedented hikes for both resident and nonresident students.

It's gotten to the point where students (myself included) have come to expect an increase. And with the UNC Tuition Task Force already immersed in talks, I anticipate nothing different this year — especially if Student Body President Seth Dearmin fails to stick up for our constitutional right to an affordable education.

I hope Dearmin isn't taking advice from last year's SBP, Matt Calabria, who might as well have been a pawn of the Board of



EMMA BURGIN
IT'S A GLAMOROUS LIFE

Trustees. And I hope Dearmin soon gets the guts to stand up for those he was elected to represent.

Either way, we'll see an increase. But the students — led by Dearmin — could make the hike just a little less.

Hopefully, by the time any further increases go into effect, I'll have ventured out into the real world and my parents will no longer have to foot the bill for my education (and my expensive shopping habit).

Now, to be fair, the news isn't all bad. We all know North Carolina takes its constitutional mandate for accessible higher education seriously. And for that I am truly proud.

Our state, more than any other, provides each of its residents with a place of learning. The rest of the state systems get caught up in rankings and money. The Michigan and Virginia university systems provide good educations, but how great can you be when you alienate the very people you're meant to serve?

Both the University of Michigan's flagship campus in Ann Arbor and the University of Virginia charge substantially more than UNC-Chapel Hill does for in-state students, bringing in more revenue but shutting the door to residents.

But I am severely disappointed in the Democratic leadership in our legislature — even though I'm a Democrat who believes fully in the ideas and leadership of the party (it's a character flaw; I'm loyal to the end).

Two powerful men — Basnight and Rand (who both remind me very much of my grandfather, the most powerful man in the Mississippi Senate during the 1950s and '60s) — have let me down.

They seem to assume they know what's best for UNC-Chapel Hill. Which, to some degree, is fine. They're alumni; they're entitled to care about their alma mater.

Except when it starts hurting the rest of the 15 schools in the system, which they should be trying to protect.

Take, for instance, the measure they pushed through the legislature this summer that allows out-of-state students with full rides to system universities to be charged in-state rates. While this frees up a trivial amount of money for scholarship foundations and athletic booster clubs, it's detrimental to the residents of North Carolina.

For every student from Florida, Michigan or Virginia who counts as an in-stater, one real in-stater gets left out in the cold (for the sake of the 82 percent in-state enrollment cap). So the University will have to admit more students to maintain its number of in-state students — cramping already crowded classes.

And that's wrong. It goes against what we as a University and state should stand for.

Other states have their own higher education systems. Let them play host to their people.

Charles Kuralt, one of the greats who worked at The Daily Tar Heel, is famous for saying Chapel Hill "is as it was meant to be: the University of the People."

We still are, but our alumni and trustees are acting less and less like it these days.

Maybe it's up to us, the students, to provide the example.

Contact Emma Burgin,
a senior dramatic arts major,
at emmaline@email.unc.edu.

Speak Out

We welcome letters to the editor and aim to publish as many as possible. In writing, please follow these simple guidelines: Keep letters under 300 words. Type them. Date them. Sign them; make sure they're signed by no more than two people. If you're a student, include your year, major and phone number. Faculty and staff: Give us your department and phone number. The DTH edits for space, clarity, accuracy and vulgarity. Bring letters to our office at Suite 2409 in the Student Union, e-mail them to editdesk@unc.edu, or send them to P.O. Box 3257, Chapel Hill, N.C., 27515. All letters also will appear in our blogs section.

The Daily Tar Heel

www.dailytarheel.com

Established 1893
112 years of editorial freedom

RYAN C. TUCK
EDITOR, 962-4086
RCTUCK@EMAIL.UNC.EDU
OFFICE HOURS: TUESDAY, THURSDAY 1-2 P.M.
PIT SIT: FRIDAY, 12-1 P.M.

JOSEPH R. SCHWARTZ
MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750
JOSEPH_SCHWARTZ@UNC.EDU

REBECCA WILHELM
DEPUTY MANAGING EDITOR, 962-0750
BECCA07@EMAIL.UNC.EDU

CHRIS COLETTA
OPINION EDITOR, 962-0750
EDITDESK@UNC.EDU

BRIAN HUDSON
UNIVERSITY EDITOR, 962-0372
UDES@UNC.EDU

TED STRONG
CITY EDITOR, 962-4209
CITYDESK@UNC.EDU

KAVITA PILLAI
STATE & NATIONAL EDITOR, 962-4103
STNTDESK@UNC.EDU

DANIEL MALLOY
SPORTS EDITOR, 962-4710
SPORTS@UNC.EDU

TORRYE JONES
FEATURES EDITOR, 962-4214
FEATURES@UNC.EDU

JIM WALSH
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR, 962-4214
ARTSDESK@UNC.EDU

SCOTT SPILLMAN
CO-COPY EDITOR, 962-4103

CATHERINE WILLIAMS
CO-COPY EDITOR, 962-4103

WHITNEY SHEFFE
PHOTO EDITOR, 962-0750

JEN ALLIET
CO-DESIGN EDITOR, 962-0750

DANIEL BEDEN
CO-DESIGN EDITOR, 962-0750

FELDING CAGE
GRAPHICS AND MULTIMEDIA EDITOR, 962-0246

CHRIS JOHNSON
ONLINE EDITOR, 962-0750
ONLINE@UNC.EDU

KELLY OCHS
WRITER'S COACH, 962-0372

EMILY STEEL
WRITER'S COACH, 962-0372

ELLIOTT DUBE
PUBLIC EDITOR, 260-9084
DUBE@EMAIL.UNC.EDU