

OLD GOLD AND BLACK

The Student Newspaper of Wake Forest University
Founded in 1916

EDITORIALS

Major bands need major venue

It was exciting; it was energetic; it was good music and good times. Tuesday's They Might Be Giants concert was, indeed, everything a concert should be.

And for the Student Union, the concert was a huge step in establishing themselves as an organization worthy of finding some decent entertainment for the university.

Every year, the Student Union seems to take its budget and concentrate on making events, like Springfest, as uneventful as possible by hiring three or four small bands that nobody has any desire of hearing.

This is not the fault of the bands, nor is it a reflection on the quality of their music.

The simple fact remains, however, that when a supposedly "major" event happens on campus, students want to see a major personality headline the evening.

They Might Be Giants is exactly what was needed. All those involved with bringing the widely-successful band to the campus and having them play at no charge to the students, no less, have done an exceptional job and should be commended.

It is a much greater achievement to have one or two concerts a year that a large percentage of the student body will enjoy as opposed to numerous shows that are of little interest to most.

It is a shame, though, that there is not a larger, closed venue for

concerts to be held. Benson 401 will never constitute a viable option for concerts and it makes SU look bad because, on the surface, it looks like they cannot pull off the big show.

This is not true but what options is SU left with when there is nowhere to hold these events? Not only was there a significant amount of confusion on the part of the students, who saw both the venue and time of the show change repeatedly, but it also hindered the quality of the show.

Improved restrictions may be necessary, but enacting those would be a more desirable option than trying to hide a concert just to regulate it.

First of all, doing so would not clutter up the Benson University Center with hundreds of people trying to cram into a conference room and pretend that it is something more.

Secondly, it casts an ugly shadow on the university when the only place it can hold a major concert is in a multipurpose room.

It is hard to imagine too many popular bands that would agree to play a concert before a crowd one-tenth the size of what it should, or could, be.

Wait Chapel was perfect in size and acoustics to hold shows, but it is a place of worship. The stage on the Magnolia Quad is great but, as this concert demonstrated, it is too dependent on the weather. It is time for a decent venue.

Hearn's speech makes positive advancements

The State of the University address that was held Monday was a quality step, in many respects, toward bridging the gap between students and the administration, specifically President Thomas K. Hearn, Jr.

Hearn's speech had some positive aspects. It was nice to see Hearn put the responsibilities of drinking where they should be as he told students that he is "not Big Brother" and that he cannot control students' habits.

It would appear that the administration will be taking the wiser road by trying to council students on the dangers of excessive drinking rather than trying to be watchdogs and enforce policy.

Another positive note was the question-and-answer period that took place at the end of the speeches. With all of the talk about Hearn not interacting enough with students, it is important for them to be able to pose questions and know their voices are being heard.

The one real problem with the evening, however, was the noticeable lack of pertinent issues that are currently facing the campus.

The topics of computers, the gates and security were not even approached by Hearn, and these are issues that are not only new, but confronting students on a daily basis.

The importance of having Hearn address students in a casual setting cannot be understated.

Usually, he is only seen introducing a featured speaker or making a grand speech in Wait Chapel. Monday's speech was much more personal though.

In the future, it should be considered imperative that current issues be addressed as they are key to the university's future.

With all of the stories and situations that are, and will be, arising, it would be good for students to be able to present their concerns to the person with the most influence and power.

Drug legalization not the answer

DAN GROSSBERG

GUEST COLUMNIST

I have a modest proposal. It is a proposal that would reduce crime, allowing good citizens to feel safe walking through the streets at night, and free up much of our court systems.

This should be a politician's dream, as it would not only reduce crime, but also provide a new industry for strained industrial workers in America. My modest proposal: mandating that all non-felons carry concealed weapons.

Statistics show that in areas that allow concealed weapons, violent crime incurs great reductions, as criminals are fearful of who may or may not be carrying a weapon to protect themselves.

If the government mandated that all non-felons carry concealed weapons, crime would be further reduced, as every criminal would have the knowledge that any victim or bystander can protect himself. It is rather difficult to commit a robbery when anyone in the establishment can pull out a .45 and blow a few holes in you.

Moreover, think of how great this would be for our economy. Besides reducing money spent on law enforcement, we would create such vast industry, generating new jobs for strained industrial workers. ...

This proposal is not modest, nor was the proposal of Charles Starks in the Sept. 26 issue of the *OG&B*, titled "Legalization helps society, economy," in which he advocated the legalization of drugs.

Starks went as far as to say, "I continue to be amazed by the reticence of the general public toward legalizing drugs. The advantages of legalization are not difficult to see." Well, the perils of legalization are very clear, and the American people are not naïve enough to believe legalization is the cure to our social or economic ills.

Initially, Starks addressed the concern of crime management. He advocates the legalization of drugs so that the cost can be put back in line with

their true value, and addicts will not need to steal to find money to support their habit.

In fact, with this reduction in crime, Starks sees the focus of law enforcement returning to its proper position, regaining respect for law enforcement.

He sees the court systems clearing up, prisons being more capable of holding true criminals, and parks being safe to walk through at night.

This line of reasoning is preposterous, as a reduction in the cost of drugs will only increase their usage. Perhaps addicts will not need to steal to support their habits, but much of the violence seen from drug use is in the

habit itself.

Addicts are far more likely to be involved in assaults, rapes, murders and many other crimes that do not support their habits.

Police officers will still have to arrest these addicts, although they now must wait for them to commit a violent crime, rather than apprehending them for the purchase, sale, possession or usage of the drugs.

The law should try to prevent the cause of violence, not legalize it. As drug abuse results in many violent crimes, under Starks' proposal, the courts will no longer be filled with drug crimes, but with drug-related crimes, which pose a more serious threat to society.

Starks suggests that there would be great economic benefits from legalization. When drugs are legal, he says

American jobs to foreigners?

Secondly, there are moral concerns. Do we really want to have more Americans making money off of lethal substances? There are currently large concerns regarding curtailment of tobacco usage, because it results in the loss of American jobs.

Do we really want American industry and our entire economy to be stimulated by increased drug usage? Think of the moral dilemma when an institution, educational or otherwise, is offered vast amounts of money in the form of charitable donations, by the drug companies. The dilemma would be far more severe than the current dilemma of accepting tobacco money, as drugs are more harmful, more addictive and more socially degenerative.

Similarly, there are great moral di-

lemmas in a federal tax system that benefits from the greater abuse of drugs.

Finally, there are pragmatic concerns. Starks suggests that the tax revenue from legalization go to drug awareness and prevention, but this simply won't work.

Although drug legalization does not necessarily endorse its usage, it does condone it. Children can not be expected to steer clear from drugs after the federal government sends them a mixed message by legalizing it.

Moreover, children cannot be expected to understand the evils of drugs when it is not only legal, but their parents or relatives work in the industry.

Starks is mistakenly under the impression that drugs are illegal because the government thinks it is wrong to use them.

Drugs are not illegal so that the government can infringe upon our freedoms, drugs are illegal because of the crime and social degradation resulting from their abuse.

The crimes associated with drugs being kept illegal are ludicrous compared to the crimes encouraged by their greater abuse. When Great Britain tried limited drug legalization, the results were catastrophic.

Starks may not understand why the American people are not willing to accept the notion of legalization as the cure, but it is quite clear that the conditions provided are far worse than what we are dealing with now.

Statistics show that the lower drug abuse is, the lower the crime rate is.

Our primary focus should be preventing drug abuse, not sidestepping the cause of the problem by simply legalizing it. We may be losing the war on drugs, but that does not mean we should surrender.

MIKE LUCKOVICH
ATLANTA CONSTITUTION 6/26



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Huffman lectures

It was something of a surprise when I opened the Sept. 19 issue of the *OG&B* and discovered that the Huffman Lecture series has been cancelled ("Academics do not leave classroom walls.") Not only am I a huge fan of the often witty, always informative series, but I am also the chairwoman of the committee that organizes them. This enormous disappointment leaves me with a sense of bitterness and one lingering question:

How did the *OG&B* discover this before I did? Clearly there must be some sophisticated detective work at hand; no one on Huffman's executive board had heard of this, nor had the Euzelian Society, which is sponsoring a lecture with us this semester, nor had any of the professors who have been asked to speak.

This must be reporting more sensitive than the amazing work that went into uncovering Watergate, Iran-Contra, or any other scandal of the last 50 years. Perhaps, you might suggest, "scandal" is a rather strong word. Well, I, for one, am scandalized and mortified to discover that, once again, the *OG&B*'s fact-finding missions have borne unexpected and nearly implausible results.

I, for the edification of the entire campus, would like to request the source of this troubling, incredible revelation. As soon as you are able, please confirm this information for me so that I can go about cancelling the lecturers scheduled from the religion, English, education departments and most notably, President Thomas K. Hearn, Jr. Thank you, again, for making me aware of this truly shocking information.

E. A. O'Donovan
Chairwoman, Huffman Lecture Series

Editor's note: The reporter of the article had received information from the former chairwoman of the Huffman Lecture series, who said that the series had been cancelled. In addition, the reporter discovered from a Huffman House Council member that at their meeting it was announced that the lecture series was cancelled. The OG&B was unaware that the series was under new leadership.

Liberal arts?

I would like to make two brief comments on recent articles in the *OG&B*. So I can end on a positive note, I'll begin with the more negative comment.

First, the Sept. 26 article on the Wake Forest Review ("Wake Forest Review seeks to promote university debate") contained a comment that the magazine excluded professors of science and mathematics from its "Ten Top Professors" list because it "prefers to focus on the liberal arts."

Unbeknownst to them, the members of the Review and the reporter (Matthew Coleman) have stepped into the middle of a minor lexicographical controversy. Of the five dictionaries I queried, three list the sciences as liberal arts, and two specifically exclude them.

Why the questionable position of the sciences with respect to the liberal arts? All five dictionaries state that the liberal arts are those subjects studied for their academic value as opposed to their purely vocational nature in education. Those subjects, as the phrase's origin indicates, are worthy of a free-thinking individual.

The controversy arises from the growing association of science with technology in our culture and particularly at the university, where the predominance of science majors (including mathematics majors) is pre-

medical, a primarily vocational course of study (though certainly one worthy of pursuit for some students).

In contrast to popular opinion, I submit that the sciences are liberal arts, and should especially be considered so, at a university that claims a biologist, William Poteat, as one of its most revered presidents. The sciences, studied in abstract, represent one of the most ancient pursuits of humanity; the quest to understand, and to satisfy curiosity.

For several centuries now and especially considering the influence of the Enlightenment, understanding the sciences has been a crucial part of the education of informed individuals. The study of science, I claim, provides its own joys, separate from vocational training, just as the other liberal arts do.

The sciences have been neglected as liberal arts for a long time at the university; they have only begun to blossom again in the last decade. I believe that Poteat, the professor who defended the sciences throughout North Carolina, would be disappointed to know that members of the university do not consider the sciences to be liberal arts.

My second comment concerns a number of recent articles relating to the intellectual climate at the university. The Sept. 26 issue saw a strange confluence of articles: a front page headline ("Work Forest" myth dispelled in Kuh report) and a staff editorial ("Work Forest" not reality) dispelling the "Work Forest" myth in contrast to a guest column ("Student accomplishments should be acknowledged," by Elizabeth D. Fisher) claiming that students are extremely hard working.

I wonder if this contradiction reflects a deep change occurring at the university in light of the "report after report" that Fisher notes decry our lack of intellectual involvement.

Given the reaction to Dean of the College Paul Escott's now infamous memo on grading standards, I doubt that many students would have accepted the Kuh report's conclusions, as the *OG&B* has. As the staff editorial implies, the time seems right for the university students to challenge themselves.

I do not mean to imply that students need a greater volume of work. What I suggest is parallel to Paul Fyfe's Sept. 12 column ("University provides wealth of knowledge"). We should take our academic pursuits and involve them in our lives and enjoy them.

We should seek out more difficult problems and concepts to master if we do not need much time to master our work, as Ken Zick, the vice president of student life and instructional resources, suggested in the news story last week. These are our greatest years, our moments to learn.

I would like to compliment the *OG&B* and Paul Fyfe for their relevant articles. I am glad to be part of a university moving toward greater challenges and greater academic involvement.

Andrew Frey

Kuh flawed

I am responding to the Sept. 26 article titled "Work Forest" myth dispelled in Kuh report" by Dan Childs.

This article seemed nothing more than misrepresentative propaganda.

The article repeated over and over the findings that students claimed to spend no more time on school work than students at three other comparable universities.

This raises many questions.

OLD GOLD AND BLACK

Karen Hillenbrand
Editor in Chief

Brian Dimmick
Managing Editor

Jim Myrick
Business Manager

News: Danielle Deaver, editor; Emily Brewer, assistant editor; Zach Everson, Jennifer Gough and Brian M. White, production assistants; Theresa Felder, copy editor; Aaron Grose, WorldWide editor.

Editorials: Andy Ferguson, editor; Rachel Avon, copy editor.

Arts and Entertainment: Charles Starks, editor; Jenny Blackford, assistant editor; Chris Grezlak, music editor; Heather Mackay, copy editor.

Sports: Mickey Kraynyak, editor; Patrick Kelley and Paul Gaeta, assistant editors; Adam Rothschild, copy editor.

Perspectives: Scott Payne and Erin Korey, editors; Laurie Parker, copy editor.

Electronic Edition: Julie Davis, David Marshburn, Andy Snyder, editors.

Photography: LeeAnn Hodges, editor.

Graphics: Joseph Dobner and Jamie Womack, editors.

Assistant Business Manager: Jaak Rannik.

Advertising: James Lewis, advertising sales; Brad Gilmore and Victoria Pham, advertising production; Matthew Beldner, circulation manager.

Adviser: Wayne King.

The *Old Gold and Black* encourages members of the Wake Forest community to address current issues through letters to the editor. To reserve a guest column call the editorials editor at Ext. 5280 at least one week in advance of publication.

We do not accept public thank-you notes. Corrections will run in the corrections box on page two.

All letters to the editor must include the author's name and phone number, although anonymity in print may be requested. Submissions should be typewritten and double-spaced.

We appreciate contributions submitted via floppy disk or the university network. Letters should be delivered to Benson 518, mailed to P.O. Box 7569 Reynolda Station, Winston-Salem, NC 27109, sent via electronic mail to letters@ogb.wfu.edu, or faxed to (910) 759-4561.

The *Old Gold and Black* reserves the right to edit, without prior notice, all copy for grammatical or typographical errors, and also to cut letters as needed to meet layout requirements.

The deadline for the Thursday issue is 5 p.m. the previous Monday.

The *Old Gold and Black* is published each Thursday during the school year, except during examinations, summer and holiday periods by Piedmont Publishing Co. of Winston-Salem, N.C.