

OLD GOLD AND BLACK

The Student Newspaper of Wake Forest University
Founded in 1916

EDITORIALS

Assault reiterates that cruelty exists

Last Saturday morning's assault served as a resounding reminder that the university, with all of its attributes and precautions standards, is still a part of a larger picture that is the world.

This is not the first time a violent crime has happened on campus and it would be foolish for anyone to think that it could be the last.

It is easy to lose sight of this fact, though, because this is such a safe, controlled environment. The university and its community enjoy a standard of living that is uncommon for most college campuses, as well as most people, throughout the country.

One of the attractions of the university is the trust one feels when journeying throughout the campus. And because the campus is so self-sufficient, it is easy to forget that bad things can, and do, happen.

Think back, though. How often have you gone a week without even picking up a newspaper? When was the last time you can remember watching the news on television?

With all of the rigors of academia, as well as the numerous social outlets to be explored, we can sometimes forget that there are things going on around us. Meanwhile, the world surrounding the university stays active and sometimes, the world can be a cruel place.

This is not to say that it is not a possibility that this assault was perpetrated by a student. That would be prejudicial and naive.

This type of crime is not a characteristic of the university though, and that is why it is shocking.

Obviously, this is not to say that everyone should give up hope, as good and bad things alike will happen regardless of our preventive actions.

Nor is this a call for all students to become paranoid and keep a close watch of the person next to you. Saturday's assault, though, serves as a reminder that the world around us is always moving and sometimes, bad things happen.

Everyone of us, students, faculty and administration, should never lose sight of this fact. This does not mean that personal security measures should be increased. Only so much can realistically be done for prevention as there is no such thing as a society without crimes.

It does, however, mean that common sense should not be discarded, just because we now have a gate system.

Students must keep their senses and continue to make safe decisions. For example, running by yourself at night is not a safe deci-

sion, particularly for women.

Gates are not protection for all situations. They were not constructed to serve this purpose. For any students to assume that they can take any unnecessary risks is foolhardy.

The university is here to provide us with a quality education, not to absolve us of the need to take the ordinary precautions dictated by common senses to protect our safety.

While the administration and the police are able to aide in our safety, the true responsibility lies within the individual.

We are, in no way, trying to say that Saturday's assault could have been avoided. It was, however, an example of a negative aspect of the world we live in and the world that exists around us.

We all need to be aware of this world around us because, even though it may not penetrate the campus often, it still has the power to stop by and visit.

As far as additional safety measures are concerned, though, the administration's decisions to construct more lights in the Scales parking lot, the increased number of blue-light telephones and the increased number of police officers should be applauded.

For years, students have gone without these benefits and, potentially, put themselves in harm's way undeservedly.

Extra lights should benefit anyone who has been privy to the noticeable lack of lighting in the Scales lot.

These lights should make students feel much more at ease with an unavoidable late-night hike to a residence hall or student apartment.

There are too many students who travel to and from the outer borders of the campus, making this safety element a necessity. Having additional lights and phones is a move that is both cost-effective and intelligent.

These types of security enhancements can have an effect on security, without infringing on students' privacy and individual freedoms, and we hope that these efforts continue.

There are many areas on campus where the lighting is still poor and could use improvement. Additionally, having more police officers on patrol would do much to make the campus environment safer.

Without resorting to a militaristic state that includes video cameras and wire-tappings, having some crime is unavoidable. But, keeping this crime to a minimum is something that each student has the ability and responsibility of doing, simply by using the common sense that they have.

Equality standards cannot waver

This past month, the Virginia Military Institute announced that it was ending a long-standing tradition of closing its doors to women. They proudly proclaimed that they would reach the end of the millennium with some "drastic" changes in their admission policies and that the incoming women would be treated with "equality."

I opened up the *Random House College Dictionary* and looked up the word "equality." It reads "in an equal or identical manner."

OK, but what exactly does equal mean? It means "of the same in quantity, degree, merit, etc." Is that what they meant? Are men and women treated equally in the military? Right ... pull the other one, guys. Who are you kidding?

Before you begin to label me as a drum-beating, chest-pounding male, let me explain a few things. Women belong in these institutions, as do all others so inclined to seek enrollment in them.

Anyone, be they male or female, black or white, oil rose or pea green, gay or straight, should be allowed to enter these institutions. If you wish to take up arms in defense of this country and its constitution, then you're OK with me. No exceptions! But let's get back to the issue at hand: equality.

Page one of the initiation script reads, "Break 'em down!" I don't care how self-assured you are or what your background is — you are going to be scared. When someone in a uniform looks your way and barks, you almost wet your pants. Ask anyone about their first days in the military, and they'll all begin with "Whew, I was so scared."

Page two reads, "Make 'em all the same." Put everyone in the same uniform and shave their heads. Be-

ROBERT KELLER

GUEST COLUMNIST

lieve it or not, it works. People with shaved heads look alike. So now you're scared and your head is shaved. Perfect! Just what the military ordered.

Here's where the "equality" definition begins to break down. Men get their heads shaved and women

make you prove your fitness level during periodic tests. Everyone must do sit-ups, push-ups and must run a certain distance in the allotted time.

Are these tests equal in regards to the sexes? Nope. Women are required to do less of everything. Once again, the question is "Why?" There are plenty of women that can sit-up, push-up and run with their male counterparts. What's the deal here?

Page four, in big bold letters, reads

Equal work means, well, equal work. ... Women are required to do less in regard to military standards, physical requirements and military duties. Their male counterparts not only do more for their pay, they are continually required to step in harm's way when there is a shooting war.

get their hair cut to off-the-collar length. Big difference, right?

Trust me, it is a big difference to have your head shaved. You may laugh about it when it occurs, but sooner or later you'll find a mirror and you will realize, as Dorothy did, that "we're not in Kansas anymore, Toto!" Usually, one of your new colleagues is examining his new "do" in the mirror next to you. You can tell that his thoughts are the same as yours because he's got that same funny look on his face.

But why do only the men have to go through this misery? Are we men more receptive to utter humiliation than women? Are we missing something here?

On to page three. It reads "Get 'em physical!" All military organizations observe this rule. Just to show you their seriousness, they

"Fight 'em!" Do our military forces fight? You bet. Since 1980, the U.S. military has been overtly involved in six military actions. If you join the military, you better be ready to take up arms to defend the national interest. As of today, women are still not allowed to fight.

I know, I know. They're on aircraft carriers and pilot military vehicles in areas where actual combat is occurring. Yet women are not allowed to engage in combat. Can women fight as well as their male counterparts? I believe they can, given proper training. Do they wish to fight? Most of them do.

Page five has no double standards attached. It reads "Pay 'em!" Equal pay for equal work, right down the line. A woman earns the same amount as a man.

In the academic institutions, the

scholarships are the same. In medical school agreements with the military, males and females do the same active service after their school days end. A female captain earns the same as a male captain. But look back at that statement, "equal work for equal pay." Is it equal work? Unless I've missed something here, it's not.

Equal work means, well, equal work. The problem here is that job A doesn't quite jive with job B.

Women are required to do less in regard to military standards, physical requirements and military duties. Their male counterparts not only do more for their pay, they are continually required to step in harm's way when there is a shooting war.

Are we equal? If so, let's take a stand and make a mark. Men must produce on a peer with women and vice versa. We may be on our way to that very standard, and guess who's leading us? I direct your attention toward Charleston.

Shannon Faulkner sought enrollment at the Citadel. She had gone to extremes to be the first woman. During her fight to get in, she became a media darling.

On her trek to the wrought iron gates of the Citadel, she made one trip too many to the press *hors d'oeuvres* table and showed up in lousy shape. In just a few days, she was photographed leaving via the same portals.

I applaud the people at the Citadel that ushered Faulkner to the exit door. She failed to live up to a standard and they said "Thanks, but no thanks."

Now other serious women follow behind her. I saw their picture in the paper the other day. Not a shaved head among them. Nice try, guys. Keep at it. We'll get there one day. Maybe.



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, Mike Beabout, and Brian M. White, production assistants; Theresa Felder, copy editor; Aaron Grose, WorldWide editor.

Editorials: Andy Ferguson, editor; Sam Newlands, production assistant; Rachel Avon, copy editor.

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

Sports: Mickey Krainyak, 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, and 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.

Advertiser: 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.

Rats still scurrying throughout campus

The first time I learned to detest rats was when, as a little girl, I saw *The Nutcracker* and watched the wonderful prince get attacked by the evil man-sized rodents. At the time, they seemed like the most horrible creatures in the world to me, but at least they weren't real.

Later in life, in fact this past summer, I watched plastic imitations of these dreadful little animals being cast onto the ice as my beloved Pittsburgh Penguins bowed down to the Florida Panthers in the Stanley Cup playoffs, marking yet another traumatic encounter with those darn things. But ... at least they weren't real.

Well, nothing can compare to the experiences I have at this university with the adorable little disease-carrying beasts.

Living in Kitchin House, which is so aptly nicknamed "the ghetto," I'm running into them more often than I ever dreamed I would.

Standing out on the patio outside my suite at night, I can watch them scurry about doing whatever it is that

AMY BARNETT

GUEST COLUMNIST

rats do, while I wonder whether or not they can climb stairs.

Every week I hear a new story of how a rat ran right in front of someone's feet as they were walking home.

And of course there is the constant eerie rustling of bushes that makes my heart race and my feet move faster.

I had heard last year that there had been an effort made to control the rat population somehow, and I was quite pleased to hear that, even though I had only seen a few here and there plus a dead one on the Quad.

Apparently this endeavor was in vain because they have found quite a happy home here. And they are just the biggest, fattest rats one could imagine. Perhaps they enjoy the food here a little bit more than the students do.

Should I be scared of these little rodents? I really do not know the answer to that. To be honest, I have

no idea what harm a rat could do to me.

What I do know is this — rats are a prime symbol of filth and squalor. In movies, in books and on televi-

There are people to remove the toilet paper from the Quad and even people to blow the leaves off the sidewalk so that we won't have to step on that despicable foliage. And yet, the classic symbol of foulness is alive and well on this campus.

sion, we know an unkempt or troublesome place for sure when we see those rats scoot across the floor, startling and disgusting whoever discovers them.

I never expected such a place to be synonymous with my living area.

It is so amusing that this problem exists. Perhaps I would find it even funnier if I wasn't cohabitating with the problem, but it is comical none the less.

We are surrounded by such uniformity — buildings that all look alike and grass that is always so neatly and carefully taken care of. There are people to remove the toilet paper from the quad and even people to blow the leaves off the sidewalk so that we won't have to step on that despicable foliage. And yet, the classic symbol of foulness is alive and well on this campus.

Now, you may think, because I have chosen to be in an uproar about a seemingly minor and perhaps harmless circumstance, that I am a spoiled young woman.

My answer to that is, "Yes, I am spoiled." I am receiving a very costly education at a respected university that has recently been rated one of the top 25 in the country. Do you think a place like that should be crawling with rats?