

OPINION

This column represents the views of the Old Gold and Black Editorial Board.

Irresponsibility besets student governance

With the recent elections on campus, questions arise concerning the qualifications for judicial and honor council positions and the process students should go through to run for a position.

According to Clay Hipp, the judicial adviser, two students on the current honor and/or judicial boards have honor and judicial violations on their records. One of these students has on his record convictions of both indecent exposure and an alcohol violation. The other student was convicted of three charges: deception, alcohol violation and noncompliance with a university official.

Should students with judicial or honor code violations be allowed to serve on the judicial or honor council? An absolute answer to this question does not and should not exist. Rather, it should be decided on a case-by-case basis.

But the key issue at stake is that the decision in each case should be an informed one. Both the elections committee who screens the candidates and the students who vote for them have a right to know the qualifications, characteristics and background information of the students they are choosing — they are choosing a body of students who may judge their fates.

But this is one of the problems: No one is informed. Students have no information about the judicial and honor records of the candidates, mainly because the SG elections committee does not actually screen the candidates.

Section 2 of Statue II of the Constitution of the Student Government states, "The Elections Committee shall conduct an interview with all potential candidates for the Judicial Board and Honor Council. Based upon these interviews, the Elections Committee shall nominate no less than 15 for positions on the Judicial Board and no less than four from each class for positions on the Honor Council. These nominations will be forwarded to the student body for a campus-wide election." The Elections Committee consists of the four executive officers, the Honor Council and Judicial Board chairmen and two legislators.

When Tina Carlucci, the SG speaker of the house was asked why the candidates are not interviewed, she said that the elections committee had handed over the screening responsibility to the co-

chairmen of the judicial board and had subsequently never checked to ensure that the candidates were in fact screened.

But senior Matt Lane, a co-chairman of the judicial board, said that the board did not know it was their responsibility to interview the candidates.

In the words of the warden in *Cool Hand Luke*, "What we have here is failure to communicate." What we also have here is complete irresponsibility, lack of initiative and cyclical blame on the part of the student leadership of this campus.

Student Government is bound, as all organizations are, to the integrity of their constitution. By not following the words of this constitution — "shall" means "will," not "might" — SG is undermining its own drive for credibility with the student body and with the administration.

And where was SG's adviser during all of this neglect of proper procedure? An organization's adviser shouldn't run things, but he should probably check in every once in a while to make sure that things are getting done.

SG has the responsibility to make sure that students have the best possible representation on campus, not only by the way it governs, but also by the way they ensure election choices. They must start interviewing possible candidates before they go on the ballots, not only because the constitution requires so, but also because it is fundamentally important to inform students of the kinds of people they are electing.

SG should interview all candidates before the campaign and ask them to legally release their judicial and honor records. The records should then be made available to students, probably in SG's candidate advertisement in the *OG&B*. If a student refuses to release his records, his profile in the ad should state that he refused.

A low quantity of candidates might have hindered a screening process in the past, for fear of eliminating any kind of choice in candidates, but SG should treat the interview and investigative work as a process of obtaining information for the voters, not as merely a way to weed out candidates.

That way students could make a truly informed choice about the people they want to see sitting on the Honor Council and Judicial Board.



LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

University not committed to helping anthropology

I just received my Wake Forest Alumni magazine and read with dismay yet another story about the "state of disarray" of anthropology at the university. I am compelled to comment because of what I perceive as a misrepresentation by the administration regarding its commitment to the department of anthropology.

Paul Escott, the dean of the college; Gordon Melson, dean of the graduate school; and Provost David Brown are presenting the case as though the department now has a choice about whether to make changes that will allow it to continue as a viable department.

I quote Escott in a recent article in the *Old Gold & Black*: "It's inherently a shared decision. If they tell us that they can (continue to offer the major) and they have good plans to succeed, I expect that we will support them in that."

Yet in the same article, acting chairwoman Carole Browne, a professor of biology, is quoted as saying, "The department isn't receiving any new faculty." Not only is the department not receiving any new faculty, but when the temporary, non-tenured position currently filled by Nancy Nelson, an assistant professor of anthropology expires within two years, the funds that have supported that position will be reallocated to another university department.

Clearly, this is not a "shared decision," since the department of anthropology indicated in its own self-appraisal that it needed more positions, not fewer, in order to address issues of gender bias and research productivity.

The department's self-assessment found support in this regard from the outside reviewers (who, incidentally, did not recommend the "suspension" or "probation" of the graduate program). Linda Wolfe of East Carolina University stated that a department needs at least eight professors to function. She also rightly pointed out that the archeological research of Ned Woodall, professor of anthropology, depends upon the active involvement of graduate students.

I will use Woodall's situation as an example of the way in which we should interpret Escott's statement that the university will support the department if it can continue to offer the major while also responding to the issue of inadequate research and publishing by the faculty. By taking away the opportunity to recruit graduate students to participate in his research projects, can we conclude that the university is giving Woodall adequate support to conduct research and to publish?

Of course, Woodall's case is just one of the many difficult obstacles faced by all of the current faculty in the department of anthropology. Primarily, by suggesting that a lack of "female role models" and female faculty in the department is a problem that must be overcome, and then denying the department any future hires, the administration is essentially taking the "choice" and the "sharing" out of all decisions regarding the impending destruction of the department of anthropology.

While the language used by Dean Escott might lead a casual observer to believe that he is sincerely trying to help the department of anthropology overcome its problems, his actions in his capacity as dean of the college belie those words. And actions are what matter.

I write now no longer believing, as I did when I first began to hear of the department's troubles in the spring, that justice and fairness will win out over whatever the motives are of those who wish to see the department dismantled. I write now simply to advise anyone who may one day care to ask why the university does not have an anthropology department to look beneath the surface of the explanations provided. To say "they had a choice" and actually to have presented them with a choice are not the same things.

I am a 1989 graduate of the university. I was an anthropology major. I participated in archeological field school with Woodall, a bonus for undergrads made possible by the presence of the graduate program.

I took courses with anthropology professors Stanton Tefft, David

Weaver, David Evans and the late Pendleton Banks. Anthropology, under their guidance, offered some of the most exciting sets of questions that I encountered as an undergraduate.

I am currently pursuing a Ph.D. in sociocultural anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis. Wake Forest's Department of Anthropology prepared me extremely well and enabled me to pursue anthropology as a career.

What troubles me now is that the university appears to be choosing not to allow future students to make the same choice I made. Not only that, but it is also silencing a department through which students might learn ways to address issues of welfare reform, the concept of "race" and its validity for public policy, ethnic conflict, border disputes, human rights and even NAFTA and international trade.

Anthropology has very much to offer to any graduate, whether or not he or she is an anthropology major. To deny this is to lessen the strength of the university's voice in many current debates.

I worked as an admissions counselor at the university for 2 years upon my graduation. Until recently, I have been very proud to be a graduate of Wake Forest, even when I disagreed with many of its policies. I continued to believe that the fundamental values of the university remained intact. However, I now regret to learn that the university no longer values alumnae like me, and my pride in the institution is diminished.

Margaret "Lou" Brown '89
St. Louis

For more letters, see next page.

Our letters policy

We welcome letters. Send yours via e-mail to letters@ogb.wfu.edu, by campus mail to P.O. Box 7569, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27109, or deliver it to Benson 518. We reserve the right to edit all letters for length and clarity.

Chelsea grows up in front of nation

All eyes watch Clinton's daughter go to college.

Chelsea Clinton bade farewell to childhood last week when she left for Stanford University, where she will begin classes on Wednesday. Bundled in her arms

Christen Balady

GUEST COLUMNIST

were a stuffed frog "for hugging" from a White House aide and a framed collage of photos. More than two dozen reporters and photographers surrounded the South Lawn to cover this momentous occasion.

Big deal. I, too, left home as an anxious and somewhat scared college-bound freshman. I waved goodbye to my friends and grasped my teddy bear for support. I received an array of pasted fragments of my family and my friends, and, just like Chelsea, I reached to find my mother's hand for comfort for the last time. So, where's my article?

Every year American youth stride over the chasm between the swelled-breasted high school senior to the wide-eyed college freshman.

We deal with the chaos of packing up 18 years of accumulated "stuff" and transporting it to an unfamiliar location.

Every year American youth stride over the chasm between the swelled-breasted high school senior to the wide-eyed college freshman.

We are thrown into a swarm of other misplaced rookies and have no other choice but to wander around a foreign campus for what seems like ages before becoming accustomed to its disorienting twists and oddly designed building layouts.

We are forced to share a room with a complete stranger and thus vanquish almost all privacy. Our food sources are changed, our sleep schedules are rearranged, and our way of life is discombobulated. Why doesn't America make a public fuss about us?

Face it, starting college is tough. Even if you're the type who is glad to be rid of Mom and Dad, there is still that slight stab of helplessness in the pit of your stomach upon saying goodbye. There's that tiny bit of reluctance to let go — that eerie feeling that tells us we're finally on our own, whether we like it or not.

Chelsea is 3,000 miles away from her mother and father. She also hasn't escaped her fishbowl lifestyle as photographers and reporters crawl all over Stanford's campus eager to cover

the beginning of her first year. Aside from her parents, Chelsea also has press corps and Secret Service agents to embarrass her in front of her new classmates. Imagine the uneasiness she must feel.

So why haven't people made a big deal about this coming of age until now? For one, almost everyone does it. If the masses participate in an activity, then we think it's run-of-the-mill. My mom went to college. My dad went to college. They didn't get a movie deal.

Another reason for this hoopla is the people's affection for the presidential daughter. America has watched Chelsea grow from an awkward, frizzy-haired 12 year old with braces to a gracious, poised young adult. "It's been fun watching her grow," my mother says, "just like it's been fun to watch you." We feel that we know Chelsea because her family is constantly in the news. And now that she's leaving for school we all watch as if we are the proud parents.

There is yet another similarity between Chelsea and the rest of America's college freshmen. The president (and father) said reassuringly, "Planes run out there and phones work out there. E-mail works there, so we'll be all right."

No matter how lonely or frightening this new beginning is for us, all it takes is a quick phone call or e-mail home, and we'll be all right, too.

OLD GOLD AND BLACK

THE STUDENT NEWSPAPER OF WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY SINCE 1916

Danielle Deaver
Editor in Chief

Charles Starks
Managing Editor

Brad Gilmore
Business Manager

News: Zach Everson, editor; Theresa Felder, assistant editor; Shannon Bothwell, Reagan Humbar and Heather Seely, production assistants.

Editorials: Jennifer Gough, editor; Melissa Shields, copy editor; Poppy Durant, production assistant.

Arts and Entertainment: Jenny Blackford, editor.

Sports: Scott Payne, editor; Paul Gaeta, assistant editor; Greg Wilson, copy editor; Taylor Brown, production assistant.

Perspectives: Kate Cosgrove, editor; Sarah Kutner, assistant editor.

Electronic Edition: Julie Davis and David Marshburn, editors.

Chief Proofreader: Sam Newlands.

Graphics: Jamie Womack and Brian White, editors.

Assistant Business Manager: Scott Bayzle.

Advertising: Victoria Pham and Kristin Hemric, advertising production; Melanie Griff, sales.

Photography: Noel Fox, Carlton Ward.

Adviser: Wayne King.

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. Questions or comments should be sent via e-mail to comments@ogb.wfu.edu or via mail to P.O. Box 7569, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27109.

If you wish to submit a guest editorial, contact the editorials editor at Ext. 5280 at least two weeks in advance of the issue in which you would like it to appear.