

Eating disorders not a weight loss answer

Students do not need to make themselves sick in order to lose extra pounds.

My best friend and I see girls here at the university that need to "go eat something" almost daily. We always comment on the fact that we see them running everyday even though they look so unhealthy. While I knew

Jenny Billings

OLD GOLD & BLACK COLUMNIST

that eating disorders were prominent on this campus, I wasn't confronted with one until recently.

The other day while I was in one of Benson University Center's women's restrooms, I heard a girl vomiting. At first, I assumed that the girl was sick and decided not to bother her. After she continued for a few more seconds, I asked if she was "okay."

The girl stopped, saying absolutely nothing even though she knew I could see her sorority-patterned flip-flops under the stall door.

You could say that I am jumping to conclusions; after all, there are plenty of reasons why people get sick. Maybe this particular girl doesn't have an eating disorder. Maybe she had a hangover or maybe she had food poisoning.

This column isn't about this girl; it's about the fact that eating disorders exist on this campus and we can't continue to walk around as if they don't. Believe it or not, products of them pass you everyday but I'm not one of them.

I am fully aware that I am not a size 4 and that I do things in order to differentiate myself from people on this campus. But like some of you, I know what it feels like to have a bad self image.

When I enrolled in 2002, I weighed over 300 pounds. I never looked people in the eye, I never smiled and I used extreme sarcasm as a defense mechanism. Of all things, it was a picture of me from Spring Break that inspired me to make some changes. I had no idea I'd be here today.

I joined Weight Watchers in March of 2004 with the support of my family and friends behind me. Since then, I have lost over 110 pounds.

No, I didn't have surgery. I don't have an eating disorder. I don't even work out every day.

I just decided to make a permanent life change—something that all of you can do, as well. My biggest life change though,

was the way I decided to see myself from now on: different but beautiful.

I'm not saying that all of you need to lose weight. I'm not even writing to brag on myself because I believe that my results speak for themselves.

I am however saying that eating disorders are never the way to go.

Those of you who complain about what you see in the mirror are missing the big picture.

Maybe seem hypocritical for me to say that looks aren't everything. Losing over a hundred pounds does a lot for you on the outside. However, the things it does for you on the inside are far more important.

Most seniors will say that they have "gained" a lot here at the university. On graduation day, I will tell people what I "lost." I lost a lot of sleep and a lot of my parent's money. I lost my low self esteem and I lost a lot of weight. But it is through

these losses, that I have gained more than I could ever imagine. I have gained close friends who have always seen me for me. I have gained a boyfriend that calls me his "Homecoming Queen" even though I didn't make court. I will leave here with an accomplishment that most people will ever accomplish. Most importantly, I will leave here happy.

Those of you who are taking this editorial too personally – it's okay. I'm not attacking you – I'm sympathizing with you because I know what it feels like to want to take drastic measures. All I'm saying is if I didn't have to turn to an eating disorder – neither do you.

Get help, talk to someone if you have to. E-mail me. Just know that it's your health and ultimately your life that's in jeopardy. Don't miss out on anymore of it than you have to.

Jenny Billings is an English major.

Free market brings peace

Nobel Prize should go to people who promote capitalism.

On Oct. 7, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to Mohammed ElBaradei, the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency. According to the guidelines established

Barbara Smith

GUEST COLUMNIST

by the Nobel Foundation itself, this is an incredibly poor choice. The Nobel Peace Prize Committee reports that Alfred Nobel's will, according to which the criteria for the prize are judged, states that the recipient "shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding of peace congresses."

In the truest spirit of this award, what is the best way to work towards peaceful international relations without substantial armed conflict?

The best way to reduce the standing armies of the world is to work for a world where freedom and free markets prevail.

These institutions provide people the opportunity to make the lives of their choosing.

When people are able to make their dreams into reality, they will focus their energy on the pursuit of their own happiness and not the oppression of others.

Give people choice. Let people choose who governs them. Let people choose to succeed. Give people the opportunity to create a better life for their children, and they will not need to oppress people for their own betterment.

The most peaceful regimes follow these principles of democratic and economic choice. In America, we choose where we live, where we worship and what we do with our lives. In America, we have the opportunity to make for ourselves the lives of our dreams.

The most militaristic regimes of the past, those that have caused the most death, destruction, and despair, are those regimes that try to control and change the force of human nature.

Adolf Hitler's Germany, Joseph Stalin's Russia and, today, the Islamo-fascist regimes in the Middle East, all maintained their political power through oppression.

Hitler and Stalin killed millions of their own people, and their armies were responsible for the deaths of millions more. Islamo-fascism today kills the souls of millions of men and women, whose voices, talents and dreams go unrealized.

In Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Russia, and most Middle Eastern Countries today, people do not have the choice to be human.

People deserve free societies.

They deserve free economic systems. They do not deserve to suffer under the slavery of tyranny or the oppression of poverty. Perhaps it is some one who works for the prosperity and proliferation of these ideas who deserves to receive such a coveted prize for peace.

Instead, they slave under the oppression of dictatorship, and the cruelty of poverty.

If our goal as Americans, humans or members of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee is to work for a world where there is less armed conflict, then we have to work for a world where people are allowed to be human.

This does not happen under fascist dictatorships. This does not happen under oppressive religious fanaticism. This does not happen under communism.

This happens with democracy and capitalism, because both of these institutions give people an opportunity to ensure their own success, and an outlet for their frustrations.

In democratic countries, if you don't like the government, you vote. If you don't like your job, you have the opportunity to find a new one. You can go to school, or receive training for a new career. In oppressive countries, if you don't like the government, you die. If you don't like your job, you starve.

The IAEA does its job of inspecting nuclear material, containing and controlling it when asked and helping countries in the development of peaceful nuclear energy (most of the time).

The IAEA and ElBaradei, however, do not work for the advancement of freedom.

They attempt to monitor and control means of destruction, but they do not promote the continued success of freedom, or the ideal of world peace. They are simply one piece of a much bigger and more complex puzzle.

People deserve free societies. They deserve free economic systems. They do not deserve to suffer under the slavery of tyranny or the oppression of poverty. Perhaps it is some one who works for the prosperity and proliferation of these ideas who deserves to receive such a coveted prize for peace.

Perhaps some one more deserving of the Nobel Peace Prize is someone who advances the credo that "the best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world."

Barbara Smith is junior economics and political science major.



M. ZAKRESKI

Archway a link to the past for university

Support exists in university community for relocating monument to campus.

In the Oct. 6 *Old Gold & Black* article entitled "SG's Project Broadens Focus," it is clear that the initiative to consider the move of the arch from the town of Wake Forest to Winston-Salem is heavily contentious and very emotional for many

Reggie Mathis

GUEST COLUMNIST

people. Although the years of struggling to reconcile the move of the past with the growth of the present has again created tension between the town of Wake Forest and Winston-Salem, it remains clear that the discussions, and for that matter the issue of the appropriate measure of recognizing the history of this institution is one that is both timely and appropriate in the dawn of a new era.

While there is truth in the claim that the focus of this project has changed, this course of action has also yielded progress for the underlying goal, which is to reconnect students and members of the present university community to the past. Hence, this project remains a top priority to my administration. Additionally, continuing dialogue will help guide this project around something that the students can appreciate. Unlike the criticism offered from the *OGB* Editorial Board, Student Government, and for that matter current and former students, alumni of the old campus and university officials support the endeavor for the sake of reconnecting students to their history.

If history is not appreciated in its authenticity, then it will not be realized in its proper context. If it is not realized in its proper context, then it makes it difficult to understand the significance of a relic on the Reynolda Campus. To aid in this, there have been plans, since the summer, to travel to the old campus this year.

Fortunately, the university is also planning for a trek to the old campus in celebration of the 50th anniversary move to Winston-Salem. This is the fundamental goal for "Project Archway."

The endeavor to reclaim the arch represents a heartfelt attachment between a town and a school. By working with various leaders of the past and present, I hope to prompt discussions about keeping our history alive on our campus. Students today are far too removed from the transition of 1956. In 1956, it was a more appropriate thing to rebuild, but to rebuild even larger, the chapel that existed on the old campus because there were students that had a distinct connection to that campus. Contrary to claims made by the Editorial Board, Wait Chapel is not a replica of Binkley Chapel on the old campus. If you ever get a chance to go, you'll find this to be evident. The university's decision to include a chapel as large as Wait Chapel is because of its Baptist heritage and commitment to its prominence on campus. Striving to bring a piece of the old campus here is not only effective, but necessary to the perpetuation of the story of the Arch. It was a gift from the students for the students.

On a campus where students want something to distinctively identify themselves from other universities, the only "natural" thing would be to address the issue for what it truly is – a move to expand the appreciation of history – not to change it. Recognizing this, the university is interested in erecting a replica of the original Arch. "Project Archway" would then be able to organize students to give a gift to commemorate the gift that the students of 1909 gave to the institution.

Having been commended by alumni, administrators and current students, I'm not concerned about the "political capital" that may be expended to no avail. For anyone to imply that the history is best appreciated in Wake Forest, I challenge their study of our history and to see what places on campus really speak to that history. There aren't many, if any, that encourage students to even take a trip to the old campus. I will graduate knowing that I have been able to take one step further in opening the door of history, and allowing students that want to connect with their history, the opportunity to actualize it on this campus. This larger purpose cannot fail as it transcends generations.

Hence, I will never say never ... for inevitability is the prize for persistence and perseverance.

Reggie Mathis is a senior religion major.

Column filled with major errors

Barbara Smith's recent column ("Ginsburg Radical on Court," Sept. 29) was one of the least well-reasoned and least helpful editorials I have seen in the three years that I've read the *Old Gold & Black*.

In the column, Smith constructs an elaborate "radical

Patrick Jackson

GUEST COLUMNIST

cal leftist feminist" straw person, who she names "Ruth Bader Ginsburg," in an attempt to smear this moderate Supreme Court justice.

The allegations Smith makes about Ginsburg's positions are inaccurate and clearly unresearched. She should be embarrassed to have presented such a shoddy piece of analysis to the university community for publication. Smith's column reads like a laundry list of conservative fantasies about liberal feminists, but I think a few of the allegations are worth critiquing in depth. I hope that you will all research the remaining issues for yourselves to get a clearer picture of what Ginsburg's positions are.

The most egregious error was Smith's assertion that, "(Ginsburg) called for the age of sexual consent to apply to people who are 'less than 12 years old.'" This particular smear about the justice was repeated most recently by Lindsey Graham and is based on a paper from 1974 coauthored by Ginsburg and entitled "The Legal Status of Women under Federal Law." In the paper, she argued that statutory rape laws ought to be rewritten in gender-neutral language so that anyone, male or female, could be prosecuted for having sex with a significantly younger minor. Ginsburg cited a proposed Senate bill as an example of gender-neutral phrasing. While the bill would have limited statutory rape prosecutions to persons under the age of 12, this was in no way part of what Ginsburg advocated. If Smith had done her research and read Ginsburg's paper, it would have been clear that she never advocated the content of the law in question but only its non-gendered phrasing.

Smith also unfairly characterizes Ginsburg's advocacy of the removal of gendered language from federal law as "censorship." This is an intellectually dishonest description at best. As we all know, censorship occurs when someone is legally prevented from expressing a controversial viewpoint. On the contrary, changing the language of a law is called legislating.

Smith goes on to argue that Ginsburg advocates that United States law be interpreted in a manner pleasing to international public opinion. In fact, in the very speech Smith quotes, Ginsburg is clear that she does not take foreign law to be authoritative but thinks that we should learn from other countries' legal thought. There is a long and distinguished history of American leaders addressing world opinion. In fact, the line Smith quotes and attributes to Ginsburg, about being concerned for "the scrutiny of a candid world" references the Declaration of Independence and the Founders' interest in justifying the Revolutionary War to "a candid world." Where Ginsburg quotes Thomas Jefferson and his legal interests, she is hardly embodying "judicial activism."

These are just three of the points about which Smith is vastly mistaken in Ginsburg's record. What concerns me most is that Smith seems to have expended no effort in discovering the truth of the allegations she repeats and she shows little respect for honest academic debate about the state of our legal system. We will never get anywhere simply repeating partisan talking points. The democratic process instead relies upon people of different beliefs working in good faith to discuss their disagreements and coming to mutually acceptable conclusions. As members of this educational institution, we can and should be active in political dialogue, but it is crucial that in doing so we respect each other and each other's positions, even in our disagreement.

Patrick Jackson is a senior philosophy major.