

EDITORIAL

Letter to the Editor

The Beacon needs some new dictionaries!

Dear Editor,

The February 11 edition of The Beacon, like previous ones, disappointed me in the lack of proofreading on the part of the news staff. As writers whose work is published for a campus-wide audience, you should pay attention to simple spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors — mistakes that often occur when a person is writing to get the idea down on paper (or on disk) before its substance escapes him. However, this does not excuse the leniency on the part of the writer who does not proof his work before it goes to press.

Certainly, I am sure you all have busy schedules. I know that my work sometimes contains small errors because I rush. But my audience includes only myself and my professor. You are reaching the entire student body. And while many of them may not care one way or the other, I grow weary from trudging through glaring errors that could have been so easily avoided before publication. For instance, let us look at Mike Frawley's article, "Smoke 'em if you got 'em!" I counted at least seven punctuation errors. Either the punctuation used was incorrect ("...but does anyone ever really think about the consequences of what they are doing...")

should end with a question mark, since it is, after all, an interrogative clause), or it was not used where it should have been ("Now I'm not naive, I know that there are drugs on campus, hell you can show up for any class...") should have been split up by using a period after "naive," and instead of a comma after "campus," there should have either been a hyphen connecting it to the following clause, or a period, and a new sentence begun). I could go on and on, but my last comment for Mr. Frawley's article regards his "seven-step program," in which he misspelled [sic] McDonald's ("McDoanlds") in Step 7.

As for Liz Hayes' article, "I see your lips moving, but...", I will point out the most glaring grammatical error that I found. Here is the sentence in question: "I can't begin to count the number of times people have come down to the Beacon office when myself or some other poor, cornered editor is sitting down here, full of righteous indignation over the latest editorial in the paper."

Who, exactly, is "...full of righteous indignation..."? Is it the "people" that feel this way? Or is it your staff? After reading this sentence

over and over, I still have to ask these questions. Therefore, there is a problem with the syntax of the sentence.

I would continue with the remaining editorials — on the SGA elections, on commuting, and on Valentine's Day — but I think I have said enough. I can only hope that someone takes the time to consider my remarks and make changes in the editing and proofreading of articles that appear in The Beacon. This applies not only to staff writing, but also the editing and proofreading done by a student on his own work before he sends it to The Beacon.

I have not herein addressed issues of writer credibility, stereotyping, or members of the staff describing themselves as "...poor, cornered editors..." or as "slave[s]" to the publishing of the paper. Such issues must be discussed in a separate letter. My reason for writing is my dissatisfaction with proofreading, a part of the "editorial process" that, while essential to any publication, has been sorely neglected by the Beacon staff.

Susan Rohde
06 ELISH - Lit.

Editor's Note

I thank you for taking the time to write me here at the newspaper office. Makes me feel special! However, I am concerned about the context of your letter addressed to me, the editor.

I feel that I need to let you in on how the Beacon proofreads its pages. Every Thursday night a group of top-notch students, along with our stead-

fast academic advisor, pore over every word on every page before we send it to print at 3 a.m.

The process of proofreading is something that we take very seriously here at the Beacon, and we were very surprised that you found any errors. Of course, you and anyone else are invited to come down to the office on

layout night and experience this wonder for yourself.

In closing, I feel that I should defend the newspaper further by pointing out that perfect proofreading is easy...in theory. But take a look at your letter again. You misspelled the word "misspell". Not as easy as it looks, is it?

Letter to the Editor

Lion Cash...It Sucks

Have you ever had this happen to you? You're sitting down in the laundry room with one load of clothes left to do, and you only have \$1.40 left on Lion Cash. I have. So what do you do now? If you live in the lower three dorms (i.e. Niagara, Perry, and Lawrence) you have two choices. One is to try and squeeze your extra load in with your other clothes or two you walk down to Reed and put another \$5 or \$10 on your card. All of

this for \$0.10.

I don't get it, what is wrong with letting students use good old quarters to do their laundry? It didn't cost as much to use quarters, \$1.00 to wash and dry. It may be free to dry your clothes using this new system but it costs \$1.50 just to wash your clothes. I may as well go to the laundromat and wash my clothes there; it can't cost that much more.

So what is the point of Lion Cash?

I don't know, maybe it's just another way to complicate life on campus. Hey if you ask me, Lion Cash sucks.

Due to technical difficulties the Beacon was unable to obtain the name of the author of this letter. If you would like to resend the letter with your name we will reprint it in next week's issue.

National Commentary

Most NFL players belie thug stereotype by giving generously of time

by Whitt Flora
Knight-Ridder Tribune

PHOENIX -- America's parents have every right to be horrified that two NFL players have been charged with murder -- criminals are terrible role models for their kids.

So it's easy to forget that the NFL has hundreds of stars who set good examples by helping others, including at-risk youngsters.

The athletes work with thousands of needy people, and their commitments run deep. Hall of Famers Doak Walker and Tom Fears, who died recently, kept their charitable commitments right up to the end even though they suffered severe paralysis and Alzheimer's disease.

It's also worth noting that much of the volunteer work is done by former stars who already have all the fame and money they could possibly use and now concentrate on helping kids.

For example, there's Rayfield Wright, the six-time Pro Bowl tackle best known for his exploits with the Dallas Cowboys, who runs "Kids 4 Tomorrow" in the Phoenix suburb of Scottsdale.

His organization is dedicated to keeping school-age young people from becoming addicted to drugs and

alcohol and encouraging them to stay in school. Founded by Wright and Andy Livingston (former Chicago Bear and New Orleans Saint), this highly successful program pairs retired athletes with at-risk children.

Kids 4 Tomorrow is so successful that a fledgling company that provides international online business directories for Internet users, OnLineNow.com, recently gave the program \$1 million worth of Internet advertising. "From our very first day, one of our guiding principles was to give something back to the communities we served," said OnLineNow.com founder Bracken Cherry.

"The kind of work that Rayfield and Andy are doing is not only inspiring; it's absolutely vital to the future of our country," he said. "We chose Kids 4 Tomorrow because the athletes get down in the trenches and come into a community and work one-on-one with individual kids and their peers," Cherry added. "It is one thing to meet a sports star, but another to actually become friends with one... it has the potential to change a lot of lives in the right direction."

In addition, the online company and Kids 4 Tomorrow are developing a program to use pictures of the athletes

and audio files to spread their message of hope and redemption on the Web.

Meanwhile, more than 100 former NFL stars, some with terminal conditions, have been working each day to provide financial help to former teammates who have fallen on hard times.

This effort started several years ago when former San Diego Chargers tackle Ron Mix learned that many of his fellow members of the Pro Football Hall of Fame were trying to live on not much more than Social Security and a modest NFL pension. For some of the former stars, that means a total family income near the poverty line.

Determined to help, Mix asked each of the 130 members of the Hall of Fame to sign 2,500 trading card specially designed for them. The cards would be sold in sets for \$1,675 to help the now-forgotten members of the Hall.

More than 90 percent of the Hall members agreed, including big names such as Joe Namath, Tony Dorsett and Dick Butkus. Those former stars, Mix says, "saw it as a way to give back to guys who loved the game as much as they did. This wouldn't have worked without those guys."

Mix shipped the card sets for sign-

Putting The 'Liberal' In Liberal Arts

by Kelly Sullivan
Grove City College

As a college senior who chose to attend a "conservative" school, I always knew that most of academia was, well, liberal. But I didn't realize until recently just how hard it is to find anyone to the right of Ted Kennedy on an American campus.

This might sound odd, given the lip service many professors pay to "diversity." But consider the evidence. In a recent issue of Policy Review, a journal of the Heritage Foundation, professor Paul Kengor examines the political makeup of the social science departments at some of America's top colleges and universities.

Stanford University, for example, has 22 Democrats and just two Republicans in its history department. Cornell University has 29 Democrats and no Republicans. But the most eye-opening figure is from the University of Colorado in Boulder. Of the 190 professors polled in the social science and humanities departments, 184 are Democrats and only six are Republicans.

A broader survey of 800 professors from 40 universities taken in 1996 found that 37 percent considered themselves liberal, 43 percent called themselves moderate (perhaps some timid liberals hiding here), and 17 percent called themselves conservative. Still another survey found that 88 percent of "public affairs" faculty — who train students for careers in government — considered themselves liberal. The other 12 percent called themselves moderate.

The "hard" sciences do not appear to have the imbalance of the social

sciences and humanities. Professor Lewis Feuer of the University of Virginia has observed that most campus opponents of Western culture tend to come from "soft" academic disciplines, such as journalism and political science, which lack the objective "reality checks" of subjects such as mathematics. "What emerges," he writes, "is a smug, unexamined, and unchallenged consensus that dismisses dissent as a rude intrusion."

Critics will say the imbalance of political views among professors doesn't prove anything — and that conservatives are paranoid when they claim education has given way to indoctrination.

Unfortunately, conservatives appear to be right. Just look at a sample of some current course offerings. At Cornell, students can enroll in "The Sexual Child," whose instructor, Ellis Hanson, told Accuracy in Academia that the aim of the course is "to undermine preconceived notions about what a child is, what sexuality is, and what it means to love or desire a child." Required reading includes such classics as "How to Bring Your Kid Up Gay" and "Child Loving." One can only imagine the pride — or more likely horror — in a mother's eyes when her son or daughter brings home an "A" in this course.

The list of politicized courses goes on and on, including UCLA's "Gay and Lesbian Perspectives in Pop Music," Dartmouth's "Gender, Jocks and Justice," and the University of Connecticut's "White Racism" (so much for promoting racial harmony). Not to be outdone, Princeton University has hired a "bioethics" professor whose ideas on infanticide

are provocative, at the very least. Peter Singer has actually said "newborn infants, especially if unwanted, are not yet full members of the moral community," and therefore it's defensible to kill them.

Despite vehement protests — including one by former GOP presidential candidate Steve Forbes, a member of Princeton's Board of Trustees — Singer's appointment was endorsed by Princeton's administration, which referred to his doctrines as "mainstream."

In fact, the American Association of University Professors praises politically correct courses as expressions of academic freedom. In truth, they are examples of academic absurdity.

Bradford Wilson, executive director of the National Association of Scholars, believes such politicization of higher education "erodes the intellectual habit of openness to differing points of view," because administrators make clear by the courses they offer exactly that only certain views are acceptable. In the name of diversity, they are actually enforcing a rigid orthodoxy. As the Singer example shows, students can openly debate the merits of infanticide, but question affirmative action? Never.

A college education is supposed to produce free-thinking people equipped to form sound opinions, something the Founding Fathers said was essential to preserving democracy. Instead, many of today's students are being programmed to hold the views of their professors — which, in the current academic environment, gives new meaning to the "liberal" in Liberal Arts.

Disney's 'Semi-Charmed Life'

by Adam Shiver
University of Central Florida

Well, Disney is doing it again. Causing controversy that is.

I recently visited my friendly neighborhood movie theater to catch a film. I grabbed my snacks and headed to my seat just in time for previews, one of my favorite things about the whole show. As the previews progressed, I noticed one for Disney's recently released animated film, "A Tigger Movie."

As the preview started, my ears perked up at the sound of one of my favorite bands playing background music for this new Disney children's movie. I immediately recognized the catchy intro to Third Eye Blind's hit single "Semi-Charmed Life."

In just a few seconds, the song's lyrics really sank in. They're very focused on sex and drugs. In the first

verse alone lead singer Steven Jenkins refers to oral sex and taking drugs through the nose. The song also alludes to crystal meth and how to take it.

"They're very focused on sex and drugs."

While many of my college-age friends and I love this band, there's little doubt that this song in particular is sorely inappropriate for a children's movie — or even a preview advertising one.

I'm not sure what Disney was thinking when they picked this tune

for a trailer, but one thing is certain: they're only hanging themselves by doing so. After all, people have already gotten riled over some of their last films. Rumors still abound that that's a penis pictured on the cover art of "The Little Mermaid" and that animators spelled the word "sex" in clouds swirling throughout "The Lion King." There have also been plenty of people noticing just how well endowed and shapely some of Disney's leading animated, female characters have been.

Does the company do this stuff on purpose? You'd think they'd be more careful given the questions that have been raised in the not-so-recent past. Then again, after hearing Third-Eye Blind's music used to peddle a children's film, maybe I'm giving Disney too much credit for maintaining its high standards for family entertainment.

