

Friday, October 10, 2003

The Behrend Beacon

## The Behrend Beacon

published weekly by the students of Penn State Erie, The Behrend College

Editor in Chief  
Lauren Packer

Managing Editor  
Robert Wynne

Ass't. Managing Editor  
Scott Soltis

News Editors  
Courtney Straub  
Justin Curry

Sports Editors  
Kevin Fiorenzo  
Amy Frizzell

Editorial Page Editor  
Eileen Falkenberg

Features Editor  
Erika Jarvis

Greek Life Editor  
Eileen Falkenberg

Staff Photographers  
Jeff Hankey  
Heather Myers



THE BEHREND  
Beacon

"A newspaper by the  
students for the students"

Advertising Manager  
Ryan Russell

Calendar Page Editor  
Amy Wilczynski

A&E Editor  
Daniel J. Stasiewski

Healthy Living Editors  
Courtney Straub  
Erika Jarvis

Adviser  
Cathy L. Roan, Ph.D.

Copy Editors  
Carolyn M. Tellers  
Kristin Bowers

The Beacon is published weekly by the students of Penn State Erie, the Behrend College; First Floor, The J. Elmer Reed Union Building, Station Road, Erie, PA 16563. Contact The Beacon at: Telephone: (814) 898-6488 Fax: (814) 898-6019 ISSN 1071-9288.

The Beacon encourages letters to the editor. Letters should include the address, phone number, semester standing, and major of the writer. Writers can mail letters to [behrcoll2@aol.com](mailto:behrcoll2@aol.com). Letters must be received no later than 5 p.m. Monday for inclusion in that week's issue. The Beacon reserves the right to edit letters for length, content, libel, spelling, and grammar.



## The look of love

by Myriam Marquez  
The Orlando Sentinel

Arnold Schwarzenegger smiles at his wife, Maria Shriver, as he celebrates his victory Tuesday night in Los Angeles. An easy win, thanks to Kennedy gal's A magic.

There will be theories galore: The voters fed up with business-as-usual politicians. The body-builder-turned-actor-turned-governor-wannabe buying victory with millions of dollars of his own money. The star appeal of the highest-paid action-hero in the world trumping any real voter analysis of his positions or more precisely, voters' lackadaisical attitude about his lack of specifics on just about everything. Forget them all.

In the end, it was the striking presence of a Kennedy that made all the difference for Arnold Schwarzenegger.

Arnold couldn't have made history in California without Maria. And he knows it. No more than a few sentences into his acceptance speech after Tuesday's recall election of Gov. Gray (boy, is that an appropriate name for a lackluster old pol) Davis, Arnold told the world that he won thanks to his wife, NBC News Correspondent Maria Kennedy Shriver.

I couldn't have done it without Maria, he said to cheers.

Bad boy or not. Groper or worse. Voters didn't care. None of it mattered because Shriver, the daughter of Eunice Kennedy and Sargent Shriver (the running mate of the most liberal of Democrats, George McGovern), stood by her man. It's as if they were conjoined twins ever since The Los Angeles Times published last week the allegations of six women who said Arnold, as recently as 2000, had grabbed a left breast here and there, grabbed a buttock for fun, made outrageously humiliating sexual advances and on and on.

Immediately, Arnold said he "behaved badly" on movie sets and "apologized" while maintaining that most of the allegations were untrue and refusing to elaborate. And, amazingly, it worked! Maria came to his defense in a Hollywood minute, even as the tally of women with wild tales about Arnold grew to 15.

Forget the numbers. The timing of those allegations coming so close to the election (how could they not in a campaign squeezed into two-and-a-half months?)

only helped Schwarzenegger. Voters, including many women, suspected his accusers' trash talk was nothing more than dirty politics coordinated by Davis.

And there was Maria, in stop after stop, never wavering, never once showing any sign that there could be an ounce of doubt in her mind about her husband's ethical core.

She asked voters: Who are you going to trust? Anonymous women who are saying bad things or even those who give their names and talk about Arnold's raunchy side, or this woman, the gal who has pledged to love him for better or worse?

Trust me, she told voters. I'm his wife, the mother of his four children, the woman who knows him best.

And in case the little-woman thing, the Tammy Wynette act, the Hillary The Doormat imitation wasn't going to sway voters, Maria had her journalism credentials to hold over anyone. Whom are you going to trust, she told voters, "gutter journalism?" And with journalists long competing with used-car salesmen in the trust department (as the daughter of a car salesman, rest his soul, I take exception), Arnold got the easy knee-jerk response he needed to win.

Besides, voters had decided a month ago to recall Davis, polls found. Allegations, schmalleations, at least 48 percent of California voters who backed Arnold didn't care. Heck, two thirds of all voters in exit polling said Arnold didn't address the issues in enough detail, but a quarter of those voted for him anyway.

So now a 56-year-old Austrian immigrant, who came penniless to this country and built an entertainment empire, will lead the nation's most-populous state with an economy that's the fifth-largest in the world. A liberal Republican who's a fiscal conservative will try to make sense of a place that's sinking economically. And he hopes to build bipartisan support among politicians he dismissed during the campaign as the very problem to the state's woes.

Voters desperate for a change (President Bush, take notice) gambled on a Horatio Alger of the 21st century to lead them to prosperity. Winning was easy, thanks to Maria. Now comes the tough part governing and there Arnold will need more than macho charisma and Kennedy gal magic to stay on top.

## Homework and group work are pointless at any age

Once again, the topic of homework has made the headlines of national newspapers. Once again, it is saying the same thing.

Educators and parents do not feel that children are being pushed hard enough in school and want hours of homework assigned. Other educators and parents feel that children have far too much homework assigned. Moreover, the children still state that they spend less than an hour a day doing homework for school.

Hours of homework piled onto a child are useless at any age.

First, high school-aged children and below generally require the use of adults or some form of assistance to complete any given assignment. Parents today are too busy working, cooking, cleaning or car-pooling their children to various activities to spend hours helping with homework. Parents also have to spend time one-on-one with their children, and unless you are the Waltons or the Camdens from "Seventh Heaven," how many parents are able to sit for patiently for hours helping their child with homework? Patiently and hours being the key words.

Second, after elementary school is high school, where recess is no more. High school is a time where teens are figuring out what group of peers they best fit in with, what activities they like, what activities they are good at, and they are starting to rebel against their parents and other forms of authority.

When a child has so many activities to participate in, and is building a positive self-image and interacting with peers, why would anyone want to cut short these character-building experiences to assign homework? Then, at a time when teens and parents are at the height of re-

bellion, let's have teachers pile on the suggested hours of homework.

It doesn't add up.

Some educators falsely give their claim validity by saying that students are unprepared for college and receiving bad grades because of the lack of homework in high school.

I have not done any research, but an educated guess after having gone through three years of college and being in my senior year is simply this. It is not so much the lack of homework given in high school, but the lack of knowledge in areas such as time management, prioritizing and partying too much.

Even Penn State gets in on the homework bandwagon with their general rule of thumb: Students should spend at least three hours outside of class for every hour spent in class.

Bottom line, unless it's a class that students are having trouble grasping concepts, or students really like the class, nine hours a week on a three credit class is entirely too much to spend studying. For most classes, the Packer rule of thumb is one hour outside of class per hour in class, and that is only if something is due the next class.

Moreover, why must there be group work? Every major has it; every student hates it. College group work is absolutely more useless than homework and fails miserably for the following reasons:

1. **One student does all the work.** You know the drill. Maybe you even are this person. Inevitably, in each group there is one student who is not willing to work with the group for fear that his/her grade will suffer, has social anxiety disorder or the other members are so

lazy that one member must rise to the challenge and complete the assignment so everybody does not fail.

2. **Students concede to each other in order to save face.** In this case, group members usually agree to agree so that no one gets mad. Group unity is almost bigger than the project and grade. The work is done fairly well because members of this type of group are usually concerned about the grade as well as how their classmates view their peers' work.

3. **No students want to put forth the effort on the forced assignment that may or may not have any relevance to them or their major.** This is where students do the assignment because it is required for a larger part of their grade. Members of the group put forth about 25 percent in effort and say "I'll do this part" so that others cannot write in their papers that they did not do anything.

4. **Combination of previous three.** This is by far the most severe case of failed group work. It is the result of procrastination and too many other failing groups near the end of the semester.

Education institutions are doing a great disservice by assigning group work. Students find ways around it in order to get the desired grade. Lying on group papers is a common phenomenon.

All this homework and group work for what? Give students homework in elementary and high school and they miss important socializing skills and self-discovery. Keep giving them homework and group work in college and they get set up for failure.

In the business world, no one will concede to get a good grade. One worker might end up doing all the work and others might not care about being your friend in the project. It is a tough lesson to learn, and I'm glad the educators in our society want to spend a lifetime teaching us a lesson that in the end is wrong.

## Rush Limbaugh's relative mass

by Adam Massaro  
staff writer

Rush Limbaugh brazenly pushed all his chips to the middle of the public opinion poker game, after calling the media's bluff. However, he was beat before he could show his hand—the opposition trumped his hand, laying down their ace-in-the-hole, er, race card.

Limbaugh, a syndicated radio talk show host, recently opined on ESPN's NFL Countdown that Philadelphia Eagles quarterback Donovan McNabb was overrated and over-hyped by the media because of his skin color. Following his comments, public dissonance was expressed by civil rights leaders, and resulted in Limbaugh's timely resignation.

The opposition failed to grasp that Limbaugh's statement was not directed at McNabb the player, but the hype that had been built around McNabb by the media. With public pressure to see black Americans succeed at the quarterback position, the media has rallied behind McNabb as its poster child. Limbaugh was not criticizing McNabb because of his race; he was criticizing the media for their unethical bias towards him.

As a whole America has become so conscious about being politically correct

that racial issues cannot even be uttered for fear that they will be twisted and misinterpreted into a racially motivated statement. Limbaugh had no malice toward McNabb or anyone of his race, yet his comments were treated in such a manner.

In the court of public opinion, Limbaugh was charged unjustly with making a racist comment. The opposition prematurely raised their red flags, refusing to hear Limbaugh out, and instead opted to begin catapulting accusations at him.

Adding to the hypocrisy, Limbaugh was stereotyped because he is a Caucasian, conservative and the concomitant was automatically drawn that he was a racist too. Limbaugh was plagued by a double standard, for if either black Countdown host Michael Irvin or Tom Jackson would have made the comment, it would have gone without question.

Limbaugh was flagged for going against the grain and bringing to light an issue that most would rather keep in the closet. If an individual fears to make a statement, since public persecution will follow, it is equally a violation of freedom of speech. One should not fear losing their jobs, because they pointed out a flaw in the system. If that flaw

goes unattended, it will expand and weaken the integrity of the system.

Everyone operates on pins and needles because they are afraid to step outside of the PC boundaries. Sometimes those lines need to be broken and redrawn in order to deal with new issues. If people are unwilling to accept that concept, when someone does step over the line, the public backlash will be that much more amplified.

We do not live in a clear society, albeit no issue is black and white either, sometimes for movement to occur the initiator must go out on a limb.

Limbaugh has been a lightning rod in the past and will continue to be one. His statement was not intended to cut down black pursuit to play quarterback, but to suggest the media was doing a disservice to them.

When we hear race, we turn a deafening ear to the focal point of the argument, ostracize the speaker and run and hide behind our proverbial "PC shields." Unfortunately we cannot deflect issues forever, these problems will not just go away and we cannot ask for their resignation, they must be addressed.

## Letter to the Editor

### The hassles of living the in U.S.A.

Dear Editor,

We have freedom of speech. I can yell "fire" in a crowded movie theater. I can tell the staff at the bookstore that I have a bomb. I can even express my political opinions. But, for all those actions, I must accept their consequences.

Mohammed Hoque, though you are advocating a noble cause, you are misguided in your interpretation of free speech.

First, Mr. Hoque, you criticize the media for its poor opinions of Islam. How can you condemn acts against free speech but criticize news reports that offend you? Is that not a contradiction on your terms?

You display your misunderstanding of the media's purpose in your prayer when you ask Allah to "Remind them (the media) of the moral practical value of the simple truth of humility." You must consider that most people do not live up to your standard of morality and the media, being a capitalist entity, is representative of most people. By that reason, the media shall always be immoral to you. You complain that having the name Mohammed makes you feel uncomfortable when talking about certain issues in public. Have you considered that in most Arab countries, freedom of speech is nonexistent because the controllers of those nations are despots? While you

may feel uncomfortable talking about Iraq in Bruno's, I, being an Israeli Jew cannot even attempt to enter most Arab countries for the high likelihood of anti-Semitic persecution.

Mr. Hoque, you have free speech, just as I have free speech. As you should avoid talking about Iraq in Bruno's to prevent malicious behavior, I should avoid talking about suicide bombers and whites should avoid talking about racism. Mischievous people are everywhere and, despite your belief, you are not immune from them.

Sam Marvit  
Biology, 02