

# Elements of the Honor Code revisions are un-American

## Wolf questions new police officers' rights

**E**xamples of College Business include... Failure to respond to a request from the campus police."

Recently, members of an Honor Council subcommittee submitted a proposal to the Student Conduct Council to revise the current Honor Code.

**STUDENT OPINION**  
**Ben Wolff**

While these changes ostensibly aim to "provide greater clarity and organization" to the Code, they do neither. Instead, the proposed revision would detract from the beautiful simplicity of the present Code with the unclear nonsequitur above. What types of requests are covered by this clause? Would failure to tie one's shoes if asked by a police officer

constitute a violation under the new Code? What about failure to leave a Court party when initially asked to do so by a police officer? These activities neither violate the law nor constitute any veritable definition of lying, cheating, or stealing prohibited under the Code.

Regardless, under the proposed revisions, the Honor Council would have no choice but to prosecute the transgressors of such piddling offenses. But just as troubling as the potential for irrational applications of a revised Honor Code is the stark philosophical departure from American cultural and Constitutional traditions the above clause would represent if enacted.

The above proposed Honor Code clause attacks a main tenet upon which this country was founded and has a long tradition of safeguarding: personal liberty.

Enshrined in the Constitution is the idea that one is free to act as s/he wishes so long as by their

actions they do not infringe upon the person or property of another. Indeed, our country was founded by political and religious refugees seeking greater freedom and liberty. But under the new Code, Davidson College will be the only place in America (other than prison) where a person is required to offer an explanation if a police officer asks you where you are going. A person will be compelled to justify any and all activities to the police if an officer should feel inclined to inquire. In unchecked power lies the potential for abuse. Police, being fallible like everyone else, are not immune to the lures and attractions which power holds, and therefore should be denied this unprecedented expansion of power.

One of the great traditions of the American legal system, established by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, is the right to refuse to incriminate oneself in criminal proceedings. The burden of proof lies with the state; it is not the accused who

is required to produce the evidence to arrest or convict. The new Code would fly in the face of this tradition by forcing students to explain their actions, even if in doing so they may be incriminating themselves.

The proposed Code revisions are un-American, desecrating our national and cultural heritage and traditions, while raping the sacred ideals of personal sanctity and liberty. The right to know and to compel are extraordinary powers, which, as with all forms of power, can be corrupting. When police possess this ultimate power, we become subjects in a police state, rather than students in a college. There is no liberty where one's freedom is conditional upon the whims of another.

The Honor Council and the Student Conduct Council should reconsider this dangerous proposition, or if they decide to go forward, the proposition should be put before a vote of those it affects: the students.

# The Davidsonian unprofessional

I am thrilled that The Davidsonian gave "Take Back the Night" front page coverage, but I wonder how much more effective it would have been if the information covered in the article and the Op-ed section were correct. Granted, the day before the last edition of The Davidsonian came out, Sarah Ogden apologized for her procrastination in talking with me about the story, but the damage was done. So, let me set a few things straight for the greater public who could not attend. (Note: Thank you to everyone who tried to

**STUDENT OPINION**  
**Christina Biedermann**

come and was turned away. We are trying to find a larger venue that still creates the safe atmosphere for speakers. I hope that you will be patient, recognize the effect of venue on speakers, and come again next year.)

First, Women's Month is not some creation of the Women's Issues Committee; March is National Women's Month. I am the first to agree that Women's issues should not be forgotten on Apr. 1, but, like the rationale for other "months" such as African American History Month, a concentration of events into one month allows for increased awareness simply in being a "month."

Last time I checked, the Women's Issues Committee sponsored events outside of March, too, but, perhaps The Davidsonian didn't see those by virtue of not being included in a mass publicity effort for a "month." In response to the Women's Issues Committee using the "infamous" publicity for "Take Back The Night" to boost attendance at other events — that's ridiculous. I hardly think that people attend the car repair workshop based

on their experiences at "Take Back the Night."

**MEN ARE WANTED AT TAKE BACK THE NIGHT.** Did you hear that? We begged men to speak. We begged men to attend. If you didn't hear us or thought that the atmosphere was not conducive to men, give us suggestions. Our flyers on the doors to the men's bathroom were torn down. "Take Back the Night" serves two purposes: to provide a forum for people (notice no mention of gender) to heal and to provide a unique type of sexual assault education. Nowhere does it exclude or point fingers at men. It points fingers at perpetrators. Lest I repeat again — this is a social issue. Men also need to think about it and protect themselves. (Yes, men are assaulted at Davidson, too. It happens more often than you think. I know personally of two men who were sexually assaulted.)

Finally, a few corrections... according to the latest FBI stats, two percent of reported rapes are false, not four percent. Also, by no means did a majority of the speakers' experiences involve alcohol. Three of nine hardly qualifies as a majority. Perhaps The Davidsonian's staff should remove itself from the blinding light of the "sunny exterior" of Women's Month and look and listen for the real issues and facts. They are serious and sensitive.

In the past, The Davidsonian has handled the event in the appropriate manner. No pictures were taken of speakers and names of speakers were not disclosed in the article. Next year, ask before you publish someone's name as a speaker, clear the quotations with them, stop the flash photography, and get the facts straight.

For all of the courage that it takes women (and men) to speak and to attend, The Davidsonian owes them at least these decencies.

Thank you again to all the people who the Davidsonian ignored: Elizabeth Malphurs, the Student Health Center, and Margaret Lumpkin.

# Davidson's diversity is okay

## Can't we all just eat together?

The Davidsonian's Op-Ed pages have been filled lately with criticisms of the school, its students, and its policies. People have expressed mostly negative views concerning the issues of racism on our campus. Perhaps I have been seeing Davidson College through rose-colored glasses, but I don't think we're that bad off. It is very difficult for a college of Davidson's

**STUDENT OPINION**  
**Eric Ferguson**

limited diversity to have a completely integrated campus. We have such a small percentage of minority students that any instance where a number of those students gather in one place seems like segregation. The most often-cited example is the lunch table at the Commons where upwards of a dozen students of African descent gather to share lunch. I must have been naive; I thought they sat together because they had things in common to talk about while they were eating.

The Commons has many other instances of students sitting together who share common interests such as the "football table" (the long table to the right of the lunch lines as you walk in) or other tables where athletic groups gather together. Many freshmen sit together as a hall; is

this segregation? If not, what is so different about a group of black people sitting together? If it is segregation, why do we not hear about the segregation athletic teams or freshman halls impose upon themselves?

Is it because of race? Of course. The only reason that we notice this particular group of students is because they are black, and we prove ourselves racists by calling their assemblage segregation while ignoring other more uniform assemblages.

This "segregation" can be overcome very easily simply by having white people sit there on occasion. In fact, that already occurs! If you look very carefully you may see a white person having a conversation with a black person — at the "black table," of all places! I have visited there myself, as have lots of other players on the football team (and undoubtedly many others who I am not as familiar with). Know what I found? It's just a normal table. Is it segregation? Perhaps, but only in the sense of shared interests. Is it racist? Definitely not.

Perhaps of more serious concern is the proposal for halls containing only students of African descent. Phil Julien argued very effectively against the halls, and from a viewpoint I could never take. I refer anyone who has not read his article to last week's edition of The Davidsonian. I could not argue the point any better and will not attempt to here. Suffice it to say that Phil gets a ringing endorsement from this student.

**"We have such a small percentage of minority students that any instance where a number of those students gather in one place seems like segregation."**

# Alenda Lux except on weekends by Nate Lotze

