

Sapp analyzes Shaw's segregation article

I don't want to get into a personal debate on segregated housing, and I hope I won't have to return to this issue again. But I do feel that I need to address a couple of Charlie Shaw's points. Charlie began his article with the advice his mother gave him (which I assume he was giving me), that one should find out the details to avoid looking "asinine and fatuous." So as not to belabor this point, I will simply say that my information came from the presentation RLO made to the SGA. RLO initiated and implemented the policy of seg-

regation at this school should be evidence of that. Only in the last few paragraphs of Charlie's argument did he address the issue my original article focused on. I'll give him credit for the method he chose to argue against me. One of the best arguments to use against someone arguing for change from a Christian perspective is to say, "Why don't we all just pray about it and let God do what is best?" It is difficult to argue against someone who wants us to put our faith in the Lord and in prayer to solve a problem. Charlie asserts that "the Father will not hold back understanding from His children if they ask it in His Son's name."

So how does a Christian argue against that? I could just turn the same question back on Charlie (perhaps he should have just prayed that God will do what's best and not have written his article). But that's too easy a rebuttal, and I don't agree with the basic assumptions of that argument, anyway. So instead, I'll briefly point out the flaws in Charlie's argument.

First, he assumes that the understanding the Father will give his children is the understanding Charlie wants them to have, namely, that the idea of segregated halls is a good one that will benefit the campus. But as Christians, we can pray only that God will show us and those around us the right course to follow. I have prayed about this issue and believe that the proper course for Davidson to follow is in one direction, yet Charlie (who presumably has also prayed about it) believes it is in

the completely opposite direction. I would never claim that I know for sure that God agrees with me and not Charlie. Maybe we both are right in some way.

My personal opinion is that you have to do what you believe to be right. But, unlike Charlie, I believe that the "doing" should not stop with prayer and faith. Charlie asks that the people who agree with me not try to destroy the idea of segregated Christian halls with their tongues, but instead to pray that the idea will be turned into a positive tool for witnessing and trust that God will answer those prayers.

Jesus and the apostles (the best examples we have of how Christians should live their lives and their faith) spoke out against many things they did not believe to be correct. Jesus even got physically violent once to end a practice with which he did not agree. If you want a specific verse that deals with this issue, the second chapter of James should put an end to this debate: "What good is it if a man claims to have faith but has no deeds . . . Faith without deeds is dead."

Prayer is very important, but Jesus and the apostles did much more than pray, and we, too, are called to do more than just pray about our problems. As someone once said, "We should pray as if everything depends on God, and we should work as if everything depends on us." It is not a sign of a Christian's lack of faith if he/she takes an active role in seeing that a problem is resolved. On the contrary, it is the fulfillment of that faith.

STUDENT OPINION

Eric Sapp

regating halls. What better source could a person use? That deals with Charlie's first argument.

Charlie's second point simply restated the idea that blacks need their own hall so they can study African American history. As has been the case every time I have heard that statement made, he neglected to back it up with an argument or explanation.

Allow me to give a few brief arguments against this idea that we need a segregated hall to be able to study African American History or Christianity. For the last century and a half, we have managed to build our reputation as one of the

In this section, however, he quoted, "Blacks should make the first move in helping to diversify the campus; you have the most to gain." With this exception, all of his quotes were of things I had written in my article, and so one might assume that I made that comment, as well. I want to clarify that I did not say that, nor do I believe it to be the case. The fact that I made the first move in condemning

public appearances, letters to stockholders, and by appearing at a Senate hearing in early March. The noticeably ignorant Senators and bitter rivals of Microsoft accused Gates of monopolistic practices and stifling competition. This has caused a visible backlash against the company, and a lot of people have jumped on the anti-Microsoft (or anti-Gates) bandwagon.

The fact is, sometimes a monopoly is good for consumers. It's called a natural monopoly, and you can read all about it in that paperweight that looks like an Econ 101 textbook. Natural monopolies arise when a single product can be most efficiently produced by a single producer which, in turn, can benefit the consumer. In this case, Win-

dows currently enjoys this position. If the government rules against Microsoft and thwarts their efforts to innovate and improve windows, not only will Microsoft suffer, but the public will, too. Prices will go up and the industry will flounder.

Maybe Gates is a jerk, and maybe he should help out a little more, but despite that, I don't understand how such ill treatment towards a man who has been the best competitor in his field, "worked long hours, set a goal and achieved it, created not just a company but an industry that employs millions, built immense personal wealth for himself and for countless others" can be justified, because when he succeeds, we do, as well.

Leave the poor man alone; Gates is a nice guy

While in Brussels last month, Bill Gates got smacked in the face with a cream pie. I'm a big fan of his, and I have a lot of respect for the man, but it was absolutely hilarious to see one of the world's richest and most powerful men reduced

just said tersely, "Good" and "He deserved it." A little distraught because I like the guy, I told a few more people who all reacted similarly.

Now, I know my research wasn't scientific because I didn't follow my Psych 101 "How to Conduct a Survey" rulebook, but I think it's pretty safe to say that resentment towards Bill Gates is fairly widespread. It doesn't end here, either. Gates has come under fire for his personal and professional life from all angles.

Most people at Davidson don't seem to be too concerned with Mr. Gates's monopolistic power; they just don't like him because he's a rich skinflint.

Arguably, he is, but it's his right to

be so. To say that he has a responsibility to help out those less fortunate is moralistic and unfair. Just because Gates has so much money that buying a Lamborghini would set him back about as much as a Coke would set back an average American, it doesn't mean that he should have to give it away.

I'd like to think that if I were in his position, I would be considerably more philanthropic. But I don't have that much money, and I'm not in his position, so I won't try to tell him — nor should I — that he needs to pay his "fair" share.

Microsoft has been the subject of recent antitrust investigations, and Gates has been at the center of it all. He has come to his company's defense through

STUDENT OPINION

Daniel Pancotto

to looking like Krusty the Clown's sidekick. I thought a few of my friends would get a kick out of it, too, so I told the story, complete with gestures and sound effects. Instead of laughing, they

Skattum's argument is wrong

I am sorry to have so offended Randy Skattum when I and another woman taking the R.A.D. self-defense course said that "all men are potential rapists." We were, as he said, explaining why the male reporter for The Davidsonian had been told that he could not observe the class, and that if an article were needed, a woman would have to be sent to do it. We explained that the official policy of the course was to include women only, as a male, a potential rapist, could use the information presented against a victim.

Now, obviously, only a verifiable serial rapist might take the time and energy to actually do this in hopes of thwarting his victims' attempts of escape. Very likely, no such guy exists on Davidson's campus, and if he does, he's probably not the innocent reporter who came into our class. Unfortunately, that's all beside the point.

We don't know who is a rapist and who is not. We can't tell by looking at them. So, Randy, and the undoubtedly many other offended males, I'm sorry, but all men are potential rapists — a point which even Randy doesn't argue with. The word potential makes it very difficult to do so. But Randy is convinced that telling women such a thing is a "manipulation" of her fear. He says that the statement "tries to further the caution that women should have in their encounters with men... even a simple smile or the opening of a door should

be."

The first half of what he says is entirely true. This is precisely the intent of the statement that all men are potential rapists. It is the goal and purposeful intent of the R.A.D. course and the statements made by the instructors to increase women's awareness of risk.

Randy says, "How does living in such fear help anyone?" I'm afraid, however, that women, especially at Davidson, may not be living in quite enough fear. Women are often even dangerously oblivious to the risks that they take and to the potential for rape in their very own lives. But R.A.D. is not teaching us to fear a smile or a friendly gesture. It's teaching us to look under our cars as we approach them in a parking lot, to jog in well-lit areas at night, to tell a friend where we are going on a date and what time we expect to be back.

Randy says that "the fear that people already have for a certain situation is enough to put them on guard," and that "augmenting that fear with slanderous generalities only harms those involved and in no way aids anyone." I beg to differ. Unfortunately, it often takes the rape of a woman to put her on guard for the rest of her life. The rest of us should be on guard way before then, and it takes the realization that we are not invulnerable, that there are rapists around us, to do just that. That knowledge is an imperative part of self-

The value of fear

As I started to read Randy Skattum's "The problems with fear" in the Mar. 17, 1998, edition of The Davidsonian, I was a little frustrated that another article concerning the difficult life of The Davidsonian staff had made its way to print. As I read further, Skattum's words began to trouble me a great deal more.

STUDENT OPINION

Charles A. Stormont

In his efforts to cover the Rape Aggression Defense (R.A.D.) classes, Skattum had been told that "all men are potential rapists." Skattum argued that "rather than being beneficial... this statement only causes damage, mainly through the manipulation of a woman's fear" claiming that it played "off of the fear that is already part of the problem of rape." I disagree.

In asking if such a statement is beneficial to anyone, I think it is worthwhile to ponder why it is that such a statement can even be made. That fear is a part of the problem of rape is certainly true, but I would argue that there is a lack of fear among many men, not too much fear among women. Why aren't many men afraid to commit rape? What does this tell us about our society?

Skattum feels that the disputed statement would lead women "to be even more skeptical of the intentions of any male they encounter." This

judgmental and ignores the way in which most people use such a statement. I do not believe that anyone would take such a statement to heart without at least contemplating it for a few moments. Few people would use it alone to pass judgement on others. If anyone did, I would again have to wonder what that says about the nature of our society.

In Book Three of his "Ethics," Aristotle writes that the courageous man fears some things, as "there are some things which one should fear, and it is noble to do so, while not to fear them is disgraceful." He goes on to ask, "With what kind of fearful things, then, is a courageous man concerned? Is it not with the greatest? For no one else can endure terrible things more than such a man." He identifies fear of death as the greatest, and I would have to place rape high on the list of the most fearful things. I would argue that by informing women in a R.A.D. class that all men are potential rapists, they are better able to identify one of the most fearful things in life, and thus they are able to act on that fear more courageously. It also identifies a serious societal problem for the rest of us.

Aristotle warns against acting rashly and against not fearing those things worthy of fear. Skattum seems to have rashly assumed that women are incapable of using a statement like "all men are potential rapists" reasonably. His argument does not address the notion that fear can be an empowering emotion. Personally, I would like to see all women and men on this campus act more courageously, so to Randy Skattum I say, "All

STUDENT OPINION

Kathy Buek