

Board's judicial process is not fair

(Continued from Page 4)

I could see no hard evidence of marijuana (joints, paraphernalia, etc.) that they were O.K. this time, however, I told them I would have to cite them for noise and underage drinking." After Sue said this, nothing else was mentioned about marijuana, we were cited for drinking, and they left.

Twelve days later, Oct. 1, every student in the room received an unexpected letter stating that they must face the judicial board on the following charge: "9. Use or possession of any controlled substance defined by state or federal law to be illegal (specifically marijuana)."

On Oct. 5, the judicial hearing was carried out. During the hearing, Sue testified that she could not smell marijuana inside the

room. However, B.C. testified that the smell was evident. His testimony contradicted all of the other seven testimonies of the people who were in the room.

On Oct. 6 the judicial board found every student in the room innocent with the exception of me. I was found guilty of the charge stated above, put on probation for the rest of the semester, and now have a damaging scar on my transcripts which will be taken into consideration by any job I apply for after graduation, unless I win the appeal.

Other evidence which influenced the board's decision involved the following:

- A student was seen leaving the room by sliding out the door and quickly closing it behind him.
- I answered their knock by opening the door only enough to stick my face out.
- The air conditioner was on.
- One of the two vents on either side of the air conditioner was open.
- Almost everyone was smoking cigarettes.

None of this evidence is substantial. It only gains credibility through assumption. In Sue's five-page report, she also wrote, "Security mentioned that the guy who scooted out to the bathroom before I knocked on the door could have flushed any remaining 'pot' if indeed they had been smoking."

The problem here is not centered on the members of the judicial board but rather the judicial system. During the hearings I

made it clear that all of their evidence is superficial and would never hold up in a court of law. Their reply was, "This is not a court of law." It is this that confuses me.

I realize that the judicial board is not a court of law. However, this does not allow for Wesleyan's judicial system to prosecute students purely on speculative evidence and opinion. The hearing procedure specifically states that the student's right to due process will be ensured to the fullest effort, however it does not necessitate the need for evidence to be presented in a legal manner in order to take appropriate disciplinary action.

This statement allows for loopholes in the judicial procedure and often it infringes on the defendant's basic civil liberties that are established in the Bill of Rights. The judicial board's current hearing procedures are not only personally degrading but contradict the fundamental foundation of the American government, the U.S. Constitution.

Tom Cowan

Judicial board oversteps bounds

Dear Editor:

On Oct. 5 the judicial board of North Carolina Wesleyan College heard my case. The charges were possession of use of an illegal substance, specifically marijuana.

I was convinced by judicial coordinator Steve Brummett that

this case was an attempt by the college to be as fair as possible in a situation based on only circumstantial evidence. I told Steve, "I hope that when I am found innocent, that my character will not be shunned upon simply because I had appeared in such a case." Mr. Brummett assured me that if I was to be found innocent in my case, that no such thing could happen.

Fortunately, justice did prevail and I did prove my innocence to the jury. However, I can't quite figure out why Mr. Snyder, a student member of the jury, said to me shortly after my verdict had been read, "You better watch your butt, son."

This remark was derogatory, unnecessary, and carried with it connotations suggesting that I had done something wrong. I was also told by the entire jury that they did not want to see my face in front of the judicial board again. This case was absolutely nothing but a false accusation; my innocent verdict proves that. How can I be sure that I will not be falsely accused again and brought in front of the board under similar pretenses? I cannot. And if a case similar to this one was to occur, would I be judged fairly?

The thing I find so frightening is that this all seems so logical to the judicial board. Before leaving the religious life center in which my verdict was read, I was given a bit of advice by the board. They said to help ensure that I do not appear in front of them again

that I should choose the "crowd" with whom I associate with very carefully. That in itself is a precursor to discrimination.

Perhaps we should let the judicial board conduct hearings to choose our friends for us.

J. Brad Taishoff

Not all athletes disrupt library

Dear Editor:

I became extremely upset with the letter to the editor in the last issue of *The Decree*. It stated that the noise in the library is caused by student athletes. I do fully agree that the library is much too noisy, however, I do not appreciate the fact that it has been blamed on student athletes.

I am a "damned" student athlete, as explained by the last issue's writer, and am very quiet in the library. I do not agree with this title of me and wish that people would stop separating athletes from the rest of the school. Just because a student is involved with sports does not mean that he or she is not concerned with their studies. I am not classifying all athletes as being as serious about studies as others, but neither are all students. I feel that it is wrong to categorize students in this way.

If the writer wants to point fingers to the noise, I suggest that she do so to the whole student body, not just to athletes. I have been in the library enough to know that it is not only us.

Jennifer J. Meagher

Rabbits yes, but no slugs

(Continued from Page 4)

bling over to the lettuce plants.

For days, once even for a couple of weeks, I think it's gone. But no. The other night I left some new pansies on the concrete driveway to keep them away from the slugs I had found in the bed where I want to put them. Sure enough, the rabbit ate them.

But I won't kill this rabbit. (Yes, I tried one of those traps which allow you to take it to the woods. But I swear it finds its way back.) I mean, I lurk about the garden quite guilt-freely tromping on slimy slugs, but I can't bring myself to rap a rabbit on the head. One of my neighbors shoots any living being that steps into his yard, so my yard has become a kind of sanctuary for squirrels and birds. Can they have told the rabbit?

Aren't we humans funny beings? We spend time and expense to set up false, natural-looking spaces of Eden and then selectively kill off the creatures which are instinctively called to co-exist with what we plant. Why is the slug fair game and the rabbit named Peter? Can you imagine a kids' book about Steve the Slug?

And we don't even agree among ourselves. I'm glad to see snakes in my yard. I don't like to spray poisons to kill the bugs because that keeps the birds away. And some people even put ceramic rabbits in their yards to keep the real ones company!

Conservatives will win 'culture war'

By KENNETH LEONARD

When Republicans used the expression "culture war" at the 1992 Convention, the left side of American society jumped out, charging them with using Nazi-like language.

The fact of the matter is that this is not the first time this expression has been used in reference to the current state of affairs in this country, and the expression is perfectly valid. Conservatives are a vital part of a culture war and the opposing force is liberalism. Neither side is seeking compromise on much at all because there cannot be any.

The war was not declared this summer, and not by any conservative. It was declared and started

by the Left. The Right, however, has no choice but to win it. This summer, the GOP merely stated that it was happening and detailed what we have to do.

It was the liberals, remember, who told us that we must give our tax dollars (via the National Endowment for the Arts) to every sado-masochist, child pornographer, and blasphemer (Andres Serrano, Robert Mapplethorpe, etc.) with a camera. It was the liberals who told blacks and women that they could only succeed with the help of affirmative action.

Opinion

Look at the way they treated anti-AA Judge Clarence Thomas. "He would not have succeeded without affirmative action," they said. Read: Do not celebrate successful blacks; they only succeed with white liberals holding their hands.

Those who decide to make failures of themselves by dropping out of school and getting caught up in drugs are given government checks as "entitlements," punishing those who succeed by "progressive" taxation systems.

Those who irresponsibly conceive babies are told to kill them in abortuaries without guilt.

The Left told us that we had to extend legal sanction for every deviate "lifestyle." The University of Massachusetts at Amherst

is on the cutting edge by extending affirmative action protection to pedophiles. Conservatives were once called crazy for claiming that "homosexual rights" would lead to "pedophile rights." Who's crazy now?

Thanks to the effort of dedicated public guardians like the American Civil Liberties Union, prison inmates have the right to pornography but school children cannot see the Ten Commandments on the wall of a classroom. Hugh Hefner is beneficial and Moses is harmful?

Back before all of this "progress," the biggest problems teachers had in public schools were running in the halls, talking

(Continued on Page 6)