

Arts & Entertainment

Seniors display talent in multi-format art exhibit

By Michelle Alwerdt
Pilot staff writer

An art exhibit in the Communications Studies Hall featuring works by Gardner-Webb seniors opens with a reception for the artists April 16 from 4-6 p.m.

Works by art students Trudy Roth and Lauren Bilyeu comprise the bulk of the show, but there will be photography and graphic design displays as well. Roth transferred to Gardner-

Webb as an English major three and a half years ago, she said, but after taking one drawing class she quickly changed her major.

Now, she is an art major with an English and art history minor.

Bilyeu is double majoring in art and psychology.

The inspiration behind Roth's show is her childhood in Miami, specifically a place called Overtown. When Roth was in the 1950s, segregation

was a way of life. Overtown was a black section of town.

"I loved going there, it was so vibrant and alive," said Roth. "There was a bar on one corner where music always came out and right across the street was a church where men were always out barbequing and it smelled so good. These wonderful sensory things flooded me."

Her childhood memories began with a story that morphed into a painting. From there, she continued on to make the pieces

in her show. In addition to painting, she has some sculptural pieces that reflect her Miami experience.

"It's like a trip down memory lane," says Roth. "My exhibit is bringing to life a memory."

Bilyeu's show "Litter Landscapes," instead of telling a story, allows viewers to enter into her visions.

According to a press release, "Bilyeu approaches the canvas, mattress, or any other recyclable material that she scavenges

from a dumpster with the idea to create art that helps change the thinking and behavior of her viewers."

Her show deals with the environment and other pieces deal with the issue of sex trafficking.

In the press release, Bilyeu said, "The need to illustrate the suffering that 20 million women and children experience as sex slaves became a priority."

The exhibit will hang through graduation day, May 11.

No more pussyfooting around on 'America's Next Top Model'

By Diana Palka
Pilot staff writer

The CW network could not have picked a better opening scene for last week's episode, "Here's your test."

A housewide catfight erupted, with the girls siding with either Ceilia or Tahlia. Aminat got in Natalie's face, claiming an alliance was what caused Celia's bold betrayal at panel.

Of course, the girls fought over a battle that was not their own (it's "Top Model" drama!) as Celia and Tahlia watched and didn't say a word.

Natalie won yet another challenge, one that required the girls to bring their game face to compete. They posed behind their choice of two of five life-size photos of Tyra, with only their faces visible through cutouts for their heads.

Their mission was impossible: to capture Tyra's expression and emotion by observing the body language of her photos. The challenge was so farfetched and so implausible that London and Natalie were the only two who received positive feedback from Jay Manuel.

The photo shoot was one where the girls were each assigned a color, had it splashed onto their faces, and had to convey that color with their facial expressions.

The judges nailed it, calling Fo's red photo first and Teyona's yellow second.

Their sequence was perfect right down to the bottom two, when the entire world wanted both Sandra and Celia to be eliminated.

Celia was redeemed for her tasteless tattling by her photo; Tyra said that was the only reason she stayed.

Sandra was let eliminated — finally — after weeks of slipping below the bar. Of course, her departure wasn't without an arrogant statement claiming that her elimination was a mistake and she was better than all the other competitors. Apparently not, Sandra.

On tonight's episode the girls will attempt the more commercial side of modeling as they try out acting, coached by former supermodel Paulina Porizkova.

The girls will meet special guest Clay Aiken in their endeavors to become America's next top model.

Not all fashion is the high kind

Fashionistas know haute couture far above prêt-à-porter

By Jessica Caramenico
Pilot staff writer

As a fashion enthusiast, I understand that there are quite a few people who are not familiar with the different types of collections that designers produce.

When you look on Web sites such as style.com or that of a certain designer, or when watching the runway shows, there are two phrases that distinguish the quality and price of designer clothing.

The phrases denote two different types of collections that designers create: haute couture and prêt-à-porter.

Haute couture is produced by only select designers.

In France, this "label"

is protected by law, kind of like a patent.

A designer has to meet a certain number of qualifications before he or she can use the designation "haute couture."

A few of the qualifications are how many employees the fashion house has, and what types of shows it participates in.

These clothes are custom made to order for each customer.

The detail and attention paid to the finish and craftsmanship of these clothes is incredibly extensive and time consuming.

They are made from the most expensive fabrics and are also hand cut. Many of them are hand sewn as well.

Put all these factors together and the cost of haute couture clothes is very high.

Every haute couture

designer/house also designs a prêt-à-porter line. Prêt-à-porter is the French term for "ready to wear" or RTW.

These clothes are a lot less expensive and can be bought off the rack in stores.

The RTW lines draw more customers for designers, as well as provide most of the designer's profits.

Many haute couture pieces that are designed for fashion shows are never sold, so although spectacular, they contribute little financially.

Thus the RTW lines are actually the mainstay of profit for designers, whereas haute couture is used for prominence and prestige.

A few examples of current haute couture designers are Christian Dior, Giorgio Armani Privé, Chanel and Valentino.

'Li'l Abner' a hillbilly hit



Residents of Dogpatch celebrate during the finale of "Li'l Abner." The musical, a combined production of the Gardner-Webb University Fine Arts Department and Communication Studies Department Theater Section, was the most successful stage production in at least five years, according to Comm Studies Chairman Dr. Bob Carey. More than a thousand tickets were sold in advance, and Friday night's performance was sold out. The musical was on stage last Wednesday through Saturday nights.

'Adventureland' provides realism, originality

By Kayla Riley
The Maine Campus
U. Maine
UWIRE

Film review

turns out the only job he's qualified for is at Adventureland, a dump local amusement park.

It's at Adventureland that James meets a host of interesting characters, including the disenchanted Joel (Martin Starr of *Apatow* film fame), maintenance man Connell (Ryan Reynolds), and the lovely Em (Kristen Stewart).

Although James' job as announcer of mechanical horse races is unfortunate, he forms a kinship with fellow employees that helps carry him through the miserable summer.

An instant attraction between James and Em becomes the plot's centerpiece. Stewart shows surprising depth as the complicated and sullen Em, and it's refreshing to see that her talents go beyond teen queen of the vampire obsessed.

Eisenberg may be on his way to becoming the next Michael Cera, with his self-effacing disposition and adorable awkwardness.

Familiar faces include

the amusing Bill Hader ("Superbad") and the always brilliant and deadpan Kristen Wiig ("Saturday Night Live").

It would have done the filmmakers well to make more use of these characters, who spend most of their time in the background.

"Adventureland" will undoubtedly be labeled as a "coming of age" film, but don't let that scare you away.

It effortlessly captures the essence of the late '80s in a way that almost makes it look appealing, and the true to the era soundtrack carries the movie through when it drags.

The somewhat pathetic lives of the Adventureland employees make the ride simultaneously poignant and amusing.

"Adventureland" leans toward melodramatic with a touch of gritty realism. Just don't go into the theater expecting a fast paced comedic joyride.

The style of "Adventureland" is more like the kiddie dragon coaster than the Thunderbolt. It is slow-paced and mellow, but eventually delivers.

How much swearing is OK for television?

By Owen Roth
Cornell Daily Sun
Cornell U.
UWIRE

Later this year, the Supreme Court will announce a decision impacting the ability of the Federal Communications Commission to regulate single utterances of swear words on broadcast television.

The ability of the government to keep swearing off the air during peak viewing hours (6 a.m. — 10 p.m.) certainly makes for a good debate.

Under the Federal Communications Act, the FCC can regulate "obscene" and "indecent" broadcasts.

In a landmark decision — *FCC v. Pacifica* — the Court held that broadcasts during peak listening hours, which contained streams of swearing, counted as obscene and did not need constitutional protection.

The basis of the holding was that individuals who did not want to hear swear words, or did not want their children to hear them, should not have to

face the choice of never watching TV or risking exposure.

Pacifica expressly left open the question of whether a single swear word could be treated the same way; today, the FCC argues that a single swear word can be treated the same way because it counts as indecent.

When it comes to swearing, arguments exist for and against protection. On the one hand, the arguments of *Pacifica* make sense: swearing is highly offensive to some, and there's no reason they (or their kids) should have to suffer undue exposure.

On the other hand, swear words can represent significant methods of expression — they can signify our most deeply felt anger, frustration, enthusiasm, confusion — and so, should be protected in this limited form.

This latter justification represents the real hardship that the FCC faces. If a swear word has some kind of importance to a speaker's message beyond gratuitous shock value, it should not be banished beyond the peak viewing hour window; if it's a mat-

ter of aging pop stars trying to be edgy, protection seems less justified.

But beyond the easiest cases, how could anyone fairly draw the line?

Culling legitimate singular swear words from illegitimate is impossible to do on a principled basis.

The better question, I think, is why we are so sensitive about swear words when we embrace violence and sex — it's no secret that "24" is one of the most violent shows ever, or that "Grey's Anatomy" routinely exhibits detailed lovemaking scenes.

Some have suggested that swear words are different because they draw their power from human acts that we regard as private.

Swear words are largely disassociated from their original meaning. They are now broad expressions of a variety of different feelings and thoughts; given the value they can bring, and because I prefer an open dialogue, I would support an inclusive rule.

But, I cannot help but see the sense that a stricter, more conservative approach would make.