

ONE-ON-ONE

This week, two of our columnists debate each other. Their topic for this issue is:

Should alcohol be sold at Truman athletic events?



Chris Waller

I won't lie to you. I like to have a drink occasionally. In fact, I'm drunk right now. OK, that's a lie. Right now I'm in the middle of the Violette Hall computer lab, and I'm stone sober. Even I know better. I, like many students on this campus, know how to be responsible when it comes to drinking. Sure, we like to have fun, but school should always be a priority, and the last thing I would want to do is get plastered before heading to class on a Tuesday afternoon. Linguistics and rum don't make a very good cocktail.

But what is wrong with having a few drinks at a football game on a Saturday night? If I want to relax on a weekend night with my friends and enjoy a game under our new lights, shouldn't I have the right to be able to have a drink if I want to if I am of legal age? As it stands, if I want to drink Saturday night, I either have to do it before the game and run the risk of not even showing up, try and smuggle alcohol through the gate and run the risk of getting caught or forfeit going to the game altogether.

By not allowing alcohol sales at sporting events, our school is missing more than a few fans in the bleachers. Right now the University is facing monumental budget problems, yet they are turning down thousands of dollars in revenue from the sale of alcohol and even the

Potential profits trump problems

prospect of new facilities paid for by alcohol distributors. If you don't believe me, take a trip 90 miles south to Columbia. There, the University of Missouri-Columbia receives nearly half a million dollars a year from Budweiser, just from advertisements alone at sporting events. They aren't even allowed to sell the alcohol on campus — this is just for the right to advertise. And Mizzou isn't the only school profiting from this.

According to USA Today, the University of Colorado received a \$5 million contribution from the Coors Brewing Company toward construction of a new basketball arena. Perhaps the administration should have considered asking Budweiser for the money to improve athletic facilities instead of taking \$50 from every student regardless of their feelings toward our athletic programs.

On top of all of the advertising revenue, several schools also are supplementing their budgets with the income they receive from alcohol sales during sporting events. According to an article in the Oakland Tribune, Fresno State University in California, at which alcohol is sold during every sporting event, receives between \$125,000 and \$150,000 in revenue each year from alcohol sales. To schools with more students and giant budgets, that might not mean much, but here

at Truman, \$150,000 would go a long way. Although it is true that providing alcohol at sporting events does create problems, these problems have solutions, and in the long run the benefits outweigh the costs of solving them.

With proper planning, trouble can be kept to a minimum. The Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management Coalition, or TEAM, is a non-profit group that provides training and resources for schools and professional sports organizations to insure safety at large events where alcohol is served. By providing properly trained security, and educating the student body, it would be possible for our school to provide a safe, profitable yet fun environment for our students to cheer on our sports teams.

I'm not saying that we should allow drinking everywhere on campus, or that we should serve beer in the dining halls, but I do think that we need a change here. By allowing students and members of the community who are old enough to drink in a safe environment, our school's athletic program will gain popularity and our budget will gain funds. It really is a win, win, win situation.

Chris Waller is a senior English and communication major from St. Joseph, Mo.



Daniel Glossenger

Too few benefits, too much trouble

An ice-cold beer, hand-delivered and begging for your consumption, combined with a prime seat at a good, old-fashioned Truman football game. It's every red-blooded American's dream, right?

Not so fast. Selling beer to fans at Truman athletic events might sound like a profitable way to augment the spirits of the crowds, but at heart, it's a surefire way to end the clean and family-friendly atmosphere at our games, and there's no guarantee we'll get worthwhile returns by allowing alcohol on campus.

Any discussion of selling alcohol at athletic events has to be clarified a bit first. When we say alcohol would be sold, we mean beer, and when we say that it would be sold at Truman athletic events, we know that really it would be at Stokes Stadium.

As it stands, Stokes has a kid-friendly atmosphere. Parents feel safe letting their children wander a little bit, taking solace in the notion that there aren't any drunken brawls or half-full beer cups left behind by inattentive fans.

By adding beer to the mix, we run the risk of alienating a core group of faculty, staff and alumni who bring their children and friends to games. These fans devote themselves to the team even when the students do not. They show up to the games whether we've lost a record nine games in a season (as in 2004 and in 2005) or whether we've had a winning season (as in this year

so far and in 2006). And I can guarantee they'd not appreciate a drunken college student shouting obscenity-laden epithets at the Peacocks of Upper Iowa.

Even if Truman created a so-called "beer garden" in the stadium in which alcohol could be contained, there would be those who drank in the "garden" and then moved into the regular seats once they had polished off their brew. A safe zone wouldn't prevent inebriated louts from causing a scene — one that would unfold before the eyes of rival teams and children alike.

Plus, no amount of Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management will negate the fact that only one drunken fan is too many. I might add that the TEAM Coalition — which my colleague Chris Waller cites in support of on-campus alcohol sales — is funded and staffed by Anheuser-Busch, Miller and Coors.

Another pro-alcohol idea that's been floated is a tailgating area that permits alcohol consumption and sale but restricts beer from entering the stadium. Again, access would be regulated so that minors couldn't enter — but anyone who has lived on a college campus knows the extent to which the underage will go to imbibe. Really, it doesn't make a lick of difference whether people drink in the stadium or in the parking lot outside the gate in some tailgating area. It doesn't matter whether you mix dirt into water or water into dirt — you

still get mud. Although people now can drink at home or in bars before they enter the stadium, I still don't see how this is any reason to encourage public intoxication at some of our largest events.

Finally, one of the biggest props to the pro-alcohol argument is that we'd trigger an avalanche of money to expand and improve our beloved athletics facilities by increased gate receipts and alcohol advertising revenue. But really, what sort of supporters would drive to Kirksville to see a game, but only if they could have a Bud while they're at it?

The rumor mills also never stop churning out stories of the possibility of The House That Busch Built for our very own Bulldogs. But is that really a likely outcome? Northwest Missouri State University has a controlled alcohol area, but their stadium certainly isn't that awe-inspiring.

Either way, at what cost are we willing to get increased revenue, and for what real benefit are we willing to sell ourselves out? With all the attendant trouble, is it worth it for a new set of bleachers? For a few scoreboard instant replays? If anything, I'd hope that we'd peddle the fabric of our University community for something a little better than a few overpriced, warm, concession-stand beers.

Daniel Glossenger is a senior history major from Nashville, Tenn.

Kirksville Square needs more than state funding to awaken interest



Phil Jarrett

Martin Luther King Jr. had a dream. Some said that John Lennon was a dreamer. Jennifer Connelly is dreamy. When Missouri Governor Matt Blunt announced that Kirksville had achieved DREAM status, it meant all our dreams had come true. That's right, folks: news awnings for the square.

DREAM, or Downtown Revitalization and Economic Assistance for Missouri, is a fund intended for historic preservation, housing development, technical planning, façade development and public infrastructure for shabby cities in the Show-Me State. If the amount of money from last year's DREAM cities is any indicator, Kirksville could be seeing roughly 3 million dollars. But if I know one thing about dreams, it is that they do not contribute much to reality.

Part of me wants to believe that a couple of building renovations and some new sidewalks will breathe life back into our ramshackle downtown, but the truth of the matter is that peo-

ple probably will still go to Wal-Mart and Home Depot because the prices are cheaper and the parking spaces are plentiful. I hate to bask in futility, and I want to be optimistic, but in the end, no amount of state-sponsored cosmetics is going to change the real problem: The mentality of community pride is really from a bygone era.

Maybe too many episodes of The Andy Griffith Show have crafted my feeling that our city somehow got cheated out of all the good aspects of the small-town stereotype. Where is our candy store with mahogany shelves full of glass jars and the store owner who knows the name of every person in town? I can acknowledge that this is a stupid idealism rooted in a bizarre mix of fantasy, '50s television and conversations with my grandparents. Still, I have hope that when all our DREAM funds are spent, there can be some resurrection of this idealism.

Wal-Mart will always have the upper hand on quantity and low prices. However, local companies can compete through the production of quality, specifically in terms of goods and service. Until local business fills this niche, pride in our city will find no place to take root.

To clarify, there are places and things worthy of appreciation in Kirksville. However, a good deal

of these are acquired tastes that can only whet the appetite of a seasoned Kirksville resident. For example, we have a few locally owned restaurants that serve some pretty good food. Of these restaurants, I can think of about two that look like they would serve clean food. I still go to the seedier locations because I can see their charm rather than their disrepair, but outsider business certainly is lost because of an unwillingness to revamp its image.

The same disregard for quality and community can be said of local housing. If residents and owners were willing to do some periodic maintenance, Kirksville could really sparkle. Unfortunately, many homeowners and renters are willing to compromise quality for price.

Kirksville's DREAM status is an exciting development with a real potential for good. However, its impact needs to be more than skin deep. Citizens and business owners need to take pride in that which is theirs while they have the opportunity. If we do not commit to quality services and a spirit of community, we will find ourselves dreaming about how we could have done things differently.

Phil Jarrett is a senior communication major from Chesterfield, Mo.

Curious case of Senator Craig creates homosexual witch hunt



Jackie Gonzalez

A Republican U.S. Senator with an anti-gay history? Clearly not groundbreaking news. It's a scenario not too unfamiliar to the political scene. Yet, interestingly enough, a new scenario is hogging the media scene, and the pattern of anti-gay professionals who turn out to be gay is becoming strikingly common.

Take for instance, the recent developments involving U.S. Senator Larry Craig. When a police sting left Craig in the homoerotic spotlight with a disorderly conduct charge last June, his career took a turn for the worst.

After the fiasco, Craig announced early this month that September would be his last month serving in the Senate. However, on Monday he declared that he'd stick around if his guilty plea is withdrawn.

Although he is just another detestable pro-life Republican to me, I can't help but feel a wee bit sorry for this guy. Outing someone in politics has become an incredibly strong and effective weapon

in terms of destroying a political career. Whether the accusations are legit or not, once the claim is made, it is almost impossible for people to ignore. As soon as a blogger exposed Craig's arrest and claimed he was a homosexual, the media buzzed with attempts to validate the claim.

I think Craig has every right to refer to his experience as a "witch hunt." As soon as his local paper, the Idaho Statesman, heard rumors that questioned his sexuality, Craig said he was constantly hounded in an effort to crack him. And they did, in the most unprofessional manner possible.

Although I find it absurd that a senator didn't have the sense to realize he should have a lawyer around when signing any document, especially one that claims guilt, Craig was under such pressure that he panicked — it happens. Craig claimed that he was "relentlessly and viciously harassed" for the eight months prior to the sting by the local paper, a time that was most likely completely unbearable.

The police who have thrown Craig into this mess also should be reprimanded for their behavior. If nothing else, Craig listened to his kindergarten teacher and trusted the police. They broke his trust right out of the closet.

There are other things that should be put higher on the priority list than deter-

mining one's possible sexual preference. Police officers are around to protect communities, not to fuel gossip magazines. Journalists are around to keep the public informed of the news, not who is fooling around with who and where.

According to a CNN poll released Monday, "67 percent of Americans think Craig should resign, while only 26 percent say he should hold on to his seat."

One primary question remains: How long will it take for homosexuality to be tolerated in the political scene? It seems that many politicians, be they Republican or not, will continually refuse to be open with their sexuality for an unpredictable amount of time. There will continue to be stories such as Craig's for as long as professionals feel that they can't be respected and taken seriously if they happen to be attracted to same-sex individuals.

If those 67 percent are saying he should resign because of his "criminal offense" and not because of his possible homosexuality, then perhaps a good majority of U.S. politicians should resign, too. Political hypocrisy has been around longer than politics — it isn't news. But creepy cops hanging out in bathrooms is.

Jackie Gonzalez is a junior communication and history major from San Diego, Calif.

Around the Quad

This week's question:
"What do you think of the new ability for the public to search Facebook?"

Erin Gill
Junior

"I clicked [to opt out]. I think it kind of violates the whole privacy thing that Facebook had started out with."

Claire Schueler
Freshman

"I think it digs into people's privacy. They shouldn't allow people to do it. I think it should be set so you can opt in. Plus, it's creepy."

Loren Depenthal
Senior

"I think it'll become a big deal once employers start searching more on it."

Chad Richter
Sophomore

"No way — It definitely shouldn't have that. It really pushes the barriers of privacy."

INDEX Web poll

September 13 Results
as of 9 p.m. Tuesday

Do you think enforcement of drinking laws in Kirksville is too strict?

They take an appropriate stance in most situations.

Yes, the cops should lay off a little.

Vote online at www.trumanindex.com

THIS WEEK'S QUESTION:

Do you think the awnings on the Square should be removed?