

Marshall University

Marshall Digital Scholar

---

The Parthenon

University Archives

---

4-18-1972

## The Parthenon, April 18, 1972

Marshall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://mds.marshall.edu/parthenon>

---

### Recommended Citation

Marshall University, "The Parthenon, April 18, 1972" (1972). *The Parthenon*. 4789.  
<https://mds.marshall.edu/parthenon/4789>

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Parthenon by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu), [beachgr@marshall.edu](mailto:beachgr@marshall.edu).



# THE PARTHENON

# opinion

- editorials
- columns
- readers' viewpoint
- commentary

## Old Main razing presently 'talk'

It's time for everyone to jump on the proverbial band wagon for Marshall University.

The reason-- "Old Main." This is not the first time the wagon has been full of Huntington residents in support of something they thought to be the best for MU. Their last conquest was the Marshall medical school when everyone recommended a medical school to be located at Marshall.

On April 19 in "Off the Beat" column written by C. T. Mitchell, executive city editor of the Herald-Advertiser, he called for the creation of an Old Main Preservation Society.

Why?

Because of talk around Marshall of tearing down Old Main. At this point all it is, is talk.

Wood and Tower, cost construction firm based in Princeton, N. J., was hired in November, 1971, to review the MU campus, take inventory of the campus and see what is needed and what could be torn down.

Nelson Tower of the firm noted in an interview with The Parthenon he felt Old Main needed to be razed but he and the company would never think of tearing down the whole thing because of adverse reaction.

Since President John Barker mentioned to the faculty the possibility of razing Old Main following a preliminary recommendation of Wood and Tower, many have been up in arms.

However, Dr. Barker said he was ready to tangle with the Old Main Fan Club--and tangle is what he is going to have to do.

But, Dr. Barker realized that Old Main has outlived its usefulness. The building has been declared "dangerous" by the president and "dirty" by the custodians. There is no need even to begin to describe the deplorable conditions of the classrooms, hallways or restrooms except that "someplace-to-go place"--the "Buffalo Bathroom." It is general knowledge that many students try to work their schedules around taking classes in Old Main. The cold in the winter and the heat in the summer in Old Main are other factors no student needs to be reminded of.

And even the newly remodeled administrative offices on the main floor have their problems. At times, the President's Office is so cold it is necessary to wear coats while having a conference with him. That office has also had to rely, even on mild winter days, on electrical plug-in heaters that frequently cause fuses to blow.

On the other hand, the sentimentalists argue that Old Main is a place of memories--a place for remembering old friends. So was the Shawkey Student Union. But no tears were shed when it was replaced by the modern Memorial Student Center. For that matter, Laidley Hall is the oldest women's dormitory on campus. But the women living there have resigned themselves to its changing status.

When and if money is allocated to replace Old Main with a new building on the same site, why should this sentiment stand in the way? A new building with modern facilities could not only provide students and faculty with an atmosphere more conducive to study and learning but cut down on unbelievably high operating costs involved in heating and keeping up a building of the age and structure of Old Main.

However, history can be important to an institution. And so can support from alumni. In order to satisfy both the proponents of Old Main and the students who must attend classes, why not preserve the original portion of Old Main--that now containing the auditorium, the towers, and the offices of the president, registrar and cashier?

This suggestion could preserve the main section of the building--while allowing the remaining added portions to give way to a newer structure.

What should become of the original part of Old Main? The auditorium could still be used--especially since it is the only such auditorium on campus and it is doubtful that another would be forthcoming in the near future.

The offices could still be used for what they are now.

The classrooms on the second and third floors could be used for anything--except classes. Uses could include part of a museum of Marshall's history, offices for administrators or offices for faculty.

Realizing that compromises such as this rarely please anyone, this still has the possibility of preserving the "old" Old Main, getting student classrooms out of the terrible conditions and making room for a modern, more desirable structure.

THE PARTHENON EDITORIAL  
by John Wilson and Joe Niechwiadowicz

## Communication gap

Lack of communication between the Housing Office and University Heights is posing problems for both housing officials and Heights residents.

Located on Route 60 and on Norway Avenue, University Heights are housing units provided by Marshall for married students. Both locations are approximately four and one half miles from campus. Because of this distance, Marshall seems to have taken an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude toward them.

Students living there are forced to take their problems to Buildings and Grounds located on the Route 60 site or to a building representative whose main function seems to be the loaning of pass keys for those who have forgotten theirs or as an official noise silencer.

Requests for improvements and changes in policy go unheeded. Some of these requests are for fenced-in play yards, lined parking areas, basketball goals, and shuttlebus service.

Vandalism has repeatedly occurred in a particular parking lot with no lighting. Various items (golf clubs, a racing bike, tools, etc.) have been stolen from basement areas due to the absence of lockable storage compartments. However, these articles can be replaced in most cases. But who can give life back to a child who may step into the path of speeding driver taking a shortcut between Route 60 and Norway Avenue. Will this tragedy occur before the thru traffic is halted.

Because communication is so poor, housing officials are seemingly unaware of the urgency for improvement of these conditions.

Another problem resulting from this unawareness is the chronic violation by the residents of various provisions in the housing contract.

Instances of subleasing, pets, persons other than the members of the immediate family "living in", and failure to notify the Housing Office in the event of failure of husband and wife to inhabit the same household for a period in excess of 30 days go unnoticed.

There has been much confusion as to the provisions which states the head of the household must be a full time student. Some wives have argued this is discrimination against women and have been allowed to stay.

Students never know which provisions of the contract will be enforced nor for whom. Perhaps they would be more willing to uphold this contract if they were able to voice their opinions as to its contents.

What is needed then is a resident supervisor who will listen to the problems and work with the Housing Office toward improvements for the Heights. It is vital that this person live at the Heights in order to see first hand the problems as they exist. This person should also be responsible for collecting keys from those moving out and assessing damages before others move in. This would eliminate the problem of not knowing who is responsible for breakage.

MARY Q. MONTGOMERY  
Of the Editorial Writing Class



## Readers Viewpoint 'Old Main should stand'

If Old Main is torn down, then take down the John Marshall bust, cut down the old Beech tree, change the name of the university, and start anew, because the spirit of Marshall will be gone when Old Main goes.

MRS. ELIZABETH CZOMPO  
Assistant professor  
Department of Mathematics

### Says Old Main must go

TO THE EDITOR:

It is time for the people of Marshall University to stop using the idea of historical preservation to keep spending large amounts of money to maintain old, shabby buildings. Specifically, I am speaking about Old Main. According to C. Steve Szekeley, superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, the upkeep of Old Main averages about \$100,000 per year compared with \$50,000 to \$75,000 per year for Smith Hall. This difference is even greater when you consider that Smith Hall has electric heat and central air conditioning. Also, the Old Main figure does not include remodeling of its auditorium and other such jobs.

I have walked through the halls of Old Main, trying to feel the sentiment that other people feel, but have not been able to. I just feel sorry for the teachers and students who have classes in the creaky old place.

Even if I did feel sentimental about Old Main, Marshall University is a place of higher education.

How can people expect to receive modern instruction in a building that sounds like it might fall down every time you walk through its halls?

I think Old Main should be torn down and replaced by a sound structure instead of being patched together continuously with money that could better be spent in other ways.

SAMUEL BAUSERMAN  
Unclassified Huntington student

## Four-UM

By RON ROESER  
News editor



Four-um is a column of comment written by the four The Parthenon news editors.

Which is the better method for dispensing information on marijuana and drugs? Scare tactics or impartial, analytical information.

Scare tactics are methods employed to frighten people away from drugs and scare people who don't have the time or ability to search out the facts about drugs. Some scare tactic methods include picturing a hypodermic needle superimposed on a skull with DEATH written in large black letters underneath.

Another method is placing comic book super-heroes Green Lantern and Green Arrow, fighting horrible junkies and killing them.

A question I asked myself was "Is the realm of green men and flying saucers the proper place to dispense drug information and are comic books the medium selected by our society to inform our young of drugs?"

Are scare methods the best methods for marijuana and drug information? Is this where you want your sons, daughters or friends to get their information which they pass on to you?

The best method for dispensing drug and marijuana information is impartial analytical reports which tell of physiological and psychological changes, and social ramifications.

This information would come from reliable sources independent from prejudice or bias from either rightist or leftist factions which should correlate with other information released.

With the attainment and publication of these reports the social services and other interested persons or organizations could dispense true information rather than repeating superstitions and misinformation about drugs and marijuana.

A question here is, "If the information does not correlate with the predisposition of the person, will they believe it and transfer the information on to others, or will they prefer to use scare tactics and disregard true information?"

An example of one meeting predispositions is the report findings of the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse. Since these findings did not correlate with the harmful predispositions of the people who established the committee, the reports were said to be incomplete and more research must be done to find something harmful with marijuana. This committee was laden with conservatives appointed by President Nixon who expected the results to show harmfulness. Even before the report was finished President Nixon commented that he would not legalize marijuana or even consider legalizing it, being pre-disposed to the idea marijuana is harmful.

Even with the proper information some people will still prefer the scare method. An example of this is a scare pamphlet I picked up at a local pharmacy, the legal dispenser of drugs.

I figured he would want most to dispense the true facts about drugs. This pamphlet utilizes some scare tactics mentioned about and more. The pamphlet said, "Marijuana is an inducement to take stronger narcotics; recent medical findings reveal that prolonged usage causes brain lesions." This information is not true according to reports filed by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse and other reports filed with the government.

An example of unidentified authority comes from this quote, "It may start with marijuana, but one authority warns that if a young person smokes marijuana on more than 10 occasions, the chances are one in five that he will go on to more dangerous drugs," another fact disclaimed by the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

The question of which is the better method and medium for information must be answered by the individual. Will we continue to allow scare tactics and lying or will we support impartial, analytical agencies?

What can an individual do to stop scare tactics? Write to your governmental representative or complain to the retailer who supplies these pamphlets and boycott him financially if he's not responsive.

DENISE GIBSON  
Of the Editorial Writing Class



