Cheaters never prosper

(Continued from page 4)

student member. We were represented by Nancy Wheatley of the Alumni Office, who volunteered to defend us. The instructor was also present as a witness. We did not contest the charges, as it was evident that we had cheated, so there was no point in a fair break. Nevertheless, the hearing was quite embarrassing as we attempted to explain how we possibly could have cheated in such an obvious manner. We were surprised to learn that our case wasn't unique. During the past three years cases were brought before the Committee for review, yet we knew nothing about them, and were lulled into a false sense of security. I hope to make it clear to the community that the Committee does exist and views disciplinary infractions very seriously. The Committee then went into delibration and decided that "...the infraction was of significant gravity to warrant formal prosecution.

Officially, the Committee had three purposes: Reprime, Punishment, and Publicity. A repression is imposed in the least severe cases as a matter of education. I believe I learned more in the student's Dean's file. Prohibition is only imposed for a period determined by the Committee. The notation is removed after one year if it is evident that we had cheated, so we did not contest the charges, as it was apparent that we would be guilty of overweening arrogance if he then claimed it to be worthless. Simply, Roger Kolb, not understanding the language of Henry Moore or Louise Nevelson, is in no position to contest that their works are worthless or meaningless, although he would certainly be justified in saying that he disliked them. I would not presume to act as "interpreter" for Mr. Moore or Mr. Nevelson, particularly for a reviewer such as Mr. Kolb who starts out with a chip on his shoulder and blunders on both eyes. Sculptures, and indeed paintings and music as well, are not susceptible to verbal translation — attempts invariably result in the purloining of prose. One can no more verbalize a meaningful description of the virtues of the sculptures in question than one can a description of their faults (and indeed we have seen neither). Words are wholly inadequate substitutes for the direct visual experience of the three-dimensional forms, colors, textures that have been the language of sculpture from the time of the ancient Egyptians, through Michelangelo, to Henry Moore. It is no more possible to come forward bearing a verbal description of a sculpture's virtues for a blind man than it is to describe the graces of Tristan and Isolde to a deaf man who can't read music. There are none so blind as those who refuse to look. Mr. Kolb, Steven E. Shladover, G December 11, 1976.

Understanding of art vital to appreciation

To the Editor:

I was grateful to Roger Kolb (The Tech, Dec. 10) if he could point out where in my letter (The Tech, Dec. 3) I said or implied that "not to enjoy [art works] means that one has not understood them." I am left with the impression that either I have been grossly misquoted or Mr. Kolb is of confusion in his aversion to Mr. Thomas B. Keating's written statement with its converse. Whatever the case be, Mr. Kolb has not stated what he did not say. Certainly one may understand an art work and dislike it, but the chances of liking an art work one has not understood are greatly reduced. I have no complaint against those who make an informed unfavorable judgment on an art work, but the comments by Roger Kolb and others, and the earlier Commentary by Peter Coffin (The Tech, Nov. 12) to which I responded were of the level of "I don't like it; therefore it's junk." That hardly seems to qualify as "informative art criticism," and would certainly fail Mr. Kolb's own definition of artistic sophistication. Mr. Kolb does not even consider the possibility that one may come to understand a work of modern art and then like it — for it has only the chance to "think critically" (disapprovingly) and being a "creature of fashion." It is a pity that he has been cut to himself off from all the art of our own time, denying even the possibility that it has any value.

I hope that Mr. Kolb does not dismiss a scientific theory or a poem as worthless if it does not appeal to him on first reading. Many of us have found that the most richly rewarding works of art are precisely those which do not reveal their glories on first exposure; some comprehension of their particular language is necessary first. Turning to the world of music, some obvious examples of this are the late quartets of Beethoven, Wagner's Tristan and Isolde, Stravinsky's Sacre du Printemps and Brahms' Elektra. A musically sophisticated listener who disliked one of these masterpieces on first hearing (an entirely understandable response) would be guilty of overweening arrogance if he then claimed it to be worthless. Simply, Roger Kolb, not understanding the language of Henry Moore or Louise Nevelson, is in no position to contest that their works are worthless or meaningless, although he would certainly be justified in saying that he disliked them.

I would not presume to act as "interpreter" for Mr. Moore or Mr. Nevelson, particularly for a reviewer such as Mr. Kolb who starts out with a chip on his shoulder and blunders on both eyes. Sculptures, and indeed paintings and music as well, are not susceptible to verbal translations — attempts invariably result in the purloining of prose. One can no more verbalize a meaningful description of the virtues of the sculptures in question than one can a description of their faults (and indeed we have seen neither). Words are wholly inadequate substitutes for the direct visual experience of the three-dimensional forms, colors, textures that have been the language of sculpture from the time of the ancient Egyptians, through Michelangelo, to Henry Moore. It is no more possible to come forward bearing a verbal description of a sculpture's virtues for a blind man than it is to describe the graces of Tristan and Isolde to a deaf man who can't read music. There are none so blind as those who refuse to look. Mr. Kolb, Steven E. Shladover.

Feedback

We are all familiar with the falsification of facts: stories are often told with the intention of misleading the audience. This technique is often used to manipulate public opinion and influence decision-making processes. However, as we can see from the text, even accurate reporting of events can sometimes be misleading due to the selective use of information or the presentation of facts in a way that supports a particular agenda.

Another example of misinformation is the selective omission of relevant data. This can occur when researchers or journalists choose to highlight certain aspects of a story while ignoring others. In the text, this could be seen in the way the committee's actions were portrayed as serious and objective, while the students' perspective was downplayed.

These examples highlight the importance of critical thinking and media literacy in today's information-rich society. It is essential to question the sources and motives behind the information we consume and to seek out multiple perspectives on any given topic.

Additionally, the text discussed the consequences of cheating in academic settings. It is crucial to uphold academic integrity and to hold all members of the academic community accountable for their actions. While the consequences of cheating may vary, it is important to understand that these actions can have far-reaching implications for both individuals and institutions.

Overall, the text provides a valuable lesson on the importance of honesty, transparency, and the risks associated with deception in various contexts.