

# Letters To The Guilfordian Editor

## Hulburt: No Salary For Staff

## Activities Are Outlet For Interest

Dear Editor,

First of all I would like to say that in no way do I support The GUILFORDIAN strike, if indeed, it is a strike. The staff refers to their actions as a strike, yet The GUILFORDIAN continues to be published. The point has been made that the staff members desire salaries.

The GUILFORDIAN staff, however, is not the only staff on campus that works hard. It is not the only staff that has deadlines. It would be nice if everyone could be paid.

According to the last issue of The GUILFORDIAN, salaries could be paid if each student paid a mere \$1.50 extra per year. (This figure would actually be closer to \$1.70 per year.) But why do I haggle over a mere \$.20? Why, especially, when students (as The GUILFORDIAN cleverly pointed out) pay \$2,500 per year? But are we talking about a mere \$.20, or a mere \$1.70 per student, per year?

No. The question is whether or not an organization's staff should be paid. Also, there are a minimum of twenty-three organizations on campus at the present time. If each organization desired a mere \$1.70 per student, each student would then be paying an additional fee in excess of \$39.00.

But, one might ask, would every organization seek this additional amount? I would think not, in all probability. But the point is we're not speaking only of The GUILFORDIAN, and we're not speaking of only \$1.70 per student.

### Over Dramatizations

My figure of \$39.00 is certainly an overdramatization of my point. But was not the last issue of The GUILFORDIAN also a rather ridiculous overdramatization? Was it necessary for the issue to include nearly seven blank pages? Would not further "strike editions" be a clear waste of the money students have allocated? I definitely think so.

Mr. Chapman argues that salaries are necessary "to retain and attract qualified staff members." Are salaries the only alternative to this problem? I think not.

I think some sort of retribution would be good, though not imperative, nor absolutely necessary, for some leadership po-

sitions on the campus such as the President of the Student Government and the College Union, The Editor of The GUILFORDIAN, and of the QUAKER, the head of the Radio Station, and perhaps others. But I think we are going too far by giving salaries to the other staff members of our student organizations. At a college of this size, I think we are biting off more than we can chew.

I also think we are kidding ourselves if we assume that the reason we don't have many students vying for leadership positions on this campus is the fact that no salaries are offered. I'm afraid the reasons for this are a little deeper than a lack of salaries.

### Immature? Hogwash!

Members of Student Legislature have been accused of being immature by The GUILFORDIAN Editor. I believe this is pure, unadulterated hogwash. Those members of Legislature, including myself, who have had dealings with Mr. Chapman, have also been accused by him of being dishonest and untrustworthy.

I defy Mr. Chapman or any other member of the college community to bring forth any information which would so much as imply that I have been anything else than honest in my dealings with them. I find these remarks ludicrous, unwarranted, and slanderous.

Mr. Chapman went on to accuse those students, again including myself, who are in opposition to The GUILFORDIAN staff of dealing with personalities rather than with issues. At the risk of repeating myself, I believe that this too is pure unadulterated hogwash.

## Guilfordian Editorship

Applications are being accepted until April 20 for the editorship of The GUILFORDIAN and the QUAKER.

Interested persons should contact Mrs. Carter Delafield, Mrs. Janet Speas, Mr. Frederick Parkhurst, Mr. David Morrah, Dr. William Lanier, Mr. George Roycroft, or leave their names in the GUILFORDIAN'S office.

## Hobbs Supports Stipend

Dear Editor,

I have no wish to get involved in the argument over whether the Editor and various personnel of the GUILFORDIAN should be paid for his services, but I am glad to state my belief that student interests could be well served if the most important and most time-consuming offices of student organizations carry a stipend. This is, of course, the case at a number of colleges and universities.

I say this for several reasons: it would tend to stimulate a lively interest in and competition for these offices, thereby increasing the likelihood of obtaining highly qualified persons; it would encourage persons needing financial assistance to aspire to these jobs rather than having to take others to help defray expenses; it would tend to attract capable students to come to Guilford, and would stimulate the officers continuing sense of responsibility to perform the duties of his office. All of these would be definite plus factors.

No doubt we would all wish that the above conditions would prevail without this form of artificial stimulation. We also do not like the matter of increasing the cost of a Guilford education. Students must weigh these matters seriously, but I am of the opinion that the students could be well served by offering stipends for leadership positions.

Grimsley T. Hobbs, President

### No Staff Salaries

Time and time again I have stated my position regarding salaries. I am opposed to giving The GUILFORDIAN STAFF salaries. I am NOT opposed to giving some sort of compensation to the heads of some organizations—including The GUILFORDIAN.

I suggest that Mr. Chapman take another look at the issue at hand—that of giving salaries to the Editor and his staff, not the Editor alone. To me there is a vast difference—one of \$1,100 in terms of dollars and cents.

Mr. Chapman announced that this issue of The GUILFORDIAN would carry letters to the Editor concerning the strike. I find it odd that a statement to this effect was not carried in the previous issue so that all students interested in writing letters would be encouraged to do so.

Surely this announcement would have reached more students via The GUILFORDIAN than by relying on our "immature" Legislature members. Surely Mr. Chapman did not assume that word would be disseminated by our "irresponsible" Legislators. Perhaps our Legislators are only irresponsible on some issues.

### Reconcile Dispute

I would hate for the dispute between the Student Legislature and The GUILFORDIAN staff to drag on still further. Legislature has stated that money shall not be allocated for salaries for the staff of The GUILFORDIAN. The Executive Council of the Student Government supports this decision.

If we want to talk about the question of salaries as compensation for any student leader, let's begin—but continuing to bang our heads together on the issue at hand will get us nowhere.

DAN HULBURT  
President, Student Government

## Morrah Defends Salary Requests

Dear Editor,

The practice of paying salaries to principal staff members of student publications has been common practice at many colleges and universities for decades. Because student publications are important elements of campus communication systems, many administrators and student leaders long ago realized that financial incentive would help to attract responsible and qualified students who might otherwise be unwilling to work many extra hours without academic credit, to reduce time spent studying, with a resulting reduction in grade averages, and to receive often unwarrentedly harsh criticism from students, administrative officials, alumni and trustees.

The position can be taken, as it often has been, that other students should receive pay for their work. This statement is not

## Activities Are Outlet For Interest

Dear Editor,

It is my opinion that salaries for extra curricular activities at this time are if not out of place at least premature for Guilford College. My own reasoning on this point is based on two main factors. First, extracurricular activities are just what the title implies and that infers that students get involved with them because they have an interest in the activity and are fortunate enough to be supplied with an outlet for that interest.

Secondly, there is just not enough money to go around to all the organizations for salaries for all the top echelon workers. Any other manner of dispersing salaries other than by sheer title of office would be a form of value judgement that I don't think the Student Legislature should be involved in.

### Upgrading Life At Guilford

Just how would funds be allocated to the people who put in the real work? Would this in fact upgrade the quality of the participants? Would this tend to

shift the emphasis from the learning and sharing experience to one of a more commercial and competitive nature? I am not sure of the answers to these questions. I do think there are many more and perhaps better ways to upgrade the life of students at Guilford. I do agree that this challenge MUST be met soon.

I am afraid that I cannot agree that there will be a wholesale acceptance by the student body to increase activity fees for the purpose of paying other students. If the activity fee were to be increased for some purpose or program which would generally benefit the student body as a whole, I feel there would be less debate on the point.

But let us face the fact that money is tight this year with no real hope for a brighter situation next fall. There are a number of students who feel that they just can't lay out extra funds to the tune of a 35% increase. I think this has to be respected.

Karen Rheeling

## Student Dismissed In Springfield, Mass.

WASHINGTON — (CPS) — The spirit of Spiro Agnew has apparently penetrated the state of Massachusetts, which already holds the record for censorship cases in the country this year. Springfield College in Springfield, Mass., triggered another college press battle last week.

Lawrence Libow, a columnist for the Springfield STUDENT, received notice of his dismissal from Dean of Students John Costello in early February after he wrote a series of articles

questioning college involvement in a local community development project. Included in some of the columns were sprinklings of graffiti from student desks around the college. A later editorial in THE STUDENT, which has given no support to Libow, noted that the graffiti might be construed as "obscene."

During the weekend over a hundred students continued a constant sit-in vigil in the college administration building to protest Libow's dismissal. Springfield College President Wilbert Locklin's only comment was "the students have permission."

The letter of dismissal from Dean Costello referred to the Joint Statement on the Rights and Freedoms of Students and the Springfield College dismissal policy as reasons for Libow's dismissal. Costello's letter to Libow stated:

"It is appropriate to indicate that your attacks on personal integrity and the techniques of harassment and inuendo in earlier articles, culminating with the objectionable language in your article in the Springfield College STUDENT . . . is not consistent with the ideals and ethical standards of the College and of the professions to which preparation is being given . . . in fact, such action is considered *prejudicial to the welfare of the students and the College.*" (Italics ours)

Libow and his attorney, Steven Silvermann of the local American Civil Liberties Union, appealed Libow's dismissal to the Springfield Faculty Hearing Committee in closed session Feb. 17. Silvermann had made request to the Committee chairman that his stenographer and

(Continued On Page 5)

DAVID W. MORRAH, JR.  
Journalism Instructor