

Letters to the Editor

To the Editors:

I am very much opposed to the *Guilfordian's* policy of printing unsigned letters. A printed letter is a personal opinion made public, and therefore the writer should take personal responsibility for what is said. Public opinions should not be relegated to the same position as rumors, graffiti and lies.

We should discourage the false concept that opinions can exist unattached to a person. Even the claim of expressing group opinion does not provide an excuse for anonymity. In a community of our size it is glaringly obvious that group opinion can and should be followed to its source: the individual members of the group.

Fear of public censure is not an acceptable argument for unsigned letters. Differences of opinion must be tolerated. If this tolerance does not exist, this in itself is one of the most important issues to be made public. This is especially true on a college campus, where it is the function and duty of the institution to ensure that personalities are protected and public opinions are examined critically.

Finally, I have been disgusted by the personal potshots taken by anonymous writers. I feel that the paper should not be a public forum for insults, and hopefully a "signed-letters only" policy would discourage such behavior.

Very sincerely,
Kathy Becker Freeman

Editor's response:

The policy of the *Guilfordian* regarding letters to the editor will be changed. As of our next issue, all letters must be typed, double-spaced, with an authentic signature.

To the Editor:

After this past student election it is easy to see that the students of this college have some political concerns about their school. These concerns, assuming student opinions are voiced, will soon reach the new Senate Executive Council. No doubt, this presents a clear chance to gripe that many students will fail to see. More importantly, is that the students present their concerns with the same enthusiasm they expect from the Executive Council.

The symbolic truths offered by the Williams regime must be represented by material results. In the case of the Elliott Good party for change, the truths which the students deserve were mocked by larking the advertising medium. In the case of the Williams party the truths were not expressed in the least. On Candidates night the parties had an opportunity to stand before the students and allow one voice to cover the opinions of all three. The reason, whatever it is, evades the common and simple question, can the other two speak in public?

Let us consider the lack of rhetoric of this ticket may indeed have contributed to the efficacy of Williams' electoral prowess, but it may also contribute to the "do-nothing" Senate which she mentioned and which, up until the election, had upset the students.

The effect of the Good Party Campaign will last (they claim to have had a good time and to have raised the electorate turnout by some 20%) while the victorious Williams Party must still prove its strength to itself and the school.

The clear plurality shows that the students were infected by a strong sense of desire for or against some form of government. It is not too much to hope that the choice made by the students will not be retroactive and swamp students with a continuation of inactivity.

Then, let us anticipate the best. Let's expect when the Williams Party begins in office that their electoral strengths will stand them in good stead in dealing with the needs of the students. And then if something goes wrong I'm sure that our public campaign night request will be remembered and honored. The request put to the four presidential candidates was, "If, after a month and a half, you fail to please the students, will you resign?" To this all four candidates, eventually, responded that they would. If this new student regime fails to be as active as the students desire and if the students include this Constitutional right of democratic *coup* in their political satchels, it will be the students turn to look at themselves and make the choice, or, find out a cold truth: That they may be the provocators of laziness and inactivity on campus.

Rimbaud

To the Editor:

I would like to offer my congratulations to Amie Williams, Chong Lee, and Nicky McLemore on their overwhelming victory in the Senate elections. Of course I am a little disappointed that I didn't win, but that is neither here nor there. I hope to be able to help out the new Community Senate executive council in any way possible and I will try to do so.

Now that the winners are decided, I would like to reflect on the campaign. Some things came out in the campaign that I feel have no place at Guilford. Specifically, the personal vendettas waged by

some people against some of the candidates were both uncalled for and tinged with *mud*. If you have some personal grudge against a candidate then keep it to yourself. The campaign is no place for your petty grudges. We at Guilford must remember that it is our duty to vote for the ticket that is most qualified not the most personable ticket.

Since the campaign is over, I would hope the Community Senate would pass an election law that puts a \$50 limit on campaign spending so as to prevent abuses in the election.

The national government has done this for Presidential elections and I think it is about time that Guilford did likewise. Finally, I would like to thank all those who got involved and helped the candidates. I would also like to thank all those people who ran for office and made it an interesting race. And I would like to especially thank Richard Phillips and Bob Wells, the other two-thirds of *An Alternative*, who bothered to run with me, for they made the campaign fun for me.

Sincerely,
John P. Richardson

Dear Readers:

At last Wednesday's Community Senate meeting, Hugh Stohler introduced a new proposal. That proposal was "that the Community Senate adopt a clear policy which establishes that *it will not fund* student political organizations or religious - denominational organizations in the annual budgeting process."

This is a rather powerful piece of legislation which Hugh Stohler is bringing out. Its implications are many and varied; if adopted it would drastically change the lifestyles of many organizations which are presently supported by the Community Senate as well as some would be organizations. It would seem that careful consideration and examination of this proposed policy via discussion and cler research *ought* to have been the means to a decisionary process. Obviously, to allow for this kind of frame-work, the immediate organizations which would be affected by this policy should have been notified so as to prepare their participation in the discussion.

This was not the case. After careful consideration of his position, Hugh Stohler chose *not* to notify any organization of his proposal although he did discuss it with some friends and colleagues. The signatories below are just some of the people who were shocked and upset by his determined action of not letting us know that he would be underlining his concern at our Senate.

We are concerned that within our small community a Director of Student Activities does not communicate with the students whose activities are his concern. Upon being interviewed, Hugh Stohler stated, "I assumed some real anger would come from some groups, but that doesn't bother me." Where

communication between students and faculty does not exist, pursuit of knowledge and understanding is impeded.

The Senate is a body composed of student representatives not organizational representatives. Could honest and forthright discussion of any legislation exist without proper representation? Hugh Stohler's apparent attempt at railroading his proposal in Senate seems to be while legal, in bad taste.

Since unwritten rules of etiquette are obviously not being observed within our community, some of the students shall be introducing into this week's Senate meeting a proposal which would insist that: Whenever any formal legislation regarding any existing student organization is submitted to the Community Senate for its approval that those organizations which would be affected, be duly notified adequately in advance in order to prepare a defense or rebuttal to said proposed legislation.

This is only fair.

As to the proposal itself, Hugh Stohler seems to be suggesting a policy independent of adequate research or understanding. And we quote, "I am in the process of looking for literature to substantiate my uneasiness with this sort of funding. Numerous court challenges in recent years have dealt with the legitimate and illegal uses of student activities fees. I do not yet have the specific documentation in hand, however. Nevertheless, our generally held political beliefs should guide us: that public funds not go to support religious or political movements."

While Stohler does mention court cases he does not clearly show that his advocated general principle is directly related to the general principle involved in court cases. The

principles he appeals to are applicable to public institutions. If he is suggesting that Guilford, a Quaker school, advocate policies based on principles presently operating in public schools, then Guilford would have to change its very basic structure and drop its religious affiliation. But Guilford's community lifestyle is resplendent in the Friend's tradition ranging from free inquiry to banning public alcohol consumption to instituting a moment of silence before any official gathering (to mention but a few) are not founded on public general principles, but on Quaker principles.

Obviously, we are not analogous to a public institution.

However, we are not arguing that Hugh Stohler's principle is wrong, just that it is in no way obvious that we should be guided by that principle. His principle may be good but not his argument. We don't know what should be our guiding principles in our legislative body, but we do know that only through a fully open confrontation with the problems can we advance our understanding.

Sincerely,
Thomas O'Connor, John P. Richardson, Bruce Clendenin, Robert C. Gold, Bobbie Jones, Catherine A. Vanneman, Jerry Sowers, William Bradley Anderson, Deidre Dempsey, Howard W. Page, Martin Block, Garnet D. Maharajh, Julia McMullan, Richard Ashley, Amy F. Steerman

(We suggest that if you are interesting seeing Hugh Stohler's proposal that you speak with him or your senator who has a copy of it.)

[Editor's Note: this concern will be discussed at the March 2 Senate meeting.]