# The Guilfordian forum February 23, 1996

# **Democratic process?**

Confusion followed by outrage pervaded the campus Wednesday as students gathered round the Dry-Erase board in Founders that bore the election outcome.

There were results; there was no winner.

These elections are one of the few times during the year that Guilford bypasses the consensus method and calls for a direct vote. From such a vote should come results.

Instead, behind closed doors the Senate Elections Committee and the candidates themselves worked to put together some piecemeal solution for this odd situation.

The students who voted were taken completely out of the process, causing many to feel as though their

vote had been cast in vain.

While neither candidate gained a majority (more than 50 percent) of the vote, one ticket did receive a two vote plurality. Unless otherwise stated in the Senate Constitution (which it is not), this should have been a declared ticket for the Marasco ticket right away.

Disappointingly, in this warm and fuzzy atmosphere where no one wants to step on anybody's toes, the Elections Committee decided, in effect, to disenfranchise the voters and replace those voices with their own.

In the end, the proper decision was made, and the winning ticket will preside over Senate next fall.

Their task will not be an easy one as the may never gain full support as a result of this fiasco. Their fault in this process in minimal, and they should not have to serve a year-long sentence of punishment.

We urge Senate to clarify its election procedures and to regain touch with the voice of the students, a voice which was thoughtlessly disregarded late Tuesday night.

Editor-in-chief's note: As a candidate for an Senate executive position, I did not participate in the development of this editorial.

# A second opinion on recycling

#### OLIVIA BRADEN staff writer

OK, I read it. In fact I read it twice. And you know what? I disagree

First of all, to refer to the recycling system currently in place at Guilford and across the nation as "decadent" is a backwards statement.

If you look back just ten years in American history you will find huge amounts of recyclable materials being dumped in slimy, disgusting landfills. And what were they doing there? Rotting away, polluting our air, water and soil. Now such materials as plastic, glass, paper, aluminum, and even Styrofoam are being reprocessed into usable resources.

Recycling has proven itself the world over to be an enormously effective means of reducing harmful waste. Did you know it takes only one third the energy to manufacture a product from recycled materials that it does to produce the same product from raw resources?

Secondly, there is nothing slothful about throwing bottles and cans into recycling bins instead of just dumping them all in the trash. In fact, Guilford students should be encouraged to recycle more instead of being insulted for trying to improve our imperfect system.

Finally, there are few things as arrogant as knocking one's own generation just for the sake of kicking up a fuss. I would even say that it was our parents' generation, not ours, that first thought of recycling.We simply expanded it by pioneering the recycling of certain materials. Just because your peers may not be willing to carry a china plate and stainless steel utensils on their person at all times does not make us decadent, slothful, or arrogant.

Instead of some people spending large amounts of time knocking their peers in order to set themselves above the "common people," they should take a lesson from politicians, who know that you never get an audience to listen by insulting them.

Our culture has simply moved too far away from its agrarian roots to ever return. Even if we could, what should be done with the tons of harmful waste that has been produced up to this point? Simply telling everyone to use reusable containers will not make the many millions of disposable containers that are still sitting around go away.

### editorial board

 $\left( \right)$ 

Cory Birdwhistell Adam Lucas Keir Bickerstaffe Susan Allen

## statement of purpose

The Forum exists to facilitate dialogue and expression on matters of importance to Guilford College and its mission. Toward this end, active community participation in these

pages is vital.

## editorial policy

Every effort will be made to print appropriate submissions of editorials, cartoons and letters to the editor. They must be signed, with the phone number of the author or artist included. Editorials must be no longer than 400 words and letters to the editor must be no more than 250 words. The Guilfordian reserves the right to edit submissions for grammatical correctness and brevity.

#### Response to "Stuck" Kudos for Circles Dear Editor, Dear Editor:

We are writing in response to John Cocking's article, "'Stuck' in an Embarrasing Situation." As members of Guilford's housekeeping staff, we take exception to Mr. Cocking's remarks regarding the work we do in Binford Hall and elsewhere

First, for Mr. Cocking to include the name of a particular residence hall and describe the cleaner's body shape was not only insensitive, but in extremely poor taste; no one's physical appearance should play any part in this discussion.

As for Mr. Cocking's suggestions, when exactly are "normal showering times," around which we should do our cleaning? He himself mentions getting up at 10:00 one morning and at 8:00 on another. How can we possibly predict when everyone will be showering on a given day. If it were possible, housekeeping staff would be the first to avoid any embarrasing situations."

And in regard to the suggestion that male staff clean the men's restrooms on campus, we agree that this would be ideal, but the fact of the matter is that our staff (like the housekeeping profession in general) is overwhelmingly comprised of women.

Last, all students' showers are cleaned and disinfected on a regular basis. Housekeepers, of course, cannot be held responsible for whatever might be left behind in a shower stall after we have cleaned that day. We do the best we can in an 8-hour shift, often without much cooperation or support from the students. As for Mr. Cocking, we would suggest he consider wearing shower shoes when in any public restroom, and that he understand that it is up to all of us, as a community, to work together respectfully to ensure that Guilford students have a clean environment in which to live.

> Sincerely, Guilford Housekeeping

# On behalf of the Admissions Of-

Letters to the Editor

fice and Richard Harrison Bailey/ The Agency, I would like to express our appreciation to those members of the community who took time out of their often all-too-hectic schedules to participate in the Circles of Influence. In particular, I would like to thank the eight students who formed Circles: Brian Burton, Will Butler, Gwyneth Cliver, Bryan Corbitt, Mary Henry Hawes, Sara Johnson, Shawntay Stocks, and Chris Weber. The groups which they assembled represented a broad, if not comprehensive cross-section of the Guilford College community and provided our guests-Lissa Hunt, Scott Collins, and Rick Baileywith invaluable qualitative impressions of our distinctiveness.

Equally important to articulate publicly is our continuing reliance on the passionate involvement of the Admission Communications Committee, which was instrumental in the initial selection process. The input of students Susan Allen, Santes Beatty, and Cory Birdwhistell, SOAN professor Patti Delaney and College Relations Director Mark Owczarski was crucial in narrowing the field of interested candidates from twelve, who submitted proposals, to six, whom we invited to campus to make presentations, to the ultimate consensus that RHB was the firm with which we ought to work

Collectively, our confidence continues to grow that Lissa, Scott, and Rick will be able not only to understand the complexities that define Guilford College, but to assist us in communicating our message to an even broader ranger of prospective students. We look forward to their return visit in mid-March when their objective will be to address some

gaps that they and others in the com munity identified by attending a Community Senate meeting, meeting with groups of faculty and staff to discuss how we might market specific aca demic and extra-curricular programs and to continue to enjoy various com munity activities as they did the Student Loan Fund Auction.

Thanks again to the entire Guilford College community, especially the stu dents, who helped to make RHB's first full visit a success. Many of the people with whom we have met through this process have commented that Guilford is one of the "best kept secrets" in higher education and a college whose time has come; by working together we can ensure that their impressions indeed do come to fruition!

> Sincerely, **Bob Spatig** Admissions Office

### Response to a response

#### Dear Editor.

I must first apologize to Cara Skeat. in no way meant to assume a protector' role. Cara, please accept my humbles apologies.

Now, I will unabashedly strike back at Max Carter in defense of Sara Johnson Please forgive me, Sara, if I step out of bounds

The point of the article was to give the means of self-protection to those who choose recreational sex. That is their choice, as yours, Max, is to consider sex a 'sacramental act.'

I take umbrage at your insinuation that those who choose a life style other than yours are "self-disciplanarily challenged." I guess it just comes down to tolerance. had considered this a Quaker value, and am disappointed to discover in its place a smug moral superiority.

> Sincerely, John Cocking