

The FORUM

editorial board

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.

Corrections: a part of life

We try to make the "Corrections" section of this paper as minimal as possible. It tends to frustrate us when we mess up, as we did last week when an important word was inadvertently left out of guest writer Dick Dyer's column on vandalism.

Fortunately for the Guilfordian staff, we have a little box titled, appropriately enough, "Corrections" to clear up any misunderstandings or errors that we may make. Not everyone is that fortunate.

Think about it. When you do something stupid, what can you do about it? Usually, not very much. There's always an apology, but that is distasteful at best to most people.

You'd have to talk to the per-

son and actually admit that it was you who did the wrong thing. Over here at the paper, we just put an anonymous little ditty in a box that nobody really ever notices, and the whole thing is over and done with. If anyone ever asks us, we can say, "Yeah, we corrected it, didn't you see it?"

There are a lot of people around Guilford who could use a Corrections box of their own. While obviously no one

is going to stand up and say, "I'm the idiot who keeps breaking lights in Bryan," would they do it if it could be anonymous?

There are a lot of people around Guilford who could use a Corrections box of their own

Corrections box on the sidewalk out front of Milner on the side closest to Founders, and the person could chalk their apology right there for us all to see. No

one would have to know who made the mistake, just like here at the paper.

We're not just trying to fill up space. Think about how good an apology makes you feel when you think someone has wronged you—whether it comes anonymously or not. There are a horde of undercurrents running through Guilford—a new one was sighted just the other day. Seems some large intellects have been having a running conversation on a second floor bulletin board in Duke about the academic proficiencies of football players.

No names attached, just various ridiculous and stereotypical statements.

No names attached, just how the "Correction" could be.

Letters to the Editor

Response to 'Stereotyping'

To the Editor,
Mr. Dailey illustrates for us, although I think unintentionally, a significant point on stereotyping.

He asserts that African-Americans are often stereotyped. He cites financial issues, athleticism, and scholarship in particular. This is to say that it is quite easy to stereotype and in a number of different ways. I don't think anyone would agree that African-Americans students are exclusively stereotyped, or even more so than others. But to say that stereotyping is easy to do tells us that we should be careful as to how we use terms of generalization. Mr. Dailey says, "Not all black students are athletes. Some are here because of academic excellence or a number of other reasons." I hope he is not saying that athletes are distinct from these students who attend Guilford because of academic excellence, or that the only reason athletes attend college is to play sports. Certainly we could all point out a number of men and women at Guilford who excel both in the classroom and on the field.

Forcing readers to make assumptions about generalizations is dangerous, because we know how likely people are to stereotype. If terms such as athlete, African-American, and others are not used carefully and with exactitude, then

readers will likely add connotations of their own to articles. In this way unclear statements do not reflect "neutral" generalizations, but allow for misinterpretations into stereotypical remarks. Perfect examples of this are the stupid athlete, the athletic African-American, etc. We must recognize the equivocal nature of these words and express them precisely, or we invite stereotyping through forcing people to assume meaning in what we write.

Sincerely,
Chris Leady

Senate economics

To The Editor,
Why, may I ask, has Senate raised our Student Activity Fee?

Senate has a \$60,000 SURPLUS!! Yes, it is true. Each year, \$20,000 is designated to not be spent so that in the case of an emergency, money is available to students. Well, this has been accumulating for three years.

If there will be a significant drop in those attending Guilford next year, then I believe that reserve can and should be dipped into out of necessity.

Guilford's Board of Trustees voted to not raise tuition. Now, Senate seizes this as an opportunity to raise the SAF.

If the situation was indeed bad enough to warrant an increase, where were our dutiful Senators? Were they in Founders letting us know? No. In fact, no out-of-the-ordinary measures were taken to make students aware.

Where is the commitment to communication here? To be in compliance to the \$20,000-a-year rule, perhaps we need to raise the fee by \$20...but not by \$60!

The SAF has not been raised in the four years I have attended Guilford. If the situation is dire, maybe we should consider cutting budgets instead of increasing them. With a smaller Guilford population, should we then increase the size of the yearbook? It seems illogical to me.

When times are financially strict, splurging is not the answer. I believe, as do many others, that Senate's decision was an inappropriate one.

Sincerely,
Wade Tomlinson
Security speaks out

To the Editor,
This article is in response to Josh White's little research project

on Security's unlocking procedure in a recent issue of the Guilfordian. Guilford is a small school; everyone knows this. It is rare that you will see someone you do not recognize, especially in the Residence Halls. In those Residence Halls we have people called Resident Advisors and Hall Directors. These Residential Life employees have keys to each room on their hall. There is a reason for this. When you are locked out the first person you should contact is your RA. If not your RA, then another, and if not another then perhaps the Hall Director. If none of them can be found... then Security.

I realize that if you are prone to locking yourself out that can become expensive. I also realize that many residents bypass that whole one dollar payment and automatically call Security. That is fine too, but our first priority is not letting people into their rooms when they have locked themselves out, or lost their keys. I honestly believe that we often take for granted that students follow the Honor Code in not asking for identification when we do unlocks. 95% of the time we recognize the person requesting the unlock as a student who lives in that building. Perhaps in the future we should pay more attention to the Honor Code, perhaps the breaks we try to give need to be stopped.

Sincerely,
Craig Cotten