

# Quaker process not followed

BY PETER MORSCHECK  
Features Film Critic

One of my favorite quotes is "Never doubt that a small group of committed minorities can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." Yet, a week ago Thursday I found myself impeding such a committed group in their long-overdue quest for social justice when I blocked consensus at a called meeting of Community Senate.

The topic in question was whether Senate, and thus the student body, would support the hiring of a full-time African American Activities Coordinator that night rather than at another called meet-

ing on Sunday, which would require a suspension of normal process whereby a proposal is submitted one week and approved the next.

While everyone in the room was in favor of approving the position, I was in a small minority who advocated waiting a few days as a matter of process because, although many have fought for this position for 12 years, a written proposal was presented only that night.

And, while suspension of due process has occurred for such minor things as paying the Violent Femmes and repairing the WQFS tower, I felt it was precisely because this particular issue was so impor-

tant that we respect Guilford by approving the decision through proper channels.

Three more days is a small price to pay for 12 years of struggle if the alternative is subverting much of what Guilford stands for by disregarding proper procedure. I also saw it as imperative to wait on the proposal because it came at the end of a week of particularly high emotions and tensions with regard to race relations at Guilford.

The proposal was presented in what I saw as an abnormally hostile environment, where many tears were shed and even some personal attacks occurred. In such an environment it is impossible for a decision, regardless of how

"right" or "wrong" it is, to be truly spirit-led.

I am a birthright Quaker who came to Guilford in large part because of the Quaker values which pervade many aspects of the school. Quaker process is designed to allow decisions to be reached by consensus in an atmosphere of love and respect.

The atmosphere last Thursday, however, was one of anger, frustration, and intimidation. While the final outcome of the decision would have been the same, the symbolic gesture of respecting Guilford and Quaker process by waiting a few days would have made the backing of the proposal mean so much more.

# Paving paradise for a parking lot

BY GREGORY RINALDI  
Staff Writer

Guilford College wants to build a parking lot next to Bauman, where the Fraziers used to be. It was decided upon a few years ago, and they cite it as an immediate need.

But we don't need another parking lot. And if we did, who in the world would choose that place next to Bauman?

Imagine it. More concrete surrounding Bauman. Just one giant hub of concrete surrounding a

small building. Western Guilford College would look like a stone fortress. We don't need it.

And why, pray tell, do you pave a parking lot next to TWO other parking lots? Two other parking lots which are never filled unless some pee-wee soccer game is going on. That makes no sense.

Why pave a new parking lot when the Milner lot needs repaving first? Or when Hobbs needs lots of work? Or when every dorm on this campus needs something more important than what that money

is going towards?

It doesn't make sense. But why argue? Why argue with an administration that spends money on computer advancements instead of healthy dorm-life conditions? Why? Because it's time someone did.

It's time for this community to wise up. Greensboro is starting to overbuild big time.

They build new roads, new malls, new buildings while their old ones crumble into dust.

Guilford College should not follow Greensboro's lead. If you

must build something then tear down what is old and build something new. Or try rebuilding something.

That's simple, ain't it?

It would be nice if for once the Guilford community could stand united on an issue.

This issue is important. It will re-occur throughout your life no matter where you live. Which side are you on? Overbuilding or rebuilding?

In the meantime, leave the land west of Bauman concrete-free.

# In defense of pornography

BY WILL DODSON  
Features Editor

I think we can all agree that stereotypes are not desirable things for enlightened people to hold.

Just because I see an Italian mobster does not mean all Italians are mobsters.

Just because I see an Asian who knows martial arts does not mean I should assume all Asians know martial arts.

Just because I see an insane woman who wants to castrate all men in the name of feminism does not mean I should fear all feminists.

And just because you see a pornographic movie in which women are depicted in demeaning

and perhaps even misogynistic ways does not mean that all pornography is demeaning and exploits women.

"Even if words and images could be interpreted literally, we would still have to reject the pornophobic feminists' simplistic stance that pornography conveys unrelentingly negative messages about women," wrote Nadine Strossen in her book *Defending Pornography*. "Much commercial erotica depicts women in nonsubordinated roles, and contains images and ideas that may well be seen as positive for women and feminists."

What she means is that just because there are few rotten apples, we shouldn't be quick to chop down the tree. Pornography

is a form of expression, however distasteful any of us might find it.

D.H. Lawrence once said, "What is pornography to one [person] is the laughter of genius to another." Is pornography art? Not by my standards, and probably not by yours.

But who are we to judge what art is or is not? Works such as "Piss Christ" in which a crucifix was depicted submerged in a container of the artist's urine were condemned by opponents of the National Endowment for the Arts and are contributing reasons for the funding cut across the board for the NEA.

Quite a few of us found the cut in funding to the NEA be much more distasteful than the creations funded by the NEA.

Why do we not respect the legitimacy of the adult film industry

while we do respect the right of other visual artists to be as distasteful as they like?

Keep in mind I'm referring to legal pornography, not "snuff" films or child pornography.

Women and men of legal age have the right to produce and view pornographic materials under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

While we have the right to be offended by such material and can choose whether or not to purchase and view porn, we do not have the right to prejudge those in the industry as misogynist exploiters of sex.

Nor do we have the right to prejudge those who view such material as being perverted, dirty, misogynistic cretins. Some people just like the funny dialogue.