

Senate leaders should not be paid for services to school



The atmosphere is tense in Boren Lounge as Yahya wipes the sweat off his face, frustrated Quaker hands are in the air and the meeting has just been extended another 30 minutes. Fantastic.

This is the scene I envision at the next Community Senate meeting when the topic is brought up to potentially give payment to Senate leaders. Not a pretty picture.

Even though Senate leaders currently receive a stipend of \$500 a semester for their service, this is more of an academic scholarship than a monthly payment. This money goes towards their tuition payment, not their own pockets.

Paying Community Senate leaders would cause a slew of problems among the student body, starting with the other organizations on campus. Paying some community leaders and not

others goes against the core value of equality at Guilford.

What makes Senate leaders more important than other student leaders, such as club leaders and CAB leaders? What exactly would the pay be? Who will keep Senate leaders accountable? What money would be used for the pay?

Equality goes out the window the second one organization is given preferential treatment

Plenty of leaders on campus put in a tremendous amount of time and work into their organizations, and they do not get paid either. It would not be fair for one organization on campus to have paid leadership positions and others not.

over the multitude of other, equally significant groups on campus. Offering payment to one organization and not the others is going against a core value.

Service is a big part of what

makes Guilford unique. Our student body spends a lot of their extra time involved in clubs, volunteering or being otherwise involved with campus activities.

Being a leader on campus means doing it on a volunteer basis. If Senate leaders suddenly receive money for their service, this will no longer be the case.

Plenty of leaders on campus put in a tremendous amount of time and

work into their organizations and they do not get paid either. It would not be fair for one organization on campus to have paying leadership positions and others not.

The third negative to paying

senate leaders would be the question of integrity. Some may simply run for senate positions in order to get the money.

Currently the people on senate are there because they want to serve the Guilford community and student body, not because of any monetary incentives. It should stay that way in the future as well.

Leaders of Senate should want to do their jobs out of a sense of service to the school rather than seeing as an opportunity to get money. The integrity of the leadership roles in Senate can only be kept alive with a focus on service and commitment to the school.

Finally the core value that would really be the most in jeopardy is community. A community should be united, but this is just the type of issue that could split the community and cause a lot unnecessary controversy and arguing.

Being a part of senate without the pay is a sure sign of complete commitment to the community. Involving money in the system would muddy the waters of true commitment to the school and its students.

Why have we become so comfortable using demeaning terms towards women?

By Thomas Deane
STAFF WRITER

"Slut," "whore," "prostitute" and "nappy-headed hoers." All of these terms have been uttered on live television or radio broadcasts to describe women.

What have we become as a society when the verbal abuse of a person is acceptable? Activists have long striven to end the usage of demeaning terms.

The word "slut" is around 600 years old and originally referred to a woman that is unclean, untidy or dirty. Today, "slut" and other demeaning terms have lost their original connotations and their usage is almost a common occurrence.

Recently, talk show host Rush Limbaugh made national news during a radio broadcast in which he called Sandra Fluke a "slut." Now, I do not necessarily disagree with Limbaugh on a lot of subjects. However, when he calls a woman a "slut" and a "prostitute," then we have issues.

Immediately following the incident, negative reaction blew up the wavelengths. "Slut-gate 2012" became a popular movement aiming to shut Rush up. Tweeters have been urged to hash-tag #stopRush and #BoycottRush in order to spread information.

Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology and Coordinator of Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies Julie Winterich does not necessarily believe that, when Limbaugh used these gender-specific terms, he was reflecting the views of society.

"Rush Limbaugh uses words intentionally to be provocative — it is not necessarily representative of how people in U.S. society use words," Winterich said.

Limbaugh's use of these gender-specific terms on a national broadcast opens up a whole new can of worms. When people are using these words, and what they say

"Rush Limbaugh uses words intentionally to be provocative — it is not necessarily representative of how people in U.S. society use words,"

Julie Winterich, assistant professor of sociology and anthropology and coordinator of women's, gender and sexuality studies

is heard by millions, this becomes very alarming. Banter between two opposing sides isn't supposed to be nice and fun. We get it. You need to have tough skin if you are arguing with the likes of Rush Limbaugh. But when it escalates to the point to where young people grow up thinking these words are okay, something is awry.

When young people grow up believing these words are okay, their use becomes the norm. Furthermore, when young women grow up hearing these words, they can become discouraged to speak out against the use of gender-specific names.

The problem here isn't only that the words were used, but who used them. When a high-ranking member of the media uses these terms, everything changes. High-profile people have followers who want to imitate their actions. Someone who hears Limbaugh utter these gender-specific words will think that, because he used them, it makes it okay to demean women.

Luckily, there were repercussions for Limbaugh's actions. More than three dozen companies yanked their endorsements from Limbaugh's show.

"What's interesting about the Limbaugh example is that advertisers pulled out, which is a striking example of what is no longer acceptable in some contexts, in some ways," said Winterich.

The example of pulling sponsorships from his show emphasizes the hope that these gender-specific slurs will be a thing of the past.

"Customers and listeners have taken to social media to inundate advertisers, stations and sponsors of Limbaugh's show with calls to boycott Limbaugh," Fluke said in an interview with ABC News.

These steps to pull sponsorship as well as the decrease in listeners are positive steps when it comes to the fight against these demeaning slurs.

Staff Editorial

Take control of the social media at your fingertips

Two weeks ago, Kim Kardashian was flour-bombed at a red carpet event as she celebrated her new perfume line. The story exploded, with headlines, tweets and blogs blowing up all over the country. It seemed like thousands joined Kim and her family in the fight for justice against the attack and the attacker.

The next day, 100 miles south of Hollywood, an Iraqi woman was shot and killed in her home and left with a note that read: "This is my country. Go back to yours, terrorist." The crime, obviously motivated by hate, elicited alarm from some, showing up in the occasional tweet or blog post, but, for the most part, it remained overshadowed and under-covered.

Around the same time, headlines came out informing the American public that U.S. troops had been involved in an airstrike that killed 24 Pakistani soldiers. This story received little attention on social networks and blogs, and several days later — when it was announced that no disciplinary action would be taken against the soldiers involved — people were still preoccupied with calling for Kim Kardashian's vindication.

While these three events are not comparable in many ways, the varying levels of attention they received from the nation reflects an alarming pattern: media focuses more on celebrities than other people, no matter the tragedy. The bottom line is: Kim Kardashian's flour bombing should not outrage the public more than a hate crime or a military blunder resulting in the death of 24 innocents.

The problem is two-fold. The media can be found culpable for playing to what the public want to see and hear. They know what sells, and, ultimately, that's what we get. Even the most reputable news organizations emphasize and sensationalize certain stories while down-playing other, less palatable headlines. But when it comes down to what sells — what society cries out for — that's quite simply up to us.

So maybe we should all do something about it. Use the social media at your fingertips to spread important stories, stories that are about social justice, equality, and racism. Media should not be controlled by a small few. Take control of your media, social and otherwise.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE GUILFORDIAN CONSISTS OF FIVE SECTION EDITORS, A PHOTO EDITOR, LAYOUT EDITOR, WEB EDITOR, DIVERSITY COORDINATOR, ADVERTISING MANAGER, VIDEO EDITOR, EXECUTIVE PRINT COPY EDITOR, EXECUTIVE WEB COPY EDITOR, SOCIAL JUSTICE EDITOR, MANAGING EDITOR, AND EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.

REFLECTING GUILFORD COLLEGE'S CORE QUAKER VALUES, THE TOPICS AND CONTENT OF STAFF EDITORIALS ARE CHOSEN THROUGH CONSENSUS OF ALL 16 EDITORS.