

Letters to the Editor

Woodley Out of Line

Dear Editor:

I am writing in reaction to your cartoon in *The Clarion*, Feb. 15, 1993.

First, I appreciate the humor you were striving for- at least I hope it was humor. However, there are a couple of ideas I would like to express.

Why are the men's faces so perplexed; in presuming to know a great deal about this, you should have had them joyous.

Also, by nature of the wording and the tense, Clinton could say nothing - he would not be there to say it. If the last two people were gay, they would be in a majority; therefore, there would be no need for concern. It would be part of the vast eternal plan.

Be very careful in quoting the Bible. Please take up your copy and continue reading in Romans 14:10-15. ("Judge not lest ye be judged the same" is it's literal translation.)

Only one comment about your comic strip: that was a slanderous remark to assume that all blacks undress in phone booths and talk dirty to their women. Police become prejudice against the blacks because people like our political cartoonists stereotype them so badly.

Anyway; keep up the good work; I like *The Clarion* this year. It is doing what it should- making people think.

Sincerely,
Robert Allwyn White

A Concerned Student Affairs Staff

Dear Editor:

When I first read the cartoons published in the last issue of *The Clarion*, my heart sank. The next reaction I had was to ask the question, "How could this happen?" How could such clearly offensive material be published in a newspaper that serves Brevard College? My only acceptable response is that it was a mistake. Mature judgement would have recognized the potential harm the cartoons would cause to members of our college community.

Presentation of controversial topics is an important part of any newspaper, but requires sensitivity. Responsible editing would have protected the readers from being publicly insulted. Some will claim that it was an example of "freedom of speech." I disagree, it was rather an opportunity granted to freely offend.

At an institution of higher education, we should be concerned that

awareness and respect for others was overlooked in this incident. It is our shared responsibility to promote an environment which challenges us to develop as scholars and intellects. The encouraging fact is that many people are dedicated to working to ensure that nothing like this happens again.

Sincerely,
Aurora Olivieri John Erickson
Pablo Sanchez Drew Nelson
Norman Witek Bailey Woods
Judy Jacobson Sybil Dodson
Thomas F. Wright Charles Whitley
Susan N. Chappell Steve Woodson

Clinton Supporter Speaks Out

Dear Editor,

Concerning your inaccurate and ridiculous article, "You wasted your vote on Clinton," I would like to address a few of the preposterous accusations your paper has presented.

First of all on the subject of taxes, all the reports in 1992 projected the deficit to be much smaller than it has actually turned out to be. What was the Clinton team supposed to do, just go on the assumption that the Bush administration was lying? In retrospect that probably would have been wise in reviewing their past deceitful record such as the S&L scandal, the Iran Contra affair, and the "Iraq-gate" questions.

Who told you that this is a country founded on Judeo-Christian teachings? If you have ever glanced at the Bill of Rights, it states clearly that as Americans we have the right to practice freedom of religion. On our money it reads "In God We Trust" not "In Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior We Trust." There is a big difference. Here's a tip, when writing for a broad based paper such as *The Clarion*, with readers from a diversified religious background, stick to the facts, not some religious doctrine that you conveniently regurgitate to prove some point. Save that for your right wing Sunday school bulletins, or in case you plan on transferring to Bob Jones University.

Where did you find your facts on Clinton's disapproval rating? "The Young Republicans News Letter?" If I remember correctly, George Bush had the highest negative rating ever for a sitting president besides fellow Republican, Herbert Hoover. George Bush had over 60% of the citizens vote against him.

Clinton has made great strides since he has been in office: he signed the Family Leave Bill, he is close to passing a law that provides free vaccines for all children, and has worked out a

plan to finally start addressing the deficit without delusionary gimmicks and feel-good-quick fixes.

Do you know which country best fits the Republican ideal? Somalia: no government regulation, everyone is armed, and all the help comes from the generosity of volunteers.

Sincerely,
James Halyard

Bible Thumping Makes Enemies

Dear Editor,

In response to Assistant Editor James Woodley's column, "You Wasted your Vote on Clinton," I have a few comments to make.

Too bad Mr. Woodley referred to his readers (or more accurately, some of his readers) as "fools" and then proceeded to engage himself in that time-worn tradition of all self-righteous people: bible thumping. I'll admit that bible thumping produces a nice sound, and when a person is trying to find enemies among his own kind (i.e., fellow Christians), bible thumping works well. Obviously, though, if Mr. Woodley really spent as much time actually reading and understanding his bible as he does thumping it, he could glean from the bible's pages that Jesus Christ taught, among other things, tolerance.

Of course, Mr. Woodley is not the only person who believes that homosexuals should not be allowed in the military. In fact, his intolerance has strong-founded precedent in those who once believed that, first, Blacks and then, later, women should not be allowed to serve. People's sexual preferences have nothing to do with their ability to serve in the armed services. The argument against allowing homosexuals in the military is weaker than the argument against Blacks and women serving. Sexists and racists and - now - homophobics need to stand aside to allow more level-headed factions to prevail.

And they will prevail.

Sincerely,
Randy Jackson

Give Us A Break

Dear Editor,

I am concerned and dismayed by the harsh slant of several editorial and cartoon features in the recent edition of *The Clarion*. Depending upon one's interpretation, those features could be

seen as, at best, cavalier with respect to propriety and tolerance or, at worst, blatantly bigoted.

A college is a special kind of community with common purposes and aspirations. Without some sense of shared purpose and at least a modicum of respect for others, we cease to function as a college or society do as far as I'm concerned. We are privileged in our society (and in *The Clarion*) with the right to express opinions and beliefs, and to disagree as well. However, the right to express an opinion does not, I believe, necessarily impart the right to disparage the rights of others who might happen to hold differing views.

Secondly, I question the current preoccupation at Brevard College with extending visitation hours. There are so many real issues to be aired and focused upon and the visitation issue seems so trivial in comparison. How much visitation is really needed and for what purpose anyway? Judging from the insistant tone of the article on visitation in the recent issue of *The Clarion* the real issue is not one of extended visitation but rather of something akin to conjugal privileges. Give us a break.

Sincerely,
Bill Byers

Need Responsible Reporters

Dear Editor,

The attack leveled at the College Administration by Lorrin Wolf in the Feb. 15 issue left me somewhat confused. Last year, Dean Witek, representing the administration, worked closely with the Student Government Association to find a safe method to allow the extension of visitation hours in the dorms. A method was found and agreed upon. All the students had to do was take a measure of responsibility for their own safety by manning a sign-in table in the dorm lobbies.

Though PIO hours were granted for this duty, sufficient volunteers could not be found. During the few evenings that enough help was obtained, some of the volunteers abandoned their posts and the SGA officers ended up manning the tables. This experience convinced the SGA officers that there was insufficient interest in extending visitation hours and the plan was dropped.

A responsible reporter would have checked to find out if the administration actually opposed the extension of visitation hours and, if so, why.

Sincerely,
Ron Rutherford