

Opinion

Welcome to The Lance

Welcome to the first issue of this year's Lance. I would like to introduce the staff and their work to both new and returning students, and make all of you a proposition.

Deborah Kelly, our extremely hard-working, knowledgeable editor—and I am sincere in my references—could not be here through the entire production of this issue. That is why I, Managing Editor of *The Lance*, am extending both thanks to the staff and a request for more students to join us.

Until last week, I had only an idea of what producing this newspaper involved. By being thrown into Editorship temporarily, like a swimming teacher's student being tossed into a pool, I had to reach the pool's edge (publication) without the benefit of previous practical experience.

Unlike the student learning to swim, however, I had the help of a team of people who all wanted to reach the edge.

It is the team's kind of dedication

(and interest!) that produces this paper every other week. We like what we do, and I am certain there are other students (commuter students included!) at St. Andrews who would like to get a taste of journalism while they are here.

My proposition is this: Look at the staff box at the bottom of the editorial page that recognizes those of us on the team. If you are interested in writing, filling an open position, stuffing mailboxes, offering story ideas, or just speaking your mind, talk to one of us about getting started. Or write an article, poem, or letter to the editor and put it on the *Lance* office door, next to the computer center in L.A.

I feel, from experience, that your efforts will be rewarded every time you read what you've helped produce.

One final note that cannot be omitted is thanks to our readers. It takes a good team to produce *The Lance*, but if it were not for readers, our paper would have no purpose.

Sex Discrimination Alive and Well at St. Andrews

Mary Griggs

Sexual discrimination. Most of you have probably stopped reading at this point. "This is the 1980's," you say. "being a woman will not keep someone from being all that she wants to be."

Ladies, as of 1986 we were still earning only 62 percent of what men were earning, and that earning gap increases as educational levels increase. Most of you, even with a college degree, will earn the same amount as a man having only a high school diploma.

The men who graduate with you, who are just as highly motivated, who enter the same field, and start at the same salary as you, will earn significantly more than you in ten years and also be promoted at a faster rate. That is blatant sex discrimination.

Even on this campus there is subtle and covert discrimination. For example, at a recent SAGE 321 plenary two female students were singled out for not paying attention.

No one disputes that they were guilty of the charge, however, the professor later questioned their gender. Such a comment was unnecessary, and it embarrassed the students without any reason. Whatever the point the instructor was making, it was not served by this act of covert sexism.

An obvious incident of subtle discrimination is the difference between the male and female residence halls.

In the men's buildings, there are doors leading to the balconies, while the women's balcony is only accessible through a narrow window.

When the college was built, women were judged to be more emotional and more likely to jump from the height of the dorm, committing suicide. To my knowledge, that has never happened. Since sex role stereotypes are outdated, and hopefully nonexistent in most minds, why restrict women from using

the balconies?

Sexual discrimination continues to exist because many women have not been personally discriminated against nor have many men personally discriminated.

The illogical generalization that says if I or my family have not suffered from unemployment, homelessness, or poverty then those conditions do not exist, is unacceptable. Why then, in the area of sex discrimination, do we allow such inconsistent reasoning?

We need to break through the apathy and misguided assumption that says sex discrimination has been eradicated. The phrase "liberty and justice for all" needs to become reality, not remain rhetoric. Something that each of us can do to abolish the pattern of discrimination is to use inclusive language. By making the effort to include both sexes in your thought and speech, we can start towards that new reality.

Presidential Debate- Mudslinging at its Finest

Laura Rose

Last Sunday night, the first face-off between the presidential candidates interrupted most Americans' viewing of the XXIV Olympiad.

Aside from forcing the average sports junky to notice a current national event (other than an American boxer's second chance to flatten his Korean opponent), the broadcast provided another opportunity: to see how the Democratic and Republican party leaders wanted to package their respective candidates.

Unfortunately for unsuspecting viewers, the key word here is "package." The debate was a show-down to see who could create the best image.

The job must have been complicated, not unlike a reverse double somersault pike off the platform (diving, not party), since each candidate had to advocate basic Party beliefs while simultaneously attacking his opponent.

Bush and Dukakis were given a break, however. No thorough, reasoned argument was required to carry out the political debate — just the aforementioned system of attack on persons.

One example I found particularly interesting was Bush's description of Dukakis as a "card-carrying ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) member." If I understood correctly, this was an attempt to label Dukakis a radical liberal, definitely in opposition to the conservative Republican voter. In fact, the term sends chills down the spine of any conservative, regardless of party affiliation.

Using this simple-minded attack on Dukakis, Bush planted a seed of suspicion.

In this day and age, one might ask what the problem is with this practice. You can't pull the wool over the eyes of the American public, right? I mean when it comes right down to it, voters will look past all the mudslinging and know what each candidate really stands for, right??

People won't really believe that Dukakis is all for child pornography, just because he's a "card-carrying ACLU mem-

see Debate page 8

October 5, 1988
Vol. 26 Number 1

THE LANCE

The opinions expressed on these pages are not necessarily those of *The Lance* but are of the signed individuals. Editorial remarks are the responsibility of the Editorial Board. *The Lance* welcomes and encourages responses to the material in this publication, but reserves the right of editorial freedom governed by responsible journalism. Further information may be obtained from *The Lance* office, L.A. 176, or by calling (919) 276-3652, ext. 300 or 448.

Photography.....Rooney Coffman and Staff

Special Thanks to JCF Enterprises and the Office of Communications and Marketing.
Printed by *The Laurinburg Exchange*

The Editorial Board

Deborah L. Kelly.....Editor in Chief
Laura Rose.....Managing Editor
Steve Skinner.....Associate Editor
Eric Lien.....Business Manager
Robert Puller.....Design Director
Jon Pargas.....Quill and Ink Editor
Eric Eubank.....Sports Editor
Beth Russo.....Arts and Entertainment
Bobby Sunpeon.....Campus News and Features

Tonya Olsen.....Book Reviews
Lisa Chassy.....Tri Beta
Sharon Fields.....Legal Council

Staff Writers: Susan Russo,
Eric Faircloth, Troy Dixon,
Laura Molinaro, Jennifer
Spangler

The Lance
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
P.O. Box 757
Laurinburg, NC 28352
(919) 276-3652, ext. 300