

Opinion

From the Editor's Desk

Throughout my four years here at St. Andrews I have witnessed many changes in staff and administration. Some of these changes were unforeseen and surprising. Students were not made aware of why these 'hirings and firings' had to occur. I am not the only student that feels like they were the last to know about what was going on.

One Lance staff member was told by Dean Greer in an interview that a certain article would not be appropriate at this time. This article concerned the position of campus pastor being turned into a chaplain internship. I felt that once again decisions would be made and we would be told afterwards when our input would go unneeded.

Opinionated articles (such as this one) are reserved to the pages labeled **OPINION**. I think we covered the article adequately and without bias. The facts were stated and hopefully the rumors that are currently making the rounds on campus will be put to an end.

Concerning this change in the spiritual life of the campus, I have received much negative feedback from students. It is these same students that came to me in the first place to print the article.

Putting aside financial reasons and religious creed, I feel that decision to have interns will greatly affect some students. Each year St. Andrews' students will become guinea pigs for an unexperienced stranger. Will that person be able to cope with student tragedies, deaths of family members and friends and other various crises that we face every day? Will they be able to handle the pressure?

Fellow senior Randa Richards remarked that the personal nature of this campus is the essence of St. Andrews. "That is what St. Andrews is all about." Providing our community with a permanent pastor, one that we have come to love and trust, is only one element of this "personal" nature.

Christian guidance is only one part of a pastor's job. A relationship between a student and their spiritual mentor is one that is built on trust. How can one build that relationship with a "revolving door?" Will we feel obligated to receive comfort from someone who barely knows us or we know them?

St. Andrews is slowly losing its character and here is a prime example of that deterioration. Maybe I shouldn't care this much. After all, I'll be vacating the premises this May. However, there are many others who will be left behind to face the uncertain future of campus ministry.

-D.L.K.

The Lance	Volume 27, Number 5 February 23, 1989
Editorial Board	Writers: Pam Whitfield
Deborah L. Kelly ... editor in chief	Eric E. Faircloth, John Edmonson, Louise Marr, Elaine Franz
Mary Griggs ... managing editor	
Michael Roberts ... design director	
Eric Lien ... senior v.p. advertising	
Eric Eubank ... associate editor	
In this issue:	
Jon Pargas ... Quill and Ink	
Margaret Currie, Theresa Tadalan ... Tribute	
Janice Young ... Audacious Junk	

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 material in this publication, but reserves right of editorial freedom. P.O. Box 5-757, Ext. 388

Xanthippe

with Mary Griggs

It is time again to speak of the importance of inclusive language. As spring term '89 gets under way, the people of St Andrews need to affirm the value of all members of the community by being inclusive in their speech and writing.

Exclusive language is very harmful. It is the most visible sign that true equality and the American dream is a farce. Being exclusive in your language says to women that it doesn't matter how smart or talented or even how much will they have to succeed. They can climb the corporate ladder, achieve a position of responsibility in government, or raise children but they will never be fully human. Because *man* is *human*.

Every professor on this campus will confirm that being clear in what one says is essential to getting the point across to one's audience. Exclusive language is not clear, it is only exclusive. If one is talking about all of humanity, then say so. Don't just talk about the half that is male. Using 'man' when one is talking about women also invalidates your point.

If ever anyone wishes to see the power of language, they need look no further than George Orwell's *1984*, or the role of propaganda in every war. Words are used to define each of us, so is it right that only half of the world is included in "mankind's" accomplishments?

The most common response to the request that one use inclusive language is that it is unwieldy, all of those he/she's. Such a statement is pure bunk. Inclusive language is like a foreign language to most of us when we start SAGE. With practice and determination, however, it is easy to become fluent in it. A person just needs to think inclusively.

Finally, for all those old dogs who still don't see the reasoning behind making such a big deal about this, remember that using inclusive language is the policy of St Andrews College. To borrow from the Selective Service, "it's quick, it's easy, and it's the law." It is also right.