



The Editor's Desk

Fine Print: You Are Subject to Change

Jennifer Woodward

Well, it's finally here! I thought this day would never come. I apologize for *The Lance's* delay, however, we ran into many technical difficulties. Two weeks ago Sharon and I attended a conference for college newspapers in Washington, D.C. The conference proved to be a real success and we learned so much - especially how to use our computer system! We had no idea its capabilities. If you notice the paper seems to look much improved, more professional. We're so happy and pleased. During the course of the conference we discovered that we could lay out the entire paper on the computer! It took us a while, however, to get the hang of it - therefore, the delay.

Sharon and I had the chance to speak with many other students and we were given plenty of advice and helpful hints. We feel that we could do so much with the newspaper and we try harder with each new issue. I've been pleased with our efforts so far. However, we seem to have run to the end of our rope - at least I have!

Many of the editors at the conference spoke of "Editor Burn-out!" and, amen, I can attest to that! I enjoy working with the newspaper, in fact I love it! But there comes a time when you realize that enough is enough. I hope to continue with my efforts, however, there is so much that this staff needs for it to continue full speed.

After speaking with the other newspaper staffs I realized how inadequately equipped we are. To run a strong student newspaper we need at least two more Macintoshes, more software, a printer, light tables, and a publication room. At the present time we work out of the communications office and one computer. This is not enough! We also need to give our staff members academic credit. This will ensure the continuation of the papers success after my graduation, and will also give students the incentive to join and remain on the staff.

I feel that my plea is well justified. The academic credit could be a strong boost to the Mass Communications program. Also, the added computers and software will be another added bonus. Desk-top publishing is the wave of the future, and we need to be educating our students before they get out in the real world.

A Response
By Matt Sutherland

The United States is clearly on its way to an inclusive society; slavery has been eliminated, discrimination laws have been etched into the books of federal law, and women's rights have levelled with those of men. Inclusive language is yet another change of thought easing its way into the steaming bathtub of the English language. But inclusive language is an institutional change; it is a reform being instilled mostly in educational facilities. It cannot be a battle among people, as the guest editorial in the last issue of *The Lance* seemed to suggest with its underlying oppressive attitude.

I have converted to inclusive language and should state first that I both understand the importance of and abide by it. I am "born again." But the movement for inclusive language is, for Americans, as inescapable as Christian evangelists are to African tribespeople. All writers familiar with and fond of the old language are ultimately doomed to change their ways.. Anyone sticking with the now old-fashioned grammar will be automatically labelled a chauvinist - not an admirable title, especially for

someone who, perhaps innocently, or ignorantly, just wanted to ace his or her research paper.

It is an equal trade, though; the writer surrenders his or her uncensored or unmodified, style for a wider range of readers and less criticism. For inclusive language is not only a change in language; it is a change in thought. The readers he or she gains are people who have also been accustomed to inclusive language and who now, in the mode of "inclusiveness," expect it. But the more people made aware of this change, the more pressure is on others to use it. The writer, therefore, hasn't much say in whether or not he or she wants this bargain.

Indeed, those unwilling to conform have tried to solve the problem. And it seems there is no real answer, unfortunately, except to reorient oneself to this new thought. Using the possessive "their" in place of "his or her" or "one's" is definitely not a solution; most writers, I assume, would rather write something correctly than incorrectly. Other arguments against inclusive language are more philosophical than resolvable, and

effectually feeble.

I grew up writing and learned early what used to be proper English. I do not resent inclusive language. I resent not having a choice, having the decision made for me, and the idea of being helplessly converted to something without hope of return, of having a big part of my thought processes reworked. In an individually-oriented society, it is sometimes difficult to realize that one must change oneself in order to benefit others. There is no battle, though. There cannot be one; from the moment the idea was pondered it was determined. It is a gradual change in history, and will become as easily taught, learned, and used as the language the generations of our time grew up with. The conflict I, like many, must learn to live with is rooted in chronology. If we are uncomfortable at this stage of the development of the language, we are simply "in the wrong place at the wrong time."

By the way, will someone please tell Sesame Street to change that song to, "One of these kids is doing his or her own thing?"

A Response
By Diane Reid

I am not frequently prone to offer my private response to public statements, but I am rather concerned about the tone of Dr. Dub's article, "Ubi Sunt? The Great Role Models of Yesteryear," which appeared in the Oct. 18 edition of *The Lance*.

As a senior majoring in both politics and religion, I have been fortunate to experience many, though certainly not all, of the St. Andrews "greats" - those professors who have excelled so well in their vocations, consistently making permanent positive impacts upon the lives of their students. As one begins entering the upper levels of higher education and initiates dialogue with professors from universities across the country about one's undergraduate experience, it is encouraging to discover

St. Andrews does have that coveted "name recognition." From my own experience, names like Bushoven, White, Bringle, Prust, Bayes, Alexander, Walters (I could go on and on) are recognized nationally as well as regionally. Certainly a professor's ability to empower and educate students within the classroom greatly fosters such reputations; but there is, as Dr. Dubs articulates, more to teaching than what is done within the confines of the classroom.

According to Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, the word "teach" "applies to any manner of imparting information or skill so that others may learn." St. Andrews has historically provided a rich environment for teaching, has continued this tradition throughout my time here, and will undoubtedly in the future prove unflinching in its mission.

Those "greats" have become great (and renowned) because they are gifted with an ability to help students make responsible decisions regarding their own lifestyles, ethical mores, vocations and yes, even teaching styles. These "greats" do not impose their own values upon their students; rather, these professors/role models/mentors try to move students out of the "copy teacher" mode. These folks attempt to empower students, to help students find their own way, based on These Great Role Models of THIS Year probably see themselves not as the example of the good teacher, but as examples of persons who make decisions based upon what knowledge they have, accepting the consequences of those decisions, but not imposing their experience and decisions on others, especially students.

I am uneasy about Dr. Dubs' projections concerning what he might have learned had his professors and peers challenged him in some way other than the ways in which they did. More crucial however, is my displeasure with the innuendos within those examples and projections. If Dr. Dubs means to imply certain professors at St. Andrews do stroke their egos by treating students as "chicks" who should trust only the mother hen," do encourage illegal drug abuse, and do lead careless lifestyles that are the source of "scurrilous college and community gossip," perhaps he should be so bold as to confront them directly with his displeasure. Also, if Dr. Dubs is not pleased with the moral and ethical standard of the student leadership on campus, I hope he will attend

one of our Senate meetings and formally address us on the matter. What he seems to be saying is that St. Andrews is experiencing a "Great Role Model" drought - we are lost, with few acceptable role models, left to reminiscence fondly about "Yesteryear" when all was grand.

I sincerely hope fellow students and I have misread his article and misunderstood his intent. I would offer that St. Andrews is blessed with a plethora of most excellent role models. I hope we can all find ways to celebrate our communal richness and diversity, without trying to impose our particular standards or perspectives upon each other as individuals.

To the editor:

We chose to attend St. Andrews Presbyterian College because we loved the atmosphere of acceptance and encouragement. Having been involved with disabled people or ourselves being disabled, we greatly admired what we thought to be the attitude of the administration toward the disabled. We believed that these students were encouraged to do for themselves all that they could: specifically, to think, to make immediate and life decisions and to accept the consequences of these decisions.

We fear that either we have been greatly misled and suddenly disillusioned with the case of Stacey Leff or else the policy of the administration toward Burriss residents has been changed without prior knowledge. This arouses so many negative and confused emotions that they cannot all be named.

Stacey Leff was a third year student at St. Andrews. She suffers from childhood arthritis and is not a straight "A" student. She broke her leg Saturday,

Oct. 27. Monday, after the initial shock of the pain and cast and reactions to the medicine had settled, she was informed by Ken Keuster and Dean Cynthia Greer that she would have to go home.

Although we do agree that academically Stacey would probably be better off having withdrawn, we are extremely angry and confused as to why her wishes were not only never inquired about, but also ignored. She wanted to stay at school and "attend" classes through cassette tapes until her leg was healed enough to get back into the chair and cross the lake. She began doing that first thing Monday morning. She was willing to fight to maintain or even improve her grades and willing to accept the outcome of the battle, whatever it would be; but she was not allowed to even have input as to the ultimate decision. Despite the facts that Stacey is 20 years old and economically dependent for collegemoney on sources other than her immediate family, her mother was able to sign her out of school against Stacey's wishes.

We are not denying that other factors exist in this situation. As with any situation,

each person involved (specifically here, Ken Keuster, Dean Greer, Stacey Leff, her mother, her roommate, her friends) each brought to the situation a different viewpoint; however no one ever attempted to mesh these viewpoints into a workable compromise; in some instances, viewpoints were not even acknowledged. This extremely paternalistic action was not a part of the policies presented to us as prospectives nor as students. How can an institution which is praised so vehemently for its encouragement of the disabled to be and act as equally viable humans, ignore one of its student's wishes on an individual level? Why was Stacey Leff not advised of what the doctors and Burriss representatives and academic advisors believed to be the best option academically and medically; then encouraged to decide how she would like to address the situation: to stay and fight or to withdraw, heal then return later?

We came to St. Andrews because it encouraged people of all abilities to grow and mature into contributors to the social good, not to be stifled by

insecure authoritarians. We believed that all students were encouraged to become individual personalities, not just one subset of the personality of the institution.

Other questions which this situation brings to surface include the following: (1) Why are not all students who are in academic trouble and injured sent home? (2) When did the policy change regarding injured Burriss residents? Apparently it has changed, if not in writing, at least in application, during the course of this semester. In the past even students who have had a lengthy hospital stay have not been told to go home. (3) Why the change? (4) Or is this policy not written but left up to individual cases as Ken Keuster and Dean Greer see fit with no input from the student involved? Why are no guidelines in writing if this is the case? (5) Point blank: Why is the student not involved in decisions which affect the academic, social and emotional life of the student?

Having been involved in the whole process of requiring Stacey to leave, we

watched the Burriss representatives and administration treat her as a non-person, incapable of decision-making or accepting consequences. In a matter of four days, she was so dehumanized and depressed and overwhelmed by self-worthlessness that she no longer had the mental or emotional energy to fight. Therefore, we, her friends, are fighting for her. We are not asking that the decision be changed, but that the policies and reasons behind the decision are explained. We believe that as fellow students affected by the same administration, we have the right to know how and why the system works. If St. Andrews has become paternalistic and over-protective, it will soon suffer from the very faults which it has warned us against.

Sincerely,
Krys Wood Quincy Kaufman
Shelly Mendenhall Terry L. Federice
Elizabeth Chesky Kristy Yates
Kim Biglin