

The Guilfordian

CPS - Collegiate Press Service

The Guilfordian maintains a free and independent policy from the institution within the code of Journalistic ethics adopted by the Publications Board and printed by and for the students of Guilford College.

Editors - Rich McKelvie, Janet Ghezzi, Cheryl Sprinkle.

Writers - en generale: Jim Garvin, Ted Malick, Spencer Evans, Craig Chapman, Rod Edens, Bill Mountford, Jill Taylor, Susan Wagner, Emily Hedrick, Pat Andrew, Onedia Hamann, Jeannie Lakes, Walt Howerton, Pete Ballance, Bob Hill,

Photographer: Mike Griffin

Advisor: Caroline Carlton

EDITORIAL 'Feathering the Nest?'

With consuming interest we have observed the flagellations and inner contortions of the Hobbs regime since replacing that of the estimable, though hopelessly outdated, Dr. Clyde Milner.

Dr. Hobbs, since ascension, has cautiously proceeded to repair and restore the long-neglected institution to former eminence. And he found, as was expected, that massive doses of adrenalin were required.

While sympathizing completely with the procedural headaches incumbent upon restoration, we find a recent chain of events which has seen fit to transfer two of Guilford's most perceptive and stimulating professors - - Dr. Paul Zopf and Dr. William Burris - - from the classroom to the administration, most disturbing. For these transfers have not only weakened their own departments, but also the academic offering of the school as a whole.

Officialdom's justification for these

"promotions" rests on the tacit assumption that by improving the administration of the college, the rest of the institution will automatically improve.

In reply to such a charge, Dr. Hobbs reports: "I don't think the Administration in any sense is trying to feather its own nest." He reinforces his argument by explaining that these men are being replaced by equally reputable men.

We hope so. But the emphasis still appears to be misplaced. We feel that the interests of the students, and the school as a whole, rests more with the faculty than with a smooth functioning administration.

Clearly, President Hobbs would not overtly (or even covertly) undermine the best interests of the students, yet the plain fact of the matter is that one would have to search far and wide to find men of equal caliber.

Hopefully he has found such men, but we would have preferred importation of professional (and equally enlightened) administrators to the present imposition.

Letter To The Editors:

As a student at the South's only Quaker College, or, as is perhaps more to the point, the Quaker's only Southern college, and as a Quaker by birthright and by training, I note with amusement and fascination the exchange of views between Henry Hackett and President Hobbs. One of whom has decided that Friends who hold be-pastored, collection-plate meetings in the Bible-belt style ought perhaps to be burned at the stake like John Huss or the medieval Jews; and the other of whom states that a Quaker is a Quaker is a Quaker, and that one can believe in anything he wishes and still partake of the Friendly tradition.

The exciting possibility, as I see it, is that if Hackett wins out, there will be an excommunication or two in the offering, and if Hobbs wins out, we'll soon be seeing Seventh-Day Pentacostal Quakers,

Church-of-the-Later-Day Quakers, and heaven only knows what else. The Quaker meeting, not protected by the Sanction, the Interdict, or the Inquisition, or any of the usual clerical conveniences, will be open to anyone who evinces only a belief in his own 'inner light.' You may, evidently, observe Candlemas and Ramadan; you may practice circumcision, or observe the Kosher laws, or offer up human sacrifice if it pleases you-the Society of Friends is above making petty dogmatic distinctions.

I might point out that wide vistas for religious tolerance were first opened up precisely those North Carolina Quakers whom Mr. Hackett presumes to criticize. In how many meetings can a Friend practice racial intolerance or advocate nuclear militarism without fearing the

(Con't page 6)

LETTER FROM ADMINISTRATION:

In the last issue of the Guilfordian the Guilford College administration was charged with taking a "non-committal" attitude in the recent student demonstration at the Imperial Barbershop. I would like here to inform members of the Guilford community precisely what actions the Administration has taken in an effort to have our local barbershops serve our Negro students.

In the first place we recognize that, as an administration, we do have an obligation to do what we can to encourage local barbershops in this matter, because we must make every effort to insure equal opportunities for all students at Guilford. The only problem is which means should be used in the attempt to bring about this condition of equal treatment. The article in the Guilfordian did not mention that, as president, I sent a letter to all the barbershops and beauty salons in our immediate area, stating our problem, and asking for their cooperation. In no sense did I suggest that pressures would be brought to bear if they did not comply, because I felt, and I feel now, that this is not the proper way to gain effective solutions in such matters. That this was a proper way to proceed would seem to be indicated by the fact that the Quaker Village Barber-shop has agreed to cut the hair of Guilford's Negro students. I commend them for this decision.

In speaking with members of the Guilford Human Concerns Committee prior to the picketing, I told them that I fully supported their goals in the barbershop situation, and that they had every legal right to picket the Imperial Barbershop, but that I questioned whether the means which they proposed would actually help to accomplish these goals. I further indicated that I suspected that picketing would create an embattled situation and that we would thus lose such useful fluidity as the situation then had.

Since the college administration had not been non-committal about this situation, and since it was already acting in the manner which was deemed most productive under the circumstances, we were not in a position to endorse the action of the Guilford Human Concerns Committee. We do, however, support their right to take this action. At no time were members of this Committee forbidden to demonstrate, but they were told that they represented only themselves in this matter.

I personally believe that each of us, students and faculty alike, must act according to our understanding of what is right, and I commend those who are willing to take a stand with this motive in mind. Surely it is not too much to expect that others be accorded the same privilege.

(Con't page 6)