

The Guilfordian

The Guilfordian is printed by the students of Guilford College, weekly except for examination periods and vacations.

The office is in Cox Old North. The telephone number is 292-8709. Address: Guilford College, Greensboro, N.C. 27410. Subscription rates: \$3.50 per year; \$2.00 per semester.

Craig P. Chapman . . . Editor-in-Chief
Peter B. Ballance . . . Business Manager

Associate Editors:

Bob Price-----News	Ted Malick-----Sports
Jean Parvin-----Managing	Mark Lessner-----Contributing
Nancy Mengebier--Feature	Phil Edgerton-----Contributing

Jerry Clawges, Stuart Sherman, Jim Willson---Photographers
Kelly Dempster---Cartoonist Janet Ghezzi--Proofreader
Frann White, Ellen Tumer-----Circulation



General Staff: Tori Potts, Jeanette Ebel, Clare Glone, Jeff Bloom, Helen Macarof, Carla McKinney, Patty Lyman, Deanna Day, Liz Sparger, Carol Adams, Mary Lou Hinton, Minnette Coleman, Doug Scott, Jani Craver, Jim Shields, Eugene Hassett.

REPRESENTED FOR NATIONAL ADVERTISING BY
National Educational Advertising Services
A DIVISION OF
READER'S DIGEST SALES & SERVICES, INC.
380 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10017



Hooray for Women's Hours.

The Truth About MIG



The MIG Judicial Board's handling of a case charging Bob Wolinsky with accompanying a woman student into the parlor of a 1968 Men's Dorm suite was most unfortunate.

Instead of accepting Wolinsky's uncontested testimony that his breach of the rules resulted from his misunderstanding as to the open house hours of New Men's Dorm during Homecoming weekend, the Judicial Board chose to use the accident as an opportunity to vent their prejudice against the violator.

The decision of the Judicial Board to sentence Wolinsky to disciplinary probation for the remainder of the semester would seem to contradict the "no case" decision which the WSC Judicial Board handed down after considering charges against Wolinsky's alleged female partner.

It is interesting to note that the WSC Judicial Board, after accepting the violation of college rules as an unfortunate accident decided that the incident demonstrated the need for an improvement in the posting open house hours in the dorms.

However, the most unfortunate aspect of the entire trial was the tacit decision of the board to allow one of the prosecution witnesses to sit with the board while they deliberated the guilt of the defendant.

Perhaps before the Judicial Board dispenses any more of its now infamous justice, they should familiarize themselves with the established procedural precedents of American Courts of Law.

The sentences imposed on Moulton Avery and Evan Davis by the MIG Judicial Board following their admission of guilt to charges concerning the presence of a woman student in the parlor of their suite was a sharp contrast to the punishment the Board saw fit to impose on Bob Wolinsky for a like offense.

Instead of sentencing the two defendants to disciplinary probation for the remainder of the semester, as was the decision in Wolinsky's case, the Board saw fit to merely reprimand the pair; a penalty definitely in keeping with the relative insignificance of their offenses.

However it should be noted that the charges involving defendants Davis and Avery were clouded by the conflict of allegiance which faces students charged with the enforcement of rules molded without their participation.

On the side of the prosecution was an R.A. who in keeping with the responsibilities of his position attempted to enforce an unjust rule.

On the other side was an MIG member whose allegiance to the interest of the student body compelled him to warn the students in the suite of their impending danger.

Until the students realize, as this MIG member did, that their first allegiance is to the welfare of their fellow students and not to the enforcement of silly rules formulated without their consultation; more silly trials such as these will clog the dockets of Guilford's Judicial bodies.

Letter To Editor

Wolinsky Appeals; Asks SAC Review

(THE FOLLOWING IS THE APPEAL FILED BY ROBERT WOLINSKY TO THE SAC CONCERNING HIS RECENT CONVICTION BY THE MIG JUDICIAL BOARD.)

Dear Editor:

I would like to present to the members of the Student Affairs Committee an appeal for a new trial to substantiate or disavow the findings of the M.I.G. Judicial Board with respect to Wolinsky Vs. M.I.G. on November 6, 1969. I feel it would be of the uppermost importance that S.A.C. review the case due to the fact that illegal proceedings were used during prosecution and deliberation of the trial.

According to the written statement on "Policy for Judicial Procedure" it is stated in Part 2 section 8 that, "At the con-

clusion of the testimony and questioning, all but the members of the committee are excused from the room and further discussion of the case may take place." It has become apparent to the defendant that M. I.G. Judicial Board has become fraudulent in their procedure. At the time of the deliberations the witnesses for the plaintiff were maintained within the courtroom while the defendant and respective witnesses were asked to leave. I do not wish to suggest any sort of corroboration between prosecution and court but rather the fact that their presence can put undue influence on the findings of the court.

During the entire hearing it became evident to the defendant

that his statement was not being taken as his word or truth. The court exhibited outward bias by trying to read their own interpretation of the statement. The defendant was found guilty and the punishment pronounced was Disciplinary Probation.

In our American Judicial System the criterion for levy of disciplinary action according to seriousness of crime has always been the ideal of our democracy and the pronounced sentence by M.I.G. is an intolerable act perpetrated upon the defendant and his rights as a student and a citizen. I think it of great importance that the M. I.G. Board be reprimanded and possibly reminded of how to dispense justice in a fair Quaker fashion.

Letter To Editor

Alumnus Questions Athletics Report

Dear Editor:

As a Guilford alumnus of the class of 1964, I was interested in several articles which appeared in THE GUILFORDIAN handed out at the Homecoming football game November 1, 1969.

The articles appeared to be "anti-athletic" in content. Although I am in favor of a critical analysis when it is done properly and with a constructive goal in mind, I am highly critical of any argument that presents only one point of view.

First of all, I was unable to locate a clear statement of the purpose for such a study, nor was I able to find any concrete conclusions or constructive recommendations for a solution to the problem, if indeed a problem exists.

I accept the figures quoted for expenditures as correct; however, I have some question as to the percentages you have presented in relation to the average amount of aid received per student. You are implying that all 120 athletes and all 930 non-athletes are receiving financial

aid from the college. Don't you think it fair to give a true picture of the situation by using only the number of students actually receiving financial aid in your computations? Since you are reporting this aspect, why not publish the amounts of aid received by the Richardson Scholars, Dana Scholars, etc? I believe that you will then have a better idea of the total picture.

Since you seem to begrudge the money granted to athletes for their efforts, may I suggest that you compare the hours worked (pre-season, season and off-season conditioning programs plus the time spent traveling and participating in games) to a pay per hour basis. I am sure you will find that, if their only purpose for participating in athletics is monetary gain, that any student, athlete or non-athlete, could have a more financially rewarding job in some other area. Not to mention, of course, that these extra hours must be given over and above the time spent on their academic pursuits. How many college students give so much of their time to any outside activity which contributes so much to campus life? Very few indeed!

I was both puzzled and irritated, to say the least, by your inclusion of the information concerning violations of campus rules by athletes. What does this have to do with the financial "problem" of intercollegiate athletics? Are you suggesting that the college abolish athletics because a few athletes are involved in misbehavior? Using this logic, do you also advocate abolishing the Choir or the Physics Department if a certain percentage of their members are involved in campus misbehavior? I fail to see the purpose of this material except as a generalized defamation of character toward the Athletic Department and I consider this to be an unethical procedure for a college newspaper.

Sincerely,
Robert Wolinsky

see page 4