

Environmental Concern: Recycling at Guilford Enrollment

Chris Ward
Staff Writer

The environmental policy at Guilford does not seem to be living up to its billing. As a supposed "liberal" college, one might think that Guilford would be on the forefront of recycling and environmental concerns. Yet, recycling bins are nowhere to be found, and styrofoam cups are used at school functions. Is the school not willing to spend a few extra dollars to make a recycling center on campus and to encourage good environmental practices? Since the manufacturing process for styrofoam is extremely dirty and since styrofoam doesn't disintegrate, the college should not use it. The Guilford community seems very concerned about the possibility of a road being built on campus, yet the administration (and others?) give little or no consideration to relatively simple ways of improving our environment.

If there are plans for recycling at Guilford, people are either against the idea or take an extraordinary amount of time to put the plans into action. Meanwhile, the planet is drowning in garbage, and we as a community could be doing something about it!

The challenge to the students and faculty is simple: get up and make the environment a personal priority, if it is not already. Someone is holding up the plans here, and the status quo of inactivity remains.

A good plan of action should include recycling bins that are located in each residence hall, the number of which depending on the size of that particular residence hall. If the administration was willing to spend the small amount of money necessary to start a concerted recycling program on campus, many tons of garbage could be saved throughout the year.

If the school is unwilling to start a recycling program, the burden must fall on the students. Many people are more than willing to help in a program, and only a few hours a week would be needed to collect all the aluminum cans, newspapers, and plastic containers that students use. Although there are some individual recycling programs on campus now, a school-wide program would be most effective to collect student debris.

School has been in session for well over a month, and I, like many other students, have a collection of aluminum cans and newspaper in my room. If a recycling plan

had been in place when classes began, the amount of material that could have been conserved would be enormous. This inactivity must not persist lest the entire school, however environmentally-conscious, be overwhelmed by waste that is thrown away rather than recycled. The choice is clear: either take a stand right now or become as guilty as those who willingly pollute our planet.

Standard

> continued from page 2

obey the community standards, and those dissenters accept the consequences of their choice, regardless of the effect. What are called strict policies are merely community standards which protect the common good.

figures up

> continued from page 1

for the success including faculty assistance in the recruiting, advising, and course registration process; improved admissions literature; more attention to the development of detailed action plans; admission staff accountability; and data systems and analysis.

Other areas receiving praise included the admissions office, the Board of Trustees and Peter Bryant, a consultant who specializes in enrollment management.

Cable-Wells expressed caution, however, in evaluating Guilford's future position with enrollment management.

"I am pleased with our success, but we still have a long ways to go," said Cable-Wells. "The college's position in the market place has changed. Now our competition, who are experiencing declines in enrollment, will strive to be even more competitive. We need to be increasingly both genuine and sophisticated about our process."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Important paragraph omitted

To the Editor:

The *Guilfordian* seems to think that it can express our views better than we can.

The *Guilfordian* failed to include the following excerpt from the original manuscript of an editorial I submitted for its October 1 issue.

"...This is only the tip of the iceberg that is to come. Clearly it barely touches the relevance of the issue. The dialogue that will follow will show whether or not we want to be here. The attrition rate here is unacceptable. And one of the best ways to ensure that our peers remain is through a truly strong Union. Certainly the Ricks administration wants to keep people here too. (But not in the manner that Hussein wants to keep people in Kuwait!) It has demonstrated that it wants you here. The recent forum regarding the drug policy was an example of its commitment to listen to our voice. It wants to take the time to listen. Talk with your senators and urge them to study the ramifications of being responsible for Union..."

Failure to include this passage altered the overall tone of my editorial.

The headline for the piece implied that I spoke for Union. I did not. I am only a concerned (student activity fees paying) member of the community who has an interest in how Union fulfills its purpose. I was vice-president of Union from the fall of 1988 to the spring of 1990.

The first line of my editorial was an attention getter and a mistake for which I apologize. I would never intentionally infuriate Senate, the people who can help this cause.

Bill Stoesen

Thanks to volunteers

To the Editor:

I would like to thank the students, faculty, and staff that

helped with the recent petition to save Lake Jeanette from development. When the Guilford County Greens started the petition drive, we had but two weeks to get 8,000 valid signatures. We thought we had virtually no chance of succeeding, but we felt the people of Greensboro should have the opportunity to say whether or not they wanted to protect their drinking water for generations to come. With the help of many on this campus, we were able to obtain nearly 11,000 signatures. The people have spoken, although it remains to be seen whether the city government will listen.

Three of the 10 key values of the Greens are grassroots democracy, personal responsibility for society's welfare, and future focus. Those who volunteered their time and energy have shown that these values are alive and well on this campus.

David Barnhill

Column lacks depth

To the Editor:

I object to Phillip B. Smith's "On Golden Pond" piece in last week's "Guilford Life" section. Who cares? So what if Smith wastes a nice sunny day with his repeat mode CD player wallowing in self-pity? If you miss your sister so much, Smith, why don't you call her? Oh, I forgot, the "While she's so busy being free..." isn't about her being free, it's about you. Instead of calling, however, your response is "But I stop... I do not call. I am afraid..." What kind of sentimental over self-indulgence is this? And more to the point, what kind of disjunctive writing style is this? Is this supposed to be some sort of avant-garde stream of consciousness, or are you just unable to write complete sentences? In short, Smith, I think your disjunctive writing style reflects your disjunctive thinking and self-centeredness. I can almost hear the Miami Vice soundtrack glossing over your trendy moodiness. It's not deep, Smith, it's juvenile. But what troubles me more than Smith's failure to be profound is that the student community sees nothing wrong with it. Let's take a big step back and look at this: Smith isn't troubled by the death of

one of his parents, he hasn't just experienced a failed relationship, nor is he in jail. Anyone here who actually is undergoing a life-altering experience should be insulted. Smith's piece, by representing our depth and understanding, belittles us all.

Marc Feuerberg

Is Guilfordian over-editing?

To the Editor,

Tim Kircher and I have the same problem. The *Guilfordian* editors arbitrarily removed sections of both his article and my letter responding to that article. Both were done with no consultation of the author. My complaint is small but important because it rendered a good sentence non-sensical: "I saw such fearful buzzwords as 'Hellenism' and 'hallmarks'..." Editors, since when is "hallmark" a fearful buzzword? my original statement was "hallmarks of Western Culture," which fits in nicely with Hellenism and the basic point of the whole letter. What were you thinking? I honestly cannot understand your intention behind cutting out those words.

Now, to vent some steam. I suppose you could have rationalized removing certain sections of Kircher's article to blunt the impact on our nonchalance, to save us some well needed criticism. If so, you have proved Andrew Stuart right in the fact that Guilford tends to run from self-incriminating controversy. We are all gung-ho to criticize governments, writers, traditions, etc. But when some self-reflective criticism comes along, we run screaming. How diverse are we, how involved. And how well The *Guilfordian's* editorial policies reflect that.

David Olson

Editor's Note:

The *Guilfordian* edits on the basis of length, clarity and taste. We do not edit for content, except in the case of potentially libelous statements.