

Editorial

Screwed up world

By Dale Easley

Earlier this year I made the mistake of allowing myself to be talked into going to see a freak show at a nearby fair. One of the freaks was a man in his mid-fifties whose arms and legs were deformed grotesquely from birth. He was known as the Frogman. I couple of carnies carried him in and set him by a microphone at a table in front of the spectators. After adjusting the mike with his mouth, he told of his six normal brothers and sisters. But with pride he told us of the special ability he had developed, an ability unlike that of anyone else in the world. The Frogman could roll a cigarette and light it, using only his mouth.

As we watched, he opened a pack of rolling papers and took one out. Opening a can of tobacco, he sprinkled some on the paper and smoothed it out. All the time he used only his mouth.

Folding the paper over, the Frogman took it in his mouth and rolled the cigarette. His supreme achievement was yet to come. Laying down the cigarette, he took a wooden match between his lips and struck it on the table. Still holding the lighted match in his mouth, he picked up the cigarette and lit it. The performance was ended.

I had wanted to leave before the end, yet I could not tear myself away until the cigarette was lit. I couldn't walk out on the greatest accomplishment of a man's life. And I with my dollar for admission contributed to the degradation of a spirit which I couldn't help feeling was greater than those of us spectators.

Obviously, the Frogman deserves applause for finding a way of supporting himself, for being strong enough to not withdraw his distorted figure and hide in shame. But the society which puts such a man on stage as a freak hardly deserves applause.

The question which keeps arising in my mind is, "How do we at Guilford justify our continued ignorance of the suffering in the outside world and spend our time discussing the poor quality of food in the cafeteria or some vague concept called freedom, when we could be out trying to straighten out this screwed-up world?"

The Frogman may be called a freak, but we're the real freaks who can somehow seem happy while suffering continues. I don't understand it.

After leaving the fair I went out for a pizza.

Pizza 'round town

Feel like running out for a pizza or having a pizza run out for you? Well, there are plenty of places in the area to get a pie at a wide range of prices. If price is no problem and you want to go out for a romantic evening of "pasta y vino", fly to Italy. If the jet is out of commission, try the La Veranda Restaurant on the fifth floor of Forum VI Mall. Also Sal's Italian Restaurant and Pizza can soothe your desire for baked ziti or veal scaloppini. Sal's is located at 402 East Cornwallis Drive.

If all you are looking for is a cheese pizza to go with your beer, here are some names and prices that might help:

	Price of Large Cheese Pizza
New York Pizza	\$5.00
Bill's Pizza Pub	\$5.20
House of Pizza	\$6.57
Tony's Pizza	\$4.40 with delivery
Pizza Hut (College Road)	\$5.75
Village Inn Pizza Parlor	\$4.95
Sarji's	\$5.90

Addresses can be found in the Yellow Pages.

Guilfordian

Editors	Dale Easley, Jim Shields
News editor	Barbara Phillips
Features editor	John Mattern
Photography editor	Jack Mohr
Layout editors	Gina Daviso, Susan Ide
Sports editor	Mike Van Wagner
Business manager	Mary Merritt
Circulation	Frank Merritt, Mary Merritt
Copy Editors	Linda Paul, Carolyn Welty
Typists	Frances Alexander, Kathy Carlson
Writers	Roy Parkhurst, John Steely, Linda Paul, Sue Hubley, Bill McCathran, Joe Connors

The Guilfordian reserves the right to edit all articles, letters, and artwork for taste, veracity, and length. The deadline for all copy is 3:00 p.m. on the Saturday preceding the Tuesday of publication. Material may be left on the office door in upstairs Founders, or mailed to Box 17717. The opinions expressed by the staff are their own and not necessarily those of the paper or of Guilford College.

Right makes for liberal flight

By O.L. Backer

"Look, up in the Senate!"
 "It's a paranoid delusion!"
 "It's a joke in poor taste!"
 "No -- it's Senator Jester Heems, Majority Leader!"

Seeing the new Senate Majority Leader emerge from the Capitol building to cries of wonder and dismay came as no surprise to this columnist. I had, after all, arranged to meet him here for an exclusive interview. I was intrigued, though, when the sun parted the clouds to shine full, on the steps as he descended. And I must admit that I was impressed when he walked across the Tidal Basin to meet me.

It occurred to me that such a display might be a reflection of the Senator's belief in the righteousness of his political theories. Such a question, though, would be inexcusably crass. Naturally, it was my first of the interview.

"I only want what's Right for our country," intoned the Senator, "as God gives me to see that Right. And now I see our country getting back on the Right track."

"What are your legislative priorities?" I wondered.

"Well, the press is making much of my plans to cut back on the food stamp program. What they don't choose to realize is that the money saved by eliminating subsidies to deadbeats will go to help the truly needy."

"Do you mean a larger subsidy, enough to cover basic necessities, for those who really can't find work?"

"No, I mean the MX missile and B-1 bomber for our woefully weak Army and Air Force."

"Getting down to specifics, Senator, could you explain how the new conservative majority in the Senate plans to fulfill its

campaign theme of getting government off our backs?"

About this time the interview was interrupted by two middle-aged men in business suits and wild-eyed looks, who dashed up and began to foam at the mouth. I immediately recognized them as two of the new Conservative senators from the Midwest.

"Mr. Conservative Leader! We have now ready the constitutional amendments you ordered, like on enforcing prayer in the schools and especially on prohibiting all abortions for everyone!"

Sensing a potential contradiction, I asked, "How do you reconcile the theme of reduced government interference with the stance of eliminating women's freedom of choice on such a personal moral question?"

At this, one of the newcomers shrieked and leapt into the Tidal Basin. The other shrieked, "Where do you get the right to ask such questions? Have you been saved? Washed in the blood of the lamb?!" He then sank down writhing in a fit.

Senator Heems calmly ignored this spectacle. "Let me remind you," he said, "that we're talking about eliminating government interference with business."

"First, there are federal laws which mandate certain safety and health standards for workers in factories. These regulations cost money, which is an unhealthy situation for business growth. They must therefore be eliminated."

"Next, there are water and air pollution control guidelines which take funds that would otherwise be available for capital investment. They, too, must

go. "As a final example, there are many potentially productive acres of land being locked up in so-called 'wilderness' areas. I prefer to think of these as waste areas. They strip our timber industry of its God-given right to clear-cut mountains, and turn the trees into toilet tissue and burger wrappers."

I wanted to ask the Senator if he wasn't confusing good regulations with bad and throwing the baby out with the bathwater. But the abortion men were reviving, and I didn't dare mention "babies" in their presence. I thanked the Senator and left.

As I passed through the Capitol building, I noticed a dim figure lurking in the shadows behind a statue of Lincoln. He seemed familiar, and I paused. "Say, aren't you a surviving liberal senator?"

"Shhh!!!" He hopped frantically back and forth, and his eyes shifted like those of a trapped animal. "Don't say that word so loud!"

"Why so worried?" I replied. "Sure, they talk big, but won't it really be just business/politics as usual?"

"Don't be dense," he pleaded. "This is a genuine 'Conservative' (reactionary) Majority, and they're going to do everything they can get away with."

I began to worry a little myself. "But if they mean it, then how do we forestall the dismantling of decades of social progress? They've got the majority, and at least two years to use it."

A strange gleam came into the fearful eyes, and he almost grinned. He whispered, "It's time for us progressives to stop worrying and learn to love the filibuster."



Letters to the Editor

Keep those letters coming; it's better to debate an issue without settling it than to settle an issue without debating it. All letters must be submitted by Friday, and should be no longer 200 words in length. Letters can be left on the office door in upstairs Founders, or mailed to Box 17717.

Sat. Suffering

Dear Editor:

I must commend the person who had the brilliant idea of holding classes on Saturday. What an ingenious idea for totally ruining a weekend. For years the administration was no doubt a little upset because students tried to avoid scheduling classes on Friday, so they could have a nice three day weekend, after a very hectic and nerve-wracking week of Guilford pressures. To solve this problem of students making convenient schedules, Guilford introduced the Saturday class.

Saturday classes would be fine if they were only electives. However, Guilford chose to have required courses held on Saturday, just to make sure no one could work out a perfect schedule. Any student who is unfortunate enough to need of these required courses auto-

matically has every weekend of one semester ruined.

Congratulations to Guilford for finding another way to make the students suffer.

A Saturday Sufferer

Reagan responsible

Emerson, Thoreau, and now Loren Eiseley are made folk heroes and proclaimed great thinkers because each of them chose to base his own understanding of the world on personal experience and anecdote. Each of those three men, I have been told, humbly realized that although he was not omniscient, he is responsible to decide for himself what he believes and thinks.

In the November 11, 1980 issue of Guilfordian, the editorial criticized Ronald Reagan, saying that "He has no intellectual framework from which to

work. His epistology is organized according to personal experience and anecdotes."

As an actor, Ronald Reagan has shown that he understands human thought and emotion, a trait needed by anyone who would be a successful manager of any kind. As governor of California, Mr. Reagan has proven himself an adept and capable manager, responsive to the needs of his constituents and true to his word. To me, these seem rare and desirable qualities in anyone who would hold a responsible office. Rather than limiting his understanding, it seems that Mr. Reagan has sought to broaden his experience. What could be better?

Perhaps, instead of claiming that Reagan is unable to do the job, we should wait to see what he can do. Also, it might be nice if someone would try to help

Letters cont. on page 3