

Guilfordian

Forbert
and Mas
big winners

See pages 4 & 5

Volume LXIV, No. 18

Guilford College, Greensboro, N.C. 27410

February 26, 1980



Over 120 people packed Boren Lounge Wednesday night to hear four speakers' opinions on the reinstatement for registration for the draft. The forum, sponsored by Guilford PIRG, sparked lively debate between all participants.

Draft forum packs lounge

By Bill Des Jardins
Staff Writer

Last Thursday night the Guilford College chapter of PIRG presented a Forum on Reinstatement of Draft Registration. There were two speakers in favor of reinstatement and two opposed. Over 120 people packed Boren Lounge.

The first speaker, Joseph Shea, a disabled veteran of WWII opened for the pro side. He equated reinstatement with getting prepared for other changes in life, such as being inoculated against diseases.

He also stated that if the United States had not prepared for WWII in 1939, it would not have been able to fight as effectively as it did. He said that registration does not make the draft inevitable; rather, it is just

a way of asking "who are you and where can we get in touch with you if we need you."

On this point Ed Burrows, the second speaker, disagreed. He said that the total purpose of registration is to prepare for a draft. He pointed out that whenever there has been a draft registration in the U.S., the draft has followed shortly thereafter.

Burrows opposes the draft for three reasons. First, he considers it unconstitutional, violating the Thirteenth Amendment which outlaws involuntary servitude in the U.S.

Secondly, he considers it immoral. He stated that this was a very personal view, but he believes that each individual has rights and responsibilities, and that the state cannot take these rights away or accept the responsibilities. Lastly, he considers reinstatement irresponsible, giving the U.S. a false sense of security.

The third speaker was John McCarthy, a major in the Marine Corps Reserve and a part of the Selective Service Administration. He gave an outline of what has happened to the draft and registration in the U.S. since the end of the Vietnam War. He said that there has been no registration since 1975, and there was not much pressure to reinstate it until the Army started feeling the pinch of a lack of volunteers in 1977.

According to McCarthy, the draft should have been reinstated three or four years ago, but better late than never. Unfortunately, now it is viewed as an escalation toward war with the U.S.S.R. However, McCarthy said the function of registration

could be done with the 1980 census or social security records.

Larry York, a medic in Vietnam in 1969-70 and a past president of Vietnam Veterans Against the War, was the last to speak against registration. He said he was speaking because he had vowed to not let another Vietnam happen.

He said that it was the responsibility of every American to return this country to the people and take it from the control of big business. He said that if Americans were sent to the Middle East to fight, they would not be there to protect the interests of America but of big oil companies.

In response to a question from the audience about the connection between a weak conventional force and nuclear war, McCarthy said that if we neglect one option, it puts increased reliance on the remaining options. If America neglects its ground forces, it will have to rely more heavily on nuclear forces. York said that no matter how strong our conventional army is, it will be completely useless if there is a nuclear exchange.

Burrows said that if there is a major war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., the side losing could use nuclear weapons. He pointed out that the U.S. has used nuclear weapons to save conventional casualties before.

York was asked if he advocated complete disarmament. He replied with considerable clarification that he did. But McCarthy replied that the U.S. has been trying the unilateral disarmament road already, but

See 'Pros', page three

Mystery meat captures last place

By Senate Food Committee

Remember the Food Committee questionnaires circulated earlier this year? Believe it or not, they have been influential in decisions regarding the cafeteria.

The majority of students found the variety of food served acceptable, the serving hours and sanitation adequate and the staff competent and polite. Many people, however, felt that the quality of the food served was somewhere between acceptable and poor.

In light of this, it may interest students to know that, according to Epicure, all food items are of the highest quality, and that left-overs are served only once and then discarded. Most students undoubtedly eat left-overs at home, perhaps more than once.

By far the favorite dishes were lasagna, chicken, and roast beef, while bologna sandwiches and all varieties of "mystery meat" are definitely in last place. It may surprise some to find that all varieties of "mystery meat" are 100% beef cube steaks.

As a result of the suggestions, the salad cart has been moved closer to the salad bar on one side of the serving area to reduce congestion there.

The staff is experimenting with new menu sequences as well, and a limited version of the salad bar has appeared at brunch. All suggestions could not be implemented, as there were many conflicting requests; furthermore, not every compatible request is feasible.

Complaints about the Grill

Room's ventilation and the temperature in the cafeteria are misdirected: both come under maintenance's jurisdiction. Epicure has no control over either, but wishes that it did.

The Food Committee also attended a Monday breakfast in the dish room and collected all of the discarded milk that came through. Quite a few times trays with four or more glasses which were all half-full appeared. Money saved from wasted items such as cookies and entrees which are thrown out could be used to bring you special dinners like Italian Night.

If students have unanswered questions or complaints above and beyond the questionnaires, please contact a Food Committee member or the cafeteria Manager, Kyle Craigie.

See photo essay, page seven

Look Homeward, Angel

By Tina Hodgkin
Staff Writer

The Guilford College Revelers gave a stunning production of Ketti Frings' *Look Homeward Angel* last week. A well-designed set and good lighting complemented a strong cast to result in an evening of very good theatre.

The entire cast seemed to be comfortable with their parts, and characterizations were, if not always strong, at least consistent. The stellar performance of the evening was that of Dan Nicholson as W.O. Gant.

His portrayal of a blustery, stong-willed man who has been "oppressed" by his wife had just the right combination of gusto and pathos to make his character seem wonderfully real and human. His tirades and off-hand comments provided

much needed comic relief.

Lisa Morton's performance as Eliza Gant, wife of W.O., was very strong. Lisa made Eliza's quirks all seem logical, which is to say she was believable in her portrayal of a land-hungry, miserly woman who really wants love and understanding above everything else but who has just forgotten how to find them.

John Steely as Eugene Gant, the main character, could have been a little more convincing at times, but overall his action and his interactions with the other players were strong. His scenes with his mother, as played by Morton, were especially satisfying.

Thomas Abrams, as Ben
See "Where," page seven



Caught in the act. Setting, lights, and actors combined to allow four stunning performances of Ketti Fring's *Look Homeward Angel*, Director Rick Prouty's last play with the Revelers.