

The FORUM

editorial board

Keir Bickerstaffe
Lindsay Oldenski
Courtney Christian
Ben Thorne

statement of purpose

The Forum exists to facilitate dialogue and expression on matters of importance to Guilford College and its mission. Toward this end, active community participation in these pages is vital.

editorial policy

Every effort will be made to print appropriate submissions of editorials, cartoons and letters to the editor. They must be signed, with the phone number of the author or artist included. Editorials must be no longer than 400 words and letters to the editor must be no more than 250 words. The Guilfordian reserves the right to edit submissions for grammatical correctness and brevity.

Our duty to question

Security.

The word brings up some strange, varied reactions among the students on this campus. Anger. Fear. Disillusionment.

This issue was originally inspired by the announcement that Security had gone roughly \$30,000 over their budget for this year. Was this an example of administrative penny-pinching, or mismanaged money by Security?

Neither. Instead, this mix-up was all about a lack of communication. The cut was made prior to Chief Financial Officer Art Gillis' arrival at Guilford, and thus was lost in the transition. Thirty thousand dollars slipped through the cracks.

While this isn't a particularly endearing answer, it was an answer. Several other questions we had during our investigation

still remain.

Why do Security guards receive NO self-defense training, and only limited first-aid training—when they are the only form of a medical response team on campus between 5pm and 9am?

Why is there such confusion concerning the cutting of shifts (we received at least three different sets of answers)?

Why would the office of the CFO only allow us to print the "bottom line" of Security's budget in this issue? We understand the confidentiality of salaries—but the ambiguity of a "bottom line" leaves several questions floating in the air.

Questions that we have a duty to ask of the administration.

It cannot be denied that matters of security affect we, the students, more than any-

one else at Guilford. The gaping questions left by our investigation signify a terrifying lack of communication present at this school—between students and the administration and between different departments on campus.

We feel it is right and proper, as students, to have these questions answered. Above all else, above new computers and yogurt machines, the administration should be dedicated to the security of Guilford students.

It is up to us. The only way we will see change implemented is to educate ourselves as to Guilford's problems, voice our displeasure, and work with the administration to produce open, lasting and successful changes.

Guilford—let's get to work.

Why Marriott must go

COLIN MCFADDEN-ROAN
staff writer

We're being robbed.

Did you read my news article on Marriott. Go back and do that. Nobody pays much attention to the News section so go give it some.

Okay, now take everything I wrote and throw it out the window. It has nothing to do with why I think Marriott must go.

The international corporation that is Marriott has been rather proud of itself, recently, for an "innovative" program. They set up this little hotline for their employees to call up and get advice about things like finding a cheap apartment or high quality/low cost child care.

Sounds great, huh? It's something other food and hotel service companies do not have. Why don't others — like A.R.A. — give this

service to employees? Because they give their employees something better: money.

We're being robbed.

Marriott, unlike other food and hotel service companies, is NONUnion, and thus, is able to pay its employees far less money.

So they pay a little extra for a dinky 800 number service. It keeps their employees able to run their lives on half the money they should be making and keeps them working for Marriott.

It also keeps them someplace else — near the bottom of the economic scale. While employees of unionized companies can rise toward the middle class, Marriott employees stay toward the lower end of the pay scale.

Not only does this run contrary to the social consciousness that we hold as an institution based in Quaker values but it translates into

poorer service. When students at Pace University in New York rated Marriott at the bottom of all campus services last semester and when students at the College of New Rochelle started a petition to get rid of Marriott, food was only a part of the concern. They did not like the way they were treated.

SSC noted customer service in its February 6 memo concerning cafeteria needs.

We're being robbed.

If employees were compensated as they ought to be, they would feel a lot happier about doing their jobs. If we did not have Marriott that could happen. Yes, it will probably cost a bit more.

However, as an institution grounded in a forward-looking Quaker social consciousness, Guilford must rid itself of Marriott.

It's our money or our way of life.

It's about time: cigarette manufacturer comes clean

JACOB NOBLE
staff writer

Last Thursday, an historic decision was made. A company who makes its profits by selling cigarettes, admitted that they knew that cigarettes were harmful:

This is great, but the damage has already been done. They have known this for a long time but are only now admitting that cigarettes are unhealthy.

The Liggett company has admitted that their targets were young adults and minors in their cigarette ad campaigns. Why shouldn't they target kids? In a recent Stanford University poll conducted with over 1700 minors who smoked, they admitted to disregarding the warning labels. They knew they were there, but never looked at them. Which brings me to my next point, the Surgeon General's warning on cigarettes.

On most cigarette packs you see the Surgeon General's warning, no bigger than the explicit lyrics sticker on some CD's. These warnings are often incomplete, such as those directed at pregnant women saying that smok-

ing MIGHT cause health problems.

What about those of us who are not pregnant women? Should we worry? Yeah, I think so. Since the first Surgeon General's report 10 million people have died of causes related to smoking. This is according to the CDC's Tobacco Information & Prevention Source page.

Yet we still smoke. In 1994, more women died of lung cancer, often related to smoking, then breast cancer. Yet they too still smoke. Smoking triples the chance of heart disease of those who are middle aged, yet we still smoke.

Now I know people do not like to be preached to, but the facts are just so overwhelming, and now that even the makers of the cigarettes admit that they are harmful and addictive, I feel as though it would be a crime to not say anything opinionated about the situation. The fact is that smoking is a slow suicide. The facts show that if you smoke you are likely to die an average of seven years earlier than someone who does not smoke. Seven years to some is not much to some but picture this. In seven years you could see your kids get married. In seven years you can witness the birth of your first grandchild. In a seven years span you could

see your grandchild graduate high school or maybe even college. Now to me that is reason enough not to smoke.

It is hard not to be preachy on a subject like this—the deception involved is quite sickening. Companies have known that cigarettes are bad for your health. After the Surgeon General came out with their preliminary reports, the companies should have confessed. When they did not, however, it was like denying that an orange was an orange. How can you deny facts based on research? I do not know, but maybe you can ask the cigarette companies; they did for over twenty years. Now that the makers of the hazardous products have admitted that their products are bad for one's health let's hope we can go somewhere with it.

Although now that they have admitted to being wrong I do not see much change coming about. Even if it does increase the chances of death by lung cancer by more than 22%, even if it increases the chances of death from emphysema and bronchitis by nearly 10%, and even if smoking robs more than 5 million years off the potential life-span of those who died.