

## Staff Editorial

## Despite debate, we should share common goals

Out of all the issues that define the world we live in, the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians is one of the most volatile and difficult to deal with. Most people in the Guilford community have never seen a peaceful Middle East in their lifetime, a fact that is staggering.

The conflict has resulted in the deaths of countless people over the years. A vast majority of the deaths have been civilians, most of those Palestinians. This is a troublesome fact and one that cannot be denied.

However, Palestinian military leadership has had a long history of targeting the Israeli civilian population in order to incite backlash from the Israelis. This is the immediate cause of the most recent conflict in Gaza.

The bottom line is that both parties were at fault. Hamas' firing of rockets into cities with no military targets, during a ceasefire, is nothing short of a cowardly, terrorist act. And Israel's brutal aerial assaults resulted in the deaths of hundreds of civilians, many of them children, which could've been avoided by using different and more reasonable military techniques, ones that are expected of a modern and powerful military force.

With the most recent conflict between the Israeli Defense Force and the Hamas government resulting in the deaths of an estimated 1,350 people, again mostly civilians, people on both ends of the spectrum are understandably ignited with rage, anger, and fear.

This issue is indescribably emotional for so many within the Guilford community. As we all know, there is a sizable Jewish and Palestinian population on campus, many of whom have direct if not ideological or religious connections to the region.

What could arguably be

seen as a major issue in this conflict is the lack of constructive dialogue between the parties. This holds true in our own community as well.

One can't help but notice a strong sense of polarization. There is a strong feeling that one has to identify exclusively with one side of the issue, while totally negating the other side of the argument.

This is a serious problem and one that can only lead to further conflict.

There are many things that are currently absent from the dialogue, but one that strikes many of us is the lack of fairness and reasonability in people's arguments. Indiscriminate support of Hamas or the Israeli government, and the subsequent refusal to listen openly to the opposing opinion, is simply hostility towards peace.

The reality is one doesn't have to be pro-Israeli nor pro-Palestinian. As a community that is committed to peace, it's imperative for all of us to meet somewhere in the middle. We must respect, and expect, justice, peace, and fairness for all people involved.

While many could argue that this issue warrants a certain degree of intensity and passion, the fact remains that refusing to negotiate is perhaps the largest hindrance to peace in a land that is holy to billions of people.

The people of Israel and the Palestinian territories in Gaza and the West Bank certainly have much to disagree about. But one thing that is universal amongst the people is the desire to have a life free of danger, danger that is caused by belligerent governments.

No one can fairly argue that one side is totally correct in its actions when it comes to Israel and Palestine. But everyone can agree that all people deserve to live with the assurance of peace.

The editorial board of The Guilfordian consists of five section editors, two photo editors, a layout editor, an art director, a managing editor, and the editor-in-chief.

Reflecting Guilford College's core Quaker values, the topics and content of Staff Editorials are chosen through consensus of all eleven editors.

## Revenge of the kidney donor

By Sari Schutrum-Boward  
STAFF WRITER

We often hear about divorces involving children being taken away and money issues, but organs are never among the assets to be divided.

Until now, that is. When Dr. Richard Batista decided to take control of his slow divorce process, he demanded the return of his kidney or \$1.5 million.

Dr. Batista and his wife Dawnell married in 1990. Before Dawnell battled kidney failure, they were having marital problems.

Dawnell had two failed transplants, which led to Dr. Batista donating his kidney in 2001. Dr. Batista hoped that donating his kidney would help patch up their marriage.

According to The New York Daily News, Batista said, "After an injury suffered while trying to earn her black belt, she began physical therapy - which evolved into an affair with her therapist."

Once people are close to dying, they tend to evaluate their lives. They may change themselves and what they want in their life. Perhaps Dawnell discovered that she was not satisfied with her marriage, which led to her affair.

Dawnell filed for divorce in 2005, and the rockiness of the divorce process began.

"It's illegal for an organ to be exchanged for anything of value," said Robert Veatch, a

medical ethicist at Georgetown University's Kennedy Institute of Ethics to Newsday.

In the United States, organs can not be sold, and donating an organ is a gift.

"It's her kidney now and . . . taking the kidney out would mean she would have to go on dialysis or it would kill her," said Veatch.

Since Dr. Batista is a surgeon, he would know the laws around donating organs, and I think he chose to ignore the laws, and look for the media's sympathy.

Dr. Batista is using the donation as a hateful tool against

Batista. He is allowing his emotions to control his actions, which is making him irrational.

"I felt humiliated, betrayed, disrespected and disregarded for me as a person, as a man, as a husband, as a father," said Batista.

According to Newsday, if Dr. Batista can't get the kidney, he wants, "\$1.5 million - which, he said reflects in part the value of the kidney transplant."

Divorces are not meant to put people in danger, but should allow separation to happen in an orderly fashion, and Dr. Batista is making his divorce ridiculous.

## Asking for a return of a kidney is immoral. This man has turned cold and lost all sense of right and wrong.

her. Death is a sensitive subject that is not meant to be used for revenge.

According to BBC, Dr. Batista mentioned that he was betrayed and going to the public was the last resort.

Asking for a return of a kidney is immoral. This man has turned cold and lost all sense of right and wrong.

"There is no deeper pain that you can ever express than betrayal from somebody who you love and devoted your life to," said

Even though Dawnell ripped out Dr. Batista's heart, he has no right to request organs.

No matter how hurt the doctor is, he should not go to the utmost extreme. Receiving flesh will not help with his pain, but cause more legal issues in the future.

Dr. Batista is making his divorce into a circus. Once the divorce process speeds up, I think Dr. Batista might get a little sympathy, but he will be mainly looked down on because of his unreasonable demands.

## Lifting the financial burden

By Abbey Dean  
STAFF WRITER

A new UCLA survey noted that 49 percent of students planned to get a job to meet the expenses of a college education, the highest figure since the question was first posed 32 years ago.

There is no denying that the current economic crisis has taken its toll on the wallets as well as the patience of many Americans. College students across the nation have especially felt the increasing burden of this reality.

The price of attending college has continued to rise, adding further stress to those who are already struggling to pay for the absurdly high costs of tuition, books, food, and gas prices.

In fact, according to a recent article from [msn.careerbuilders.com](http://msn.careerbuilders.com), there are only five—that's right, five—secure career options befitting the chaotic state of our economy.

Therefore, unless your prospective career is a web designer,

nurse, accountant, adult educator, or a health services administrator, you're out of luck.

Whatever ridiculous and exaggerated sentiments are presented in this article, it does display how the economy has taken a turn for the worst.

So, what can college students like us do to stay afloat? Well, according to Guilford students, quite a bit.

"I try to avoid any kind of shopping. Even grocery shopping can be tempting," said sophomore Ivy Lamb. "I am very tight with spending in general. I'm always looking for free ways to have fun with my friends."

Personally, I feel that doing a lot of small, seemingly insignificant things can really cut costs.

For instance, walking instead of driving to Harris Teeter, buying a reusable water bottle, or even something as simple as scanning and comparing prices at Target are easy ways to reduce spending.

Sophomore Riley Ramage mentioned a few of her own tactics to

cut expenses.

"I try to only go shopping once or twice for the whole semester, which means buying everything I know I'm going to want in bulk," said Ramage.

Also, once you get into a routine of cutting out a Jimmy Johns sandwich here and there, or making one less Starbucks adventure, you can become a spendthrift in no time.

In all honesty, after a week of intense classes and pilgrimages to the library, students should have the spare change to enjoy themselves, and remember that life does not completely revolve around school. Not to mention, money is necessary for those much-needed downtown excursions to Inferno, midnight runs to Best Diner, and, of course, the ever-popular Taco Tuesdays at La Azteca.

Making an honest effort to cut back in small ways could prove immensely beneficial to us college students and put a little more cash back into our light wallets as well.