

Opinion

North wind fools many

There is a new way to get rich and famous in the nation's capital.

It's a relatively simple process.

The latest formula for success? Commit at least three felonies, cover them up, lie about them, show an utter and complete disregard for your nation's laws and lawmakers, finally and dutifully admit your crimes with pride after they have been discovered, put on your best puppy-dog face, say you did it all for the good of your country, and get called a hero by two presidents.

Then, of course, prey further on the ignorance and gullibility of your fellow citizens, hit the lecture circuit for around \$25,000 an appearance, and finally run for public office.

If and when Oliver North runs for an elected position, he will probably win in a landslide. Because, once again, the befoolable American masses will let the superficial glare of red, white and blue shine brightly enough to make them blind of the facts of North's case.

The court decision on North implemented a \$150,000 fine (six appearances) and community service. The judge said that North was responsible for his actions — including destroying official documents and lying to Congress — but a jail term would "only harden

(his) misconceptions."

On the contrary, maybe a short jail term would have given North, and others, a little time to think. Even if North didn't, others would.

North could think twice about his "rules are for everyone else" and "it's only wrong if you get caught" attitudes. The man firmly believes that what he did was right, and that is a very frightening fact. Doesn't the word anarchy mean anything anymore?

A jail sentence for North might send a message — to those in the military, the administration and the private sector — that these types of covert operations will not be tolerated.

In the Watergate scandal, Congress, the media and other investigators initially came up empty in trying to figure out exactly who did what, when, where, why and how.

Interestingly, though, as soon as jail terms were handed out to the so-called "fall guys," answers abounded.

This slap on the wrist to North makes it extremely likely that no one will ever know exactly what happened in the Iran-Contra scandal — that is, of course, until North makes another few million with a book after everyone dies or leaves the country.

Congratulations, Ollie, on a fraud well done.

— Dave Glenn

Church split has lesson

What is it going to be next?

Rev. George Stallings, Jr., a Roman Catholic priest, has been suspended for founding an independent black congregation, the Imani Temple in Washington, D.C., and could face excommunication. He has left the Catholic Church with the cry of racism.

He accuses the Catholic Church of being racist, saying that it has only given lip service to admitting that racism exists in the church without coming up with radical actions to correct racism's effects. He said he thinks the church has lost its focus of evangelization in black communities because it has closed black schools and parishes — that the church has been more concerned with conducting religious "business as usual" rather than reaching out into the black community.

Many black Catholics are upset with the decision to close three inner-city schools this spring in Washington, D.C. A spokesman for Washington's Cardinal James Hickey said Archbishop Carroll High School — as a unified, consolidated school — can do more

for black Catholic young people than the three small, struggling schools which were closed. He said it is easy to cry racism.

The church calls it separatism. Stallings calls it a radical move against racism.

What I see is a man upset with what an established institution is doing as well as with the path it has taken.

Stallings is a man who sees the Catholic Church steeped in hypocrisy on the issue of racism and following contemporary values rather than providing proper leadership.

The Bible says that we should show no favoritism, because God does not look at the exterior, but at the heart. Unfortunately for Stallings, it also calls the creating of a faction sin.

On both sides of this issue, you have some truth being followed.

Stallings is dealing with a situation that he apparently feels is a thorn in the side of the church; however, his methods of dealing with it don't follow the values he has been ordained to uphold.

— Randy Basinger



Reader's Forum

European unity overrides fears

To the editor:

As an avidly pro-European UNC student from Germany, I must take issue with Jim Greenhill over his latest column about Great Britain and the European Community. In the July 6 edition of *The Tar Heel*, he defended British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's reluctance to go ahead with the economic and monetary unification of the European Community planned for the year 1992. Greenhill, a British citizen, sees the future of Britain threatened by socialism and other evil forces from the continent. His views defy the political lessons that we Europeans have drawn from centuries of disunity and warfare. They are symptomatic of the petty nationalism, staunch conservatism and narrow-minded parochialism displayed by Thatcher during her 10 years at the helm of Britain.

True, the European Community is not like the United States. We speak 10 major (and several smaller) languages in our 12 countries, and culturally we are very diverse. If European unity meant the end of this diversity, and if it resulted in the complete loss of national sovereignty, Greenhill's fears would be justified.

But I have the suspicion that Greenhill for one can't quite forget the old map he refers to at the outset of his column. Maybe he still reminisces about the old days when most of it was pink, pink for British dependencies and colonies. With that picture of the world and the British Empire in his head, it comes as no surprise that he should be wary of the European Community. Sure, when its possessions straddled the globe, Britain could afford to turn its back on the balance of powers on the continent in "splendid isolation" as long as the balance of powers wasn't threatened. And, of course, as long as Brit-

Jurgen Buchenau
Guest Writer

ish trade with Europe could proceed in an unimpeded fashion.

But it just ain't that way anymore. Not only have European nations had to abandon colonialism except for a few outposts here and there, but we also have given up fighting among ourselves. The prime reason for both developments: loss of European power during two world wars, leading to maybe a bit more wisdom on our part. At the same time, mounting challenges have been calling our collective attention. For instance, look at environmental crises, Third World poverty, a rocky relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States, and changes in Eastern Europe. Unless we act collectively, our overpopulated continent will slide into pollution, renewed strife and economic hardship.

As for Greenhill's main worry, socialism, has it ever occurred to him that socialist parties may be as diverse as Europe itself? Germany has prospered under both the Christian and the Social Democrats, and few would deny Spain's socialist premier Felipe Gonzalez accolades for his handling of economic policy. We could extend the list: Italy's Craxi, France's Mitterrand, Portugal's Soares — you just can't blame Europe's woes squarely on the Social Democrats and socialists. I don't know as much as Greenhill about Britain's Labour Party, which does seem to have some legitimate grievances, particularly in the north of the country. But the socialists on the continent have shown cautious marksmanship in most respects. Maybe Britain could use more

socialists from the continent!

Greenhill shouldn't fret about European monetary and economic union. With one of the highest inflation rates in Europe, Britain doesn't have much to lose, and a lot to gain, by a single currency. And whatever success you justly attribute to Thatcher's economic policies, remember that the well-being of all EC countries has been enhanced since the formation of the European Community. In fact, Britain takes out more from the coffers of EC than it puts back.

Ultimately, I see other problems with the EC that may prove more serious than those cited by Greenhill: will we close our markets to the strong economies of the Asian Southeast and North America? In an illusion of strength and grandeur, will we ignore the responsibilities incurred toward the developing nations that we once governed and continue to exploit? And will our newly formed gigantic economic and political complex neglect depressed areas, women, minorities and the poor? I hope we will not have to answer any one of these questions in the affirmative. They bother me much more than worries about a socialism that has brought numerous advances to my country.

We need a unified Europe, and we need British participation. Together, we can construct a more open, generous and social Europe that serves the interests of all its people as well as global concerns. As much as I agree with Greenhill's opposition to complete cultural and political integration — let's learn from our past and unite!

Jurgen Buchenau is a third-year graduate student in history from Cologne, West Germany.