editoria1

Watt a guy!

He's done it again!

There is a thorn in the paw of our governmental body. The thorn has driven itself deeper upon every available opportunity. That thorn is none other than the Interior Secretary James Watt.

Unlike the story of "Androcles and the Lion," this thorn has taken the initiative and has driven itself between the Executive Branch and public opinion. How long will we have to tolerate this pain? How long before a modern-day Androcles rids us of this blundering, throbbing, infectious wound? We hope it will happen soon.

Watt's recent remark about having "a black...a woman, two jews and a cripple" on an advisory committee not only embarrassed the Reagan administration, it exposed Watt as a man of little tact and even less understanding of the people he lives and works with. This statement was more than a error, it was a blatant case of bigotry.

All this man (?) has done, in the way of restitution, is apologize to Reagan. How could this repay for his casual categorization of people? Of course it doesn't repay. Watt should not have apologized; he should have packed his bags and said goodbye to all his "extraordinarily unfair" remarks.

Reagan was wrong to merely accept Watt's apologies all along. At the first sign of trouble, Reagan should have put his foot down and offered Watt an ultimatum -- no more slip-ups or we will find another interior secretary.

If this was the first incident of gross negligence on Watt's record then we might be compelled to forgive him, but when he continues to make ill-worded statements, more drastic measures need to be considered.

These continual abuses of the people of this country cannot go unheeded. Resignation would be an easy way out; we hope the President will not let him off so easy.

Kaleidoscope

Tim Riddle Editor

Kari Howard
Entertainment
Editor

Anna Paulette Witt News Editor

Pam Walker Photography Editor Dana Murdock Associate Editor

Susan Benfield
Advertising/
Business Manager

Jennifer Blalock Features Editor

Dale McElrath
Sports Editor

Staff Writers: Leigh Kelley, Donna McCown Kirby, Colin White, Remona Huggins, Donna Hudgins

Staff Photographers: Scott Blalock, Phil Alexander,

David LaPour, Diane Roswech Staff Artists: Barbara Barbee, Butch Guice.

It is the policy of the **Kaleidoscope** to correct all grammatical errors in letters received for publication. Any direct quotes, in letters or articles, appear as stated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the opinions expressed in the editorials, editorial cartoons, columns and news stories in the *Kaleidoscope* do not necessarily reflect the viewpoint of the staff advisor, UNCA's Student Government, administration or faculty. Opinions may or may not agree with those of the *Kaleidoscope*.



Governmental ethics or governmental antics?

By Chris Crosson

During an ethics seminar a few years ago, the discussion involved government ethics. As we examined the ethics present in today's international affairs, I noted that our government, like that of practically every other country, operated under a very utilitarian ethic. This provoked cries of outrage from a few of the seminar's other participants. They felt that our government operated under the same Christian ethics that responsible citizens of our country live by.
The downing of the

The downing of the Korean jetliner a few weeks ago is a case in point of governmental ethics. The Russians would not admit they fired on the plane, though at first they identified the plane as a "CIA spy plane." An odd anomaly, in the eyes of the world, and our government lost no time in denouncing the "cold-blooded murder" of the hundreds of civilians aboard the plane. Why had the Russian ground control not contacted the

craft?
Then in a Sunday edition of the Charlotte Observer.

buried in a back-page article, I find a paragraph that describes the presence of an American spy plane in the vicinity of the Russian military outpost.

military outpost.

Not wanting to risk losing the indignation that Americans had felt over the events and the Russian lack of proper response, our government had down-played the presence of an American spy plane, hoping to keep all apparent guilt for the incident focused on the Russians.

The same organization/
individual ethical dichotomy present in such governmental decisions can also
be seen in studies of

"capitalist morality." Such
studies are always food for
a few laughs. West's
Business Law lists five
basic tenets of Capitalist
Morality, one of which is

"the acceptance of technology."

In essence then, one who does not embrace the increasing mechanization of our society as a good thing is a immoral person as judged by the standards of the capitalist morality. Surely one individual would never judge another by such a standard.