

Columns on South Africa 'full of contradictions

To the Students:

What a bunch of contradictions the reader found in "Left/Right" last week about "American foreign policy in southern Africa.

Writers Evans and Hamrick both dislike American foreign policy in that region: Hamrick claims Carter doesn't support the South Africans and Evans says he does. Evans claims Carter doesn't support Idi Amin in Uganda while Hamrick seems to assert the opposite. Meanwhile, both miss the point entirely.

Evans, approaching the troubles in Rhodesia from his "liberal" viewpoint, maintains no legitimate government can be formed without the consent of

Mugabe and Nkomo, two self-proclaimed "leaders" of the people. The fact at least one of these "leaders" is a self-admitted terrorist/executioner of women and children and both are avowed Marxists makes no difference to Evans.

Who chose these "representatives of the people?" The power these men have does not give them the sole right to determine the destinies of millions of Black Africans.

Certainly Evans does not represent the true "liberal" viewpoint.

This concept of "might makes right" is where Hamrick is also wrong, to the extent of being ludicrous. He says, "It seems the major problem

with these tragic governments is that they are white minority ruled nations with a sizeable number of blacks not included in the decision making. Well I say, so what?"

So what indeed! Hamrick, the supposed defender of freedom and supporter of limited government, actually supports the enslavement of millions of innocent people by a brutal totalitarian state! His justification that "no one is upset" by the equivalently brutal regimes in Uganda and Cambodia is a lie and no justification at all.

Where are Hamrick's ethics, his conservative principles? A conservative is not a fascist. Conser-

vatives are supposed to believe in freedom and principle. Hamrick espouses inhumanity, racism and dictatorship — for the sake of cheap diamonds.

Where is the responsible opinion in favor of freedom everywhere? We should equally abhor and oppose the enslavement of blacks in South Africa, the vicious slaughter by Communists in Cambodia and the meglomaniacal antics of that dangerous madman Amin, in Uganda.

The African peoples, and the Asians, need freedom. They need hope, education and support so they can direct their own destinies, free from the control of communist and

other totalitarian regimes. Neither Evans or Hamrick represent logical, consistent or humane alternatives.

Doug Lerner

Commuter lot pothole problem taken care of

To the Students:

In today's letter, I will be brief and try to give you a rundown on several things happening concerning you. As you know, my committee is dealing with the possibilities surrounding some type of walkway for the apartment students across 49 to the main campus. We have already got some feedback on this from Ed Ayers, director of the Physical Plant.

We plan to meet with him again after Thanksgiving. Until then I feel it would be better to not comment on anything yet concerning this problem. So I ask these apartment students to be patient because we will give them an answer.

If you remember, I mentioned a pothole next to the commuter parking lot. Thanks to the Physical Plant this problem has been taken care of. I know that is good news, especially for the commuters on campus.

As far as the student

handbook is concerned, my committee will continue work on this throughout the semester. As things surface I will try and report it to you as soon as possible.

I also mentioned in my last article that I was concerned about crosswalk and safety signs on campus in regard to the students' safety. My committee, after Thanksgiving, will begin the work of investigating this problem. This, as I repeated before, is a very serious problem where you are concerned.

Another thing I talk about a lot is the need for more publicity and better communication between you and your representatives in student government. My committee is going to be in the next few weeks talking to resident coordinators in the dorms and people from the Commuter Association about this matter. From them, what we hope to get is some good concrete plans or suggestions on what

(continued on page 7)



Legislation will give District of Columbia 2 senators

By Michael D. Evans

The District of Columbia should receive the kind of representation the remainder of the United States receives, and this includes the option of selecting their own senators and representatives. Every state should immediately comply with the Congressional mandate and rubber stamp their approval of this measure so the citizens of the District of Columbia will no longer have to suffer "taxation without representation" — that ideal our forefathers fought against.

Opposition to the measure has been inconsistent at best. The conservatives cannot find a strong enough reasoning for disapproval of this bill as is evident in their losing some of their major votes on it (Strom Thurmond of South Carolina for example). The reason is simple: representation is a long overdue, extremely positive act in the District of Columbia.

Regardless of what the conservative opposition might seek to tell you, their main opposition revolves around the four "too's" theory — that Washington is "too urban, too black, too liberal and too Democratic." All accusations are factual, and the district can only be commended for this. After all, the District of Columbia was alone with the state of Massachusetts in voting against the incumbent Republican disaster, Richard Nixon, in the 1972 presidential election. Given their views, Nixon must have loved his home those six years.

Since the people of the District of Columbia are considered American citizens, they pay American taxes, and are governed by American-everything else, it is only proper they should have some say in how they are being governed. A Senate committee is certainly not as accessible to the people as a local city government would be.

The District of Columbia deserves their right to proper representation. The Congress has given its approval and now it is up to the states, which means the individual state legislatures are going to have to show how willing they are going to be toward providing simple justice across the board. The legislatures failed to provide justice with ERA; maybe they can make up a little ground with a positive vote here.

By Sammy Hamrick

Washington, D.C. should not get two senators. This last minute attempt by Congress to pervert the U.S. Constitution should be rejected by the states.

In an attempt to come to a conclusion on this question we must look at why a district was created and why its citizens have never had voting representation. Washington, D.C. was originally created to be the seat of the federal government. This was to be a district free from interal political strife creating an atmosphere for sound decisions on national policy. A need for such an atmosphere still exists.

As long as the central government complex area is excluded, most conservatives don't mind letting D.C. elect representatives to the Congress. The conservative proposal is to cede the residential area of Washington back to Maryland. There is a precedent for this. The area south of the Potomac River was ceded back to Virginia years ago. The District's residents would be given one, possibly two, voting representatives and would vote in Maryland's senatorial elections. If liberals were truly interested in giving representation to the District, why aren't they opting for this proposal?

The fact is the citizens of D.C. already have more representation in Congress than any other American city. A House committee and a Senate subcommittee provide these citizens with more than adequate input into the affairs of government. But President Carter is still pushing the amendment. He says it is a "human rights" issue and that is supposed to make it O.K.

Other liberals complain D.C. shouldn't have to pay taxes without elected representatives in Congress. What these perverters of justice fail to admit is that Washington gets back \$1 of our taxes for every 29 cents they contribute. There's no way they would get more even if they had two senators.

Finally, the ultimate liberal myth is that the whole idea is too black, too liberal, too urban and too Democratic for conservatives to accept. I have never heard a conservative make this charge. With all the other reasons to oppose this measure, there is no need to speculate who might hold these offices.

Congress made a mistake by passing the D.C. amendment. It is up to the states to correct the situation by opposing the legislation. Hopefully, North Carolina will lead the way.

Carolina Journal

"I must Create a System or be enslav'd by another man's." — William Blake

Nancy Davis	Editor
James Braswell	Managing Editor
Jeff Nash	Business Manager
Gary Nelson	Advertising Manager
Kim Burns	News Editor
Joyce Wright	Arts/Features Editor
Jim Dedmon	Sports Editor
Robin Colby	Photography Editor
Steve Swetnam	Graphic Artist
Bob Mellnik	Distribution Manager

The Carolina Journal is the student newspaper of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC). The Carolina Journal is published each Tuesday of the academic year. Journal Publications represents the Carolina Journal and it is printed by the Weekly Newspapers, Inc., located at 1433 North E-85 in Charlotte, N.C. Please address all correspondence to: Carolina Journal, One University Center, UNCC Station, Charlotte, N.C. 28223. Our telephone numbers are 597-2325 and 597-2160.

The opinions expressed in the text and/or advertisements of the Carolina Journal are not necessarily those of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, of the student body or of any agency or individual affiliated with the University.

The opinions expressed in signed editorials are those of the writer, and not necessarily those of the Editorial Board. Opinions expressed in unsigned editorials express those of the Editorial Board.

The Carolina Journal will print any correspondence to the students within the limits of good taste. We reserve the right to edit for grammar, length and clarity. Correspondence not wished to be published in the Carolina Journal should be designated as such.