

## From the Editor

### SAFC needs changes

By Rick Monroe

Every year at this time, the Student Activity Fees Commission (SAFC) begins to pop up in conversations around campus. Rarely is the commission discussed without some suggestions for its improvements being mentioned.

Recently, a suggestion to improve SAFC which has been gaining in popularity is the "33 1/3 percent" plan. Under this plan, the commission will be reduced to a figurehead position. Instead of SAFC deciding who gets what share of the activity fee pie, the money will be divided among the three divisions of Student Association: Student Body Government, Student Media Board and the University Program

Board, equally. (Minus \$8,000 taken off the top paid to the SAFC accounting clerk.)

We feel this plan is a cop-out. In essence it is saying it is too much trouble to sit down and decide which division is providing the most service to the students, and should therefore get the most money, so we will divide the pie evenly and not bother with what is in the best interest of the students.

As to the charge the SAFC is presently too politically motivated, we feel this problem could be solved by changing the procedure by which the commission members are selected.

Presently, each of the three divisions choose a representative to the commission and the two other members are appointed by the chancellor. The chairman of the commission is also selected by the chancellor. We suggest SAFC should consist of nine

members (two from each division, and three at-large voted upon by the student body). After all it is your money, and it is being spent for you. The commission chairman should then be selected from the commission by the SAFC itself.

We feel, although this method will increase the amount of red tape involved in having a budget approved (can you imagine trying to get nine people to agree on how much the tiddlywinks club should get?) but, in the long run, it should prove to be in the best interest of the students.

### Tournament time

The signs are everywhere. Students are doing their homework early. Newspapers are busily calling the sports information department. Players are actually in bed by 11 p.m. Yep, it's tournament time at UNCC and this year it involves both the men and the women.

The women promise an exciting game against Guilford College tonight at 5 p.m. in the Mine Shaft. Then hopefully, it's on to win the state tournament and a chance at the regionals in Kansas City. And for the men, there's the Mid-east Regionals in Tennessee and Salt Lake City. But for now, support is all they need.

### Correction

An error appeared in the article "Elimination of October break proposed," printed in the Feb. 15 issue of the *Carolina Journal*. The Academic Calendar Committee proposed a calendar retaining the October break.

It was the academic deans who felt strongly against the October break. "We would hate

to get blamed for what the deans are doing," Cloyd Goodrum, committee chairman, said. "The Academic Calendar Committee has stood firm against the dropping of the October break."

The final decision is still left up the chancellor. The *Carolina Journal* regrets the error.



### Defense policy puts both sides on defensive

By Tom Chumley

The defense budget submitted to Congress by the Carter administration for fiscal 1980 calling for spending over \$125 billion is wasteful, unnecessary and highly inflationary.

The President's budget calls for a 12 percent increase in military spending and a three percent increase taking inflation into consideration. This is inexcusable, considering almost all other departments of government, including those which provide needed services to the poor and downtrodden, are told to tighten their belts. While the rest of the country suffers through the worst of inflation and a possible recession, the bloated fatcat generals of the military industrial complex are getting everything they want and more.

Why does the Pentagon get to spend more in this era of "austerity"? They simply get their lobbyists on Capitol Hill to warn congressmen if they vote against any defense appropriations their constituents will think they are "soft on defense," and vaguely suggest they are pro-communist. This has always been the Pentagon's oldest trick. They say "Look what the Russians are spending" or, "They are catching up with us in numbers of missiles."

"Anyone with an ounce of common sense knows quality not quantity, efficiency not numbers, are the most important factors, not only in everyday life, but in the Pentagon as well. The United States has always been more efficient in the usage of materials as has the Soviet Union. If the Soviets spent twice as much as the U.S. did on defense, the U.S. would be more than an even match with them in any nuclear confrontation.

Perhaps, the President should listen to the views of more of the people in his own party on the nation's defense policy. Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), has chastized the Pentagon's money requests. Kennedy points out that included in the Pentagon budget are a shocking eight to 12 billion dollars in unspent appropriations from previous years. There is also money for such wasteful items as \$1.6 billion for a new nuclear powered aircraft carrier (experts say these will be outdated by 1995), \$1.1 billion for the MX mobile missile. This missile is unnecessary since the Cruz missile is a much better and cheaper weapon. Kennedy said there is enough billions here to restore budget cuts in vital production of social services without weakening national security.

We can only hope Congress will see the inequity of an increase in the military budget. Americans cannot afford an unnecessary increase and should not be made to bear the brunt of the overweight Pentagon which refuses to even consider tightening its belt.

By Sammy Hamrick

President Carter's budget has been sent to the Congress. If the Congress is truly interested in representing the American people, then they should treat Carter's budget as junk mail.

The President calls his budget austere. Senator William Armstrong (R-Col.) said it best when he called Carter's view of austere (the budget), "a diet of banana splits and chocolate sundaes." Carter's budget is not austere; it's not even worth considering.

But what really bothers me is Carter's lack of concern for the defense of our nation. The budget shows this. True, Carter is putting more into defense. It's the lack of commitment on the part of the administration which has put America second best in defense posture. That should concern us.

We are hopelessly behind the Russians in defense capabilities. We should have already built the cruise missile and the B1 bomber. Instead of strengthening our defense position, Carter wants to continue to weaken it through ratification of a SALT II treaty.

But why do we find ourselves in the unique position of being second best? First, there has been, as previously stated, a lack of leadership on the part of President Carter and Defense Secretary Harold Brown. The Soviet Union is constantly improving and modernizing. They are ready and have the capability to destroy the world several times.

The next problem results from a lack of leadership on the part of the Congress. It's the George McGovern and Ted Kennedys we need to dispose of in order to make our nation strong against Russian threats. We need to elect a Congress which will have a firm commitment to a strong defense for America. Perhaps, maybe by coincidence, or in my view by design, you will find most candidates favoring a strong defense are Republicans.

It's been the Republican position to negotiate with foreigners from a position of strength. That policy has worked great in the past but try to get that through Carter's thick head. All he can do is smile at the Arabs as they gouge every penny from us they can, give our technology away to Communist China, tell the Soviet Union if they will be concerned about human rights; we'll forget the B1 bomber.

In November of 1976 when Jimmy Carter was elected President, I thought the world would come to an end. Well, the world hasn't come to an end but things have really slowed down. We should urge Congress to forget about Carter's defense proposals and create a defense policy which will make America number one again. In the meantime, the American people should plan in 1980 to correct the mistake they made in 1976.

## Carolina Journal

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

Editor	Nancy Davis
Production Editors	Kathy Espin, Rick Monroe
Business Manager	Jeff Nash
News Editor	Luann Whitley, Michael Roseman
Arts Editor	Terri Feimster
Feature Editor	Bill Whittaker
Sports Editor	Jim Dedmon
Photography Editor	Pam Freeze
Graphic Editor	Ed Miller
Advertising Manager	Greg Lane
Typesetter	Michael Evans
Proofreader	Theresa Herlevsen
Layout	Debbie Laney
Distribution	Bob Mellnik

The *Carolina Journal* is the student newspaper of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC). The *Carolina Journal* is published each Monday and Thursday of the academic year. Journal Publications typesets the *Carolina Journal* and it is printed by the Weekly Newspapers, Inc., located at 4433 North I-85 in Charlotte, N.C. Please address all correspondence to: Carolina Journal; Cone 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.