opinion

FBI case prompts look at all recruiters

The most intriguing aspect of the University law school's deferred recruiting by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for possible hiring violations of the University's non-discrimination policy, is the far-reaching ramifications on unquestioned recruiters and established programs it will prompt.

The outcome for the University — and other state institutions — regarding access for discriminatory agencies, of which the FBI may be one, is but the tip of the proverbial iceberg. That iceberg consists of recruiters as frozen as the armed forces and the ROTC program, and as fluid as the small businesses that have few occasions to use the University's placement center.

In this specific instance of the law school and the FBI, the Emerald applauds the prudence of Dean Bell for demanding clarification of that agency's hiring practices regarding homosexuals. We further applaud his action to defer the recruiting visit by the FBI until the matter is satisfactorily resolved.

It is ridiculous to assume, as suggested in other media, that deferring FBI recruiting presumes the agency guilty of discrimination based on sexual orientation. The FBI themselves have made public statements which clarifies their position. They maintain hiring homosexuals is a risk because homosexuals are more vulnerable to compromise — which threatens national security if, as agents, they handle sensitive material.

To argue the case is imperative even though the FBI has not replied in specific to Dean Bell's inquiry. We have all seen the spy movies of the compromised homosexual. The hiring policy, if discriminatory, presumes a homosexual man or woman is unable to conduct themselves in a professional, ethical manner regarding their work. Does the FBI prefer hiring licentious heterosexuals who can be as easily compromised?

It's a particular oddity, and indicative of this obsessive Freudian age, that employment judgements are based foremost on a person's sexual orientation, rather than their professional capabilities.

How will this affect recruiters such as the armed forces and programs like ROTC?

This case should invoke a review of hiring practices of recruiters and programs to ensure they adhere to the University's affirmative action policy. And frankly, even the most myopic can tell at a glance that a large number of those recruiters and programs can't stand up to the scrutiny. It's not double-vision that obscures the fact discriminatory and other-than-neutral agencies (neutrality being the University's ideal according to Pres. Paul Olum) are encouraged to recruit and station programs on campus.

The University's affirmative action policy prohibits on-campus recruiting by employers who discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, handicap, national origin or extraneous consideration not directly related to effective job performance.

The "extraneous considerations" clause is the crux of the law school and FBI case. This clause is explicit in its inclusion of homosexuals — although, as an example, it provides equal protection as well for people who've been institutionalized for mental disorders or served time in prison.

The clause, and the entire affirmative action policy, protects every student and is probably one of the most important criteria ensuring equal treatment for this University.

One student had the courage to contest the FBI's hiring practices. This one voice will make certain an agency that may discriminate will not be sanctioned to practice discrimination — whether quasi-legal or not — on University grounds.

But this case should be viewed as the first of many. It's time to take a hard look at other recruiters and programs who have access to the campus to police them for discriminatory practices.

RICHARD OF ARABIA

letters

Say something

Like Maggie Lear, "I'm not sure this is indicative of the trend in education here at the University. But I feel this situation (her letter, No comment, Oct. 13) is at least worth mentioning" again.

Lear seems surprised and apparently dismayed that her International Relations instructor was unwilling to comment on the assassination of Anwar Sadat at 9:30 a.m., Oct. 11. I was listening to the radio at approximately the same moment and it was clear from that broadcast that nothing was known (for sure) beyond the fact Sadat had been attacked. Given this lack of information, I personally feel a "no comment" response was in order. Had I been conducting a class at that moment, I too would have deferred comment.

The trend in education which worries me is Lear's unstated assumption that a professor should produce an authoritative instant analysis of one of the world's most complex situations with virtually no information at hand. This is not the role of academic scholarship, and I would argue this assumption is antithetical to reasoned judgement. There are those who must respond quickly (national leaders, for example) but I hope that Lear took note that there was no official U.S. response at 9:30 a.m.

Only electronic journalists succumbed to the pressure to "say something" even though they had nothing to say at that hour. If Lear would take the time to reread the information that became available over the next ten days, I'm sure she would realize how important the unknown facts would have been to an assessment of the situation. Without knowing who attacked Sadat, with that degree of success, and for what stated reasons, it would be foolish to go beyond an expression of shock.

Apparently Lear would have the University behave like television: instant analyses with the story wrapped up in 90 seconds. Fortunately for Lear, and all of us, the University doesn't work that way.

Jerry F. Medler
Political Science

Misquote

I am writing in regards to Dane Claussen's story on the Inter-fraternity Council Tribunal hearing concerning Sigma Phi Epsilon's Rush violation.

Claussen misquoted Pres. Todd Ruberg on his comment about the illegal Rush invitation. Ruberg did not claim that the Rush invitation was "poorly worded." Rather, he claimed the invitation was due to a communications inconsistency between President's Council and the meeting of Rush Chairmen on Monday, Sept. 21.

Sigma Phi Epsilon was guilty of a Rush violation, but I feel that it is only fair to Ruberg to define and clarify his defense accurately.

Kelly DeLacy
Tribunal member
Pres., Phi Delta Theta

Fa la la la

The Young Americans for Freedom: With a name like that one would have to conclude they stand for all the social virtues which make a society truly democratic such as freedom of speech and opposition to coercive violence. Other people disagree and think YAFers are nothing more than armchair patriots willing to defend the country with the last drop of someone elses blood.

I think the following ditty taken from the YAF songbook very cogently illustrated the YAF philosophy. The song, rendered to the tune of "Deck the Halls with Boughs of Holly," is:

Deck the halls with Commie corpses,
Fa la la la la la la la la
'Tis the time to be remorseless
Fa la la la la la la la la
Wield we now our sharp stiletti
Fa la la la la la la la la
Carve the pinks into confetti
Fa la la la la la la la la

David Isenberg
Senior, International Studies

Shallowness

Once again the shallowness of some Emerald editorials becomes apparent.

The Emerald went into a tirade Oct. 15 about the wasted time and "attempt at rewriting history" in a California court regarding the Holocaust. The editorial implied that the case was an attempt to disprove the Holocaust and waste the court's time. Nothing could be more wrong. The Mermelstein case was a breach-of-contract suit wherein the Institute of Historical Review failed to fulfill its promise of a $50,000 reward to anyone who could prove that the Holocaust existed. Mel Mermelstein had to prove that he indeed had the evidence and that the IHR was obligated to pay. Plain and simple. There was no "rewriting of history" only contract enforcement and the fear of "the crucifixion of Christ being judicially reviewed" is silly.

The editorial talks about paying the prosecution when the writer surely knows there is none in a civil case. The tirade goes on against lawyers who "never work for free." Lawyers often work for free or on a contingency basis. The Emerald irrelevently rages against lawyers "more concerned with fees than a speedy judiciary" but offers little as proof.

The final question asked by the editorial is who benefitted from the case. Obviously the plaintiff to the tune of $50,000. I suggest the Emerald spend some time thinking before a knee-jerk reaction puts its foot in its editorial mouth.

Richard E. Gray
Graduate, Political Science

letters policy

The Emerald will accept and attempt to print all letters containing fair comment on issues, ideas and topics of interest to the University community.

The letters **must** be limited to 250 words, signed, and the identification of the writer must be verified when the letter is turned in to The Emerald offices, EMU 300.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit any letter for length, style or content. Publication is dependent upon the space available.