

commentary

Carter goes overboard with new proposal

By Mike Koller
Of The Print

Most everyone would agree that the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan is a grave violation of human rights, but the way President Carter and his staff are handling the crisis leaves one seriously questioning how effective the government really is in upholding Carter's human rights policies.

First, Carter called for a grain embargo against the Soviet Union in protest of their displeasing actions. The idea seemed logical enough. After all, the Soviets do need a lot of your grain to feed their people don't they? Well, a couple of weeks have passed since then and our government's heard more grumbling from Mid-western farmers wondering what they're going to do with so much excess grain than from starving Russians wondering what it would be like to eat bread again. Maybe the sly Soviets aren't letting on, but it doesn't seem as if the old grain embargo has brought them to their knees.

Next, Carter suddenly tells us what a good friend Pakistan is and that we will suddenly be helping our buddies with military aid to strengthen their forces against a possible threat from Afghanistan. Maybe I'm wrong, but if I remember correctly the government of Pakistan is about as stable as the American dollar. Maybe fashions have changed, but last time I checked our government usually gave military aid

economic aid to countries they could trust. But let's give Carter half a star on that move. Maybe Pakistan and the United States are going to be "good friends," after all.

Then, in Carter's most recent move against the Soviet Union, he has totally stepped out of his boundaries in proposing the American Olympic Team should boycott the summer games being held in Moscow if the Soviets do not withdraw from Afghanistan within one month.

Appearing on NBC's "Meet the Press" television program, Carter stated, "I do not want to inject politics into the Olympics." But Carter put his foot into his mouth with that statement, because that is exactly what he has done.

Sure, everyone knows that the Soviets pose a threat to world peace, but then they always have. Carter has no right to use something as sacred as the Olympic games to make some kind of political point.

Moscow radio labeled the president's proposals as "futile." That word adequately describes Carter's attempt.

Carter has no legal authority to dictate an American boycott, but his proposal puts unfair pressure on all the athletes who have worked so hard in preparation for the games. Now, many will spend the next month worrying whether all their practice will be wasted un-

til 1984. Others may never receive another chance to compete in the Olympics. A lot can happen in four years to keep a hopeful Olympian from reaching his or her goal.

Recent news articles show that American athletes and Olympic officials are divided on Carter's proposal, but whether or not they agree with Carter is not the question. They should have never had to be faced with such controversy in the first place.

Keeping America out of the games is a senseless waste of time and effort. It will not matter much to the Soviets, anyway (they'll just win that many more medals with the U.S. gone). That clearly demonstrates our government's continued ineffectiveness.

First the farmers, then the athletes. Who's going to have to sacrifice for your government next, Jimmy?

FRANKLY SPEAKING

...by phil frank



© COLLEGE MEDIA SERVICES · box 4244 Berkeley, CA. 94704

feedback

Movie waste

Dear Editor:

I would like to protest the recent "Star Trek" movie review. I'm not sure, but I think Mr. Tom Rhodes saw a different movie. The movie I saw was an almost total waste of \$4 and was quite disappointing. But the part of the movie review which bothered me the most was Mr. Rhode's inept ties to the Iranian Crisis and nuclear arms race. The movie was made before the Iranian crisis began. I realize that Mr. Rhodes is entitled to his own opinions, but "Star Trek" was made strictly for entertainment value, rather than irrelevant social comment. Would you waste \$45 million for that?

Sincerely,
James J. Rhodes I.

Focus honest

To The Editor:

Psychology instructor Loren
Wednesday, January 23, 1980

Wolfford conducted a two-hour seminar on male sexuality through the Men's Resource Program Wednesday night. He broke the ice by asking each individual's name and what they wanted out of the seminar. He began, after his introduction, explaining the male point of view on sexuality.

I found the seminar open in the sense of each person's emotions being refreshingly honest. The only disappointment was the small number of people present (less than 30). While most were men, four women interested in expanding their understanding of the male point of view also attended.

However, if in today's "Open Society," only a small number of persons participate in seminars such as this one, then there is a great need for better understanding each other. As the saying goes, "You've come along way, baby," but we still have need for improvement.

Matt Johnson

Gold; unpredictable market

By Elena Vancil
Of The Print

A flurry of speculations and explanations have succeeded the surprising upturn in the demand for gold.

Predictions are common about what gold will do next. "The bottom will drop out of the gold market," or, "Gold won't reach any higher than 'x' amount this year," are typical predictions.

The unpredictable market has everyone guessing and wondering.

Is it possible that the marketplace has lost faith in the, once termed, "good as gold" dollar? Has this loss of faith unleashed the incredible demand for a more stable currency?

It appears that it has, and why not? Nobody likes to sit around and watch their savings disintegrate with high inflation. Gold was the original currency, anyway. Dollar bills were merely coupons to aid in more convenient transfers of resources in the marketplace.

Gold is a reliable currency because it has intrinsic value, and many alternative uses. It is divisible and durable—an ideal means in which to swap one resource for another.

A healthy economy has only as many dollars as it has gold in storage, to back it up. The purpose of those dollars should be strictly as claim tickets for that gold.

Problems arise when this healthy economy is threatened by government intervention. Supply and demand are alive and kicking. Nobody can deny this gauge of a population's true priorities, even the most powerful government leader, although he may try.

When the market's gold standard was eliminated in favor of fiat currency, the government seemed to think that the world's resources could be attracted for nothing but a piece of paper. They must have thought that the situation would last indefinitely, that the government could finance more and more things for nothing, except the aid of a printing press.

Although history and logic deny this to be the case, the general population was living too easily to worry about it.

If resources are directed against natural demand, toward an entrepreneur with unmarketable goods or services, economic distortions will follow. Supply and demand will resist this government choice, and eventually win the

tussle. The day of reckoning may be decades later, but eventually, people will wake up and realize that all the benefits enjoyed during inflated years were borrowed, not bought, and the time has come to pay up.

This leads us to the issue at hand. Gold prices. Weak currencies can't thrive forever. Inflation will escalate until it reaches ridiculous proportions.

For example: The post-World War I inflation in Germany. The government was turning out money so fast and furiously, that they didn't have time to print both sides of the bills.

One thing could be said for those one-sided bills. They had intrinsic value. People could write their grocery lists on the blank side of the money. That shows how little the currency was worth.

It appears from the look of things that people are looking back at history, and taking logical action. Look at Germany: at the beginning of its inflation, until the height of it—when bushels of paper money would buy a few groceries—the buying power of one currency remained stable. An ounce of gold consistently bought the same amount of goods.

