

Monologue

U.S. has no sway with S. Africa

By Thad Kreisher
Of The Print

How often does another country's government make any major change at the request of the United States? Not very often. As a matter of fact, I can't remember even one such incident. Yet our President, Ronald Reagan, maintains that by talking to the South African government we can persuade them to abolish apartheid.

Talk is cheap. Cheaper still when one is dealing with South Africa. Our government can talk until they drop dead and it still wouldn't change a thing. President Botha's regime has already shown that world opinion means nothing to them. They have repeatedly scoffed at the American people's proposals of boycotts and divestments. They have arrogantly refused to make any but the most trivial of changes in their policy of apartheid. They continue to flaunt their oppressive tactics in the face of the world despite international protest.

Despite the many atrocities that the South African government displays, our government holds fast to a program of "constructive engagement." Reagan claims that this approach has already caused significant advances to be made towards the end of apartheid. He is vague, however, as to just what

advances have been made. What proof can he offer that the blacks in South Africa are any better off than when he began his policy of constructive engagement? Indeed, what proof does he have to show that constructive engagement has made any significant change at all?

Protests across the country show America's opposition to both constructive engagement and apartheid. According to *Newsweek Magazine*, within the government, members of Reagan's own political party have signed resolutions to back economic sanctions against South Africa unless serious steps are taken to end apartheid.

South Africa's policy of oppressing the black majority to maintain the rule of the white minority is a fascist tactic reminiscent of Hitler's Germany. Their government makes a habit of stating that they will not give in to outside pressure or economic sanctions. This may be true, and perhaps our government can do nothing to force the South Africans to end apartheid.

However, that is no excuse for the United States to support their discriminatory practices. The blacks in that land are forced to live in shanties on so-called "homelands". According to *Time Magazine*, these

homelands constitute about thirteen percent of all of South Africa, and are the most desolate regions of the country. In contrast, the white population inhabits 83 percent of the land and live in comfortable, modern accommodations. The black educational system, although it possesses more students, receives only one fifth of the financing granted to white schools.

U.S. News and World Report states that in this setting, many American companies, including Mobil, Citicorp, and I.B.M., operate. They claim that if they were to pull out, it would only hurt the black population more. However, these companies are directly responsible for only a very small percentage of black employment.

The United States should not aid the economy of a nation that willingly denies the rights of a vast majority of its citizens. Nor should we stand idly by and do nothing. The South African government has said before that outside pressure and economic sanctions will not affect it, but would it maintain that opinion if they were imposed? By refusing to instate economic sanctions upon South Africa, our government is in effect supporting the very thing they claim to abhor.

'I knew it all along'

Bhagwan, other 'Reds' lose it all

By Fritz Wenzel
Editor in Chief

I'm not absolutely sure about some things in life, but one thing I am positive about is that everyone hates the type of person that says he knew something was going to happen after the fact. And one thing is for certain; you would never find me doing that myself. Usually, in a normal setting, it's just that I knew these things were going to happen so far ahead of the time they did that if I would have said something when I first discovered I knew, they would have shipped me off to Dammasch.

The first thing I knew was going to happen was that the Kansas City Royals were going to win the World Series. I knew that when they won the pennant, though I had not seen them play all year to that point. First of all, they have George Brett. Whether you like him or not, just having

him there to bat is a real lift to the team. At the plate he looks like a modern day Babe Ruth. He doesn't just want to get a hit, he wants to puncture the atmosphere with the ball. Look out, Space Shuttle!

Second, The Royals have the best uniforms. Theirs look like the baseball uniforms of old. In fact, it was because the Royals were so much more comfortable, and not because of the questionable calls that got Andujar so upset in the bottom of the fifth Sunday night.

There were times between pitches this last week when I envisioned Boog Powell sneering back at a weary pitcher, or Mickey Mantle ripping a single to left, things I saw on Saturday morning years ago, obscured by the early morning mist of time, but still dripping with reality. The Series really brings the American childhood out in the minds of men.

The other thing I knew would happen is the capture of the Bhagwan. But then, I claim no special privilege on that one. Almost everyone I talked to about the Rajneeshes has said something like "they will get theirs someday." Often people would add "even if I have to give it to them myself."

The Oregonian reported that the Bhagwan was indicted Thursday, but Rajneesh wasn't waiting around to greet the warrant-carrying sheriff at his door. Instead, he simply had a sudden craving for warmer waters, sand and salty air, instead of water in a tin cup, making sand and eating saltines. The Bhagwan went for it all when he went for the South Seas, but he now finds himself up a creek without a Rolls. Where is Sheela when you need her.

