

Foreign aid dollars need to be used for U.S. woes

By Aaron Brown
Staff Writer

If those who are in economic need in this country formed an independent republic of their own, the U.S. would most likely give aid anywhere from 500 million to 1.1 billion.

Foreign aid has been escalating over the years to almost ridiculous amounts. In his foreign aid budget request (April 1989) for 1990 before the House of Foreign Affairs Committee, James Baker wanted \$14.6 billion allotted to various organizations and countries, an increase of 10% from the previous budget.

Out of the 14.6 billion, 5.3 billion (36%) was to be provided to Israel and Egypt for security(?). The Philippines, Portugal, Greece,

Turkey are to receive \$1.8 billion, while "friends" in the Middle East received \$1.1 billion.

In the first place, where is all of this money coming from? I would like see to this monetary supply that Baker seems to think that this country has. Maybe we do have this money, but still, why does the U.S. government bother to mess with countries all over the world?

The government seems to like to place its hand in every corner of the world, hoping that all of this lending will pay off for this country in the long run. I am sure this was in their minds back when aid was given to Japan after WW II. No one needs to be reminded of the economic force that we helped build (that is now taking over the

continent).

Maybe the U.S. government is looking after world interests by giving aid to those in need. There is no argument here concerning aid in an economic capacity to those in Eastern Europe (but do the common people ever see the aid?). It is good business to help those countries.

However, the foreign aid that is questionable, which was brought up by the bespectacled half of Crossfire on CNN, is the \$7.1 billion that is given to Egypt and Israel et al. Why should we give money to a country to use for military purposes while countries like Romania are trying to get on their feet?

Wait a minute, something went really wrong there. We are

talking about billions and billions (sorry Mr. Sagan) of dollars for \$659 toilet seat covers and \$3000 coffee makers in Israeli and Egyptian barracks, while Eastern Europeans don't get that in a month's pay. Incredible.

Now since we all now know that communism is a repressive failure, the emphasis needs to slow on economic aid to those who use it for military purposes, or to defend against the "red tide." Sorry Israel, Egypt etc., but others need funds more than you do, like East Europe, or even (gasp!) those in the U.S.

So what are we to do about foreign aid? Well, it is great to help countries in dire need (sorry, not the Middle East) and I concede that those like in Eastern

Europe do need funds. BUT, once again, America should take a hard look at her own domestic problems, like the 2,400 DEA agents who need more money in the fight against drugs.

A final point to ponder is all the money the government wasted on ousted leaders. One has to remember the Marcos escapade, where all the money went for shoes, the Shah of Iran now in exile, and who can forget former CIA stooge Manuel Noriega who probably used his aid on drugs.

So your tax dollars are wasted on a banana republic which may be ousted tomorrow. Is that where you want your tax dollars to go?

Negativity rampant on CCC campus

By R. W. Jagodnik Jr.
Staff Writer

Calm it with those negative waves! The higher learning experience is meant for a positive outlook on life, and not for the further entrenchment in the deep recesses of evolutionary muck. Plain and simple, lighten up!

Too often in these times of great political strife and economic uncertainty, students become bogged down with negative waves that disrupt the cosmic balance that every soul should share in this marvelous world of higher education. Someone a while back termed this sort of education as liberal. Where are the freedoms now? How can a college student be liberal when his world hangs suspended by the threads of a negative association with the institution that the student attends?

An important part of a liberal education is the social atmosphere that the learning takes place in. In high school, a large percentage of

the student body support the athletic teams; where as, here, sports events are unattended by a majority of students. "That was then, this is now" is not an acceptable answer. Why is it that so many students work through a whole term perfecting a piece of art and when exhibited, no one shows? Where has all of the life gone in this campus?

Granted, this is a community college with mostly part-time and evening students that do not spend much time on campus. In a university, the dorms are on or near the campus and provide students with daily and nightly access. However, this difference should not affect the students who attend this institution full-time. All the students are here on campus together and should act as if they care what happens on this campus. Here, the sentence, "I do not give a f--- about anything," is far too commonly interjected. If

someone does not give a f---, then no one gives a f---, and the campus goes to sh---. See even here, the effects are already trickling down to speech patterns and how educated do these offensive phrases make students from this campus sound?

This is not a plea, and certainly not one for any particular morality, but it is a look at what has happened on this campus. This is not a plea to encourage better attendance to school functions, but it is a look at what attitude students have toward them. This is a plea to re-examine the deterioration of student morale. The change comes when negativity is eliminated and a positive atmosphere is born. Those heavy negative waves can slap some other shore.

Clackamas Print

The Clackamas Print aims to be a fair and impartial newspaper covering the college community. Opinions expressed in The Clackamas Print do not necessarily reflect those of the college administration, faculty or Associated Student Government. Articles and information printed in this newspaper can be re-printed only with written permission from the Clackamas Community College Student Publications Office. The Clackamas Print is a weekly publication distributed every Wednesday except for finals week. Clackamas Community College, 19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045. Office: Trailer B. Telephone: 657-6958, ext. 309 (office), 577 (production) and 578 (advertising).

Editor-in-Chief: Jim Titus
Managing/News Editor: Briane C. Dotson
Copyeditor: Roseann Wentworth
Feature Editor: Angela Wilson
Photo Editor: Jillian Porter
Sports Editors: Mark A. Borrelli
Staci Beard
Reporters: Aaron Brown
Me-Lissa Cartales
Amber Cordry
Cameron Dickey
R.W. Jagodnik, Jr.
Dawn Kuehl
Margy Lynch
Julie Marriot
Lane Scheideman
Jennifer Soper
Photographers: Scott Johnson
Dawn Kuehl
Lane Scheideman
Tim Zivney
Business Manager: Gregg Mayes
Advisor: Linda Vogt

Campus Views

"If you were the leader of a small, underdeveloped country and the U.S. government gave you \$5.5 billion in aid, how would you spend it?"



Jeff Gates: Personally, as a United States citizen, I have come to believe that foreign aid is in most cases a colossal waste of our tax dollars. If we desire to help other nations and of poverty, homelessness and starvation, let us first take care of our own and then assist other countries in need.



Matt Merritt: Place the money in a high-interest Swiss bank account for one year and take the interest plus \$1 billion and improve the school system. The remaining money would be divided evenly between all other national debts and responsibilities.



Shaun Huey: First of all I would ensure that all of the citizens are equally fed and sheltered. Then I would concentrate on education and helping farmers with their crops. After that I would build up the military and strengthen the government.



Ethel M. Konopka: 1. Mandatory education--free. 2. Develop natural resources to develop an economic base. 3. Join the United Nations. 4. Participate in world trade.



Ginny Cowan: 1. Supply food for sustenance until agriculture is developed. 2. Education--free and effective (3-Rs and practical). 3. Open country with roads; encourage internal trade.

