

upper classes of society to express an identity than to cause an unnecessary stir over "moral" issues. Just wait until they graduate and find they have to work for a living. Only then will they really see how they stand on the peripheral issues.

— People can't do anything constructive until they're in a high managerial position or a member of a law firm or working in an academic institution. Without a home, family, car and professional clout someone can't think intelligently and promote the kind of change which will truly improve society.

— If people just let well enough alone things will work out fine. We all have a right to be politically apathetic.

I ask one favor of anyone who thinks this way — don't become what you hate. Don't assume any of these opinions on the basis of socially determined stereotypes. Ours is a terrible society when we write off entire groups of people on the basis of their esoteric beliefs. Worse, once liberally educated students stop playing the role of true rational skeptics and assume stereotypes, education becomes pointless.

So what the hell does this have to do with last Saturday's letter writing session? Solar power is not reserved for the moral fanatics. It relates to the entire problem of supplying our energy needs. It is an issue which demands political, economic and

social analysis. Thus solar could be one's weakest subject and one could still think creatively and decisively about it. In this light how can members of IPIRG/MOBE be narrow minded, unenlightened and generally ignorant of their cause?

The same is true with South Africa. I hear bickering about the worthlessness of divestiture. Yet the only group actually taking decisive action is the South African Support Group. Personally, I'm glad to see at least one group on campus, the Support Group, perceiving the most basic flaw in the proxy system, that recent history has proven that this country will wait until hell freezes over before the proxy system works seriously enough to affect a true change in South Africa. Meanwhile only the South African Support Group is asking the most important question: Will Grinnell or will Grinnell not continue giving financial support to an oppressive regime abroad? I suggest we continue with the truly constructive suggestions we can act upon here and now.

I propose one. Ironically, it's the same suggestion activism has been proposing all along. Let's create and maintain an environment on campus for the open discussion of a variety of issues. Issues which are important in themselves but which also reflect the state of the international community. Issues ranging from South Africa

to solar power to "human rights" to personal happiness to the role of liberal arts in a career as a draw-bridge oiler.

I don't suppose I've offended anyone. On the other hand if your inclination now is to run to the nearest letter writing session, you missed the point. Thinking and acting creatively on social, political and economic issues has many manifestations. Unfortunately, the more we move into the

'80s, the fewer of these manifestations I see. My message in brief: get on the stick.

Perhaps if someone came to our next letter writing session for solar power and rationally argued that Reagan was absolutely right in cutting the tax incentives, I would be delighted to say that activism is finally getting somewhere. — Bill Ogilvie, Iowa Public Interest Research Group/Mobilization for Survival

Divestment is the proper way to go

Today, the college's Board of Trustees is being confronted with the decision of whether Grinnell should divest itself of stock held in corporations which operate in South Africa. This decision carries momentous implications for the ethical character of Grinnell's financial endowment (and thus of the college itself) and, more importantly, articulates Grinnell's explicit stance in relation to black South Africa's struggle for liberation.

Opponents of divestment argue that today's decision represents no such stance. They maintain instead that continued involvement in the American corporate structure — either through reform measures such as proxy resolutions or simply by supporting present corporate operations — is the best way in which Grinnell can contribute to the advancement of justice and equality in South Africa. The assumption that Grinnell can effectively influence corporate policy through proxy statements clearly provides an unsatisfactory justification for the corporate involvement option. In 1979, at the peak of nationwide concern for corporate responsibility in South Africa, proxy statements addressing this concern met with overwhelming opposition of 98.2 percent, 96 percent and 94.7 percent, respectively, in the boardrooms of General Motors, I.B.M. and U.S. Steel. Given Grinnell's already small voice as a shareholder, proxy action constitutes little more than an empty gesture, holding forth no realistic prospect for change.

The corporate relationship to the racist status quo is further illuminated by the South African government's request in 1980 that all foreign investors form corporate militias among white employees and pay for the installation of arms and communications gear on company premises. U.S. corporations have yet to comply with the request — primarily because its terms require that record of the proposed expenditures be withheld from corporate home offices — but the fact that they can be approached in such a manner, alongside the precedent of the G.M. plan, clearly indicates that American corporations are a dependable

cornerstone of the apartheid system.

Similar examples can be drawn from other domains of the South African economy and a consideration of the ineffectual nature and enforcement of the corporate guidelines embodied in the Sullivan Principles would further amplify the present general sketch but the above information should demonstrate that the U.S. corporate presence is a collusive and not a moderating force in the structure of the apartheid government. It is fitting, however, that the final word in this portrayal of corporate interests should come from black South Africa itself. In a recent article in the S&B, David Molho quoted with approval the black trade union leader Freddy Sauls — a confirmed supporter of the continuation of apartheid who thus retains the right to speak in public — on the beneficial economic effects of U.S. corporate involvement in South Africa. A far more representative statement of black South Africa's position is voiced by the banned South African Congress of Trade Unions which has declared that:

The ending of foreign investment in South Africa... is a means of undermining the power of the apartheid regime. But it is of such importance that there can be no compromise whatever about it from our point of view. Foreign investment is a pillar of the whole system which maintains the virtual slavery of the black workers in South Africa.

As long as Grinnell continues to hold stock in corporations which do business in South Africa, the College comes down firmly in support of a morally indefensible system of racial oppression. Given the inadequacy of conventional approaches to corporate reform, Grinnell has no other means of refraining from active support of apartheid and of expressing solidarity with black South Africa's struggle for freedom, than to divest. It is hoped that the trustees act today in accordance with this simple ethical imperative — but if they fail to do so, it is the responsibility of the student body to remind them of their moral obligation in the future. — Chris Lehmann

Publisher makes correction

To the Editor:

In your Oct. 2 edition, an article by Marilyn I. Clark indirectly quotes columnist Gary Giddins as saying that "the publishing company (in Grinnell)" engaged in "censorship-like tactics" against both the S&B and the now-defunct Pterodactyl.

Assuming the accuracy of the quote, Mr. Giddins' memory of the period is perhaps fading a bit.

The Herald-Register Publishing Co. clearly is the firm to which he was referring. But a check of our records verifies that this company never published the Pterodactyl, nor did it have the contract for printing the S&B at that time. The two publications were typeset and printed in other communities.

Thanks for allowing me to set the record straight. — John Breemer, Herald-Register News Editor

l in the blank)

rowdies who presumably knew how to have a good time." He claims that the "bang" part was added simply to rhyme, and to mean "a sense of thrill or excitement." I have seen the words "gang" and "bang" used in sequence in many contexts, but I have never seen it used to connote anything other than a group rape. Even if the persons who named this event did not intend for the title to have such connotations, many people interpret it as such — not only those who are offended by it, but also those who like the title and wish to continue using it.

Mr. Archambault's second argument likewise is quite weak. He states that "when the name 'gang bang' is replaced with anything, it just does not sound like much fun anymore." Considering that he is accusing those who oppose the title of reading too much into the name, this is a rather pathetic defense of his position. Tell me, Mr. Archambault, what is it about the name "gang bang" that sounds like so much fun? Didn't parties such as the Haight-Ashbury party or Younker Tie party sound like fun to you? Can't you possibly think of something that sounds like fun that doesn't also sound like an assault against women?

Then Mr. Archambault assures us that there is no connection between this title and any attacks on campus — past or present. I had never heard any such accusations, but there is a connection. There is a definite connection between the attitudes toward the title of the "gang bang" and the attitudes toward the recent rape of a student. It is no coincidence that an alarming number of male students found the occurrence of a rape quite amusing and that the same students that think "Gang Bang" is a good name, sounds like a real good time, heheh heh." By retaining a part title which treats the subject of rape as a joke, we foster such insensitive attitudes, we affirm them, and we make no progress at all towards their eradication.

Mr. Archambault characterizes people

who are offended by the title of his hall's party as "the few who have nothing better to worry and/or complain about." What would you consider as something better for us to worry about, Mr. Archambault? Why is worrying about the perpetuation of woman-hating attitudes not important? Why is your total lack of respect for the women of this campus not important?

Let's look at this issue from another perspective. Say that the title was something that was extremely offensive to black students, or Jewish students — any religion, race, creed or national origin. Most of those groups are of a minority on campus — would this be grounds for continuing use of a title which offended them? In fact, would the SGA so blithely let the subject pass through their hands? Would the college allow it to continue?

I think not. They would not dare. The entire campus would be mobilized, and a change would be fast in coming. But because this issue deals with women, it is deemed unimportant. This is because we live in a woman-hating society, and Grinnell, for all its progressive trappings, is a part of that society.

This is a serious issue. The attitudes that exist at Grinnell will travel out into the world with Grinnell students when they leave. If we allow woman-hating attitudes to continue here, then how can we expect to rid the world of them?

There are people on this campus who object of the title Gang Bang. We must make a stand; we cannot simply sit back and be silent. We can make a change; we can make a dent in the erroneous ways of thinking that surround us. If the name is not changed, we can boycott. People like Mr. Archambault will tell you that you will be missing a great party, but surely we could get together and make our own great party, one without a hostile title.

I have made my decision — I would rather miss out on a "good time" than give up my self-respect to attend a "Gang Bang." — Elizabeth A. Hendricks

ers the unique
g your work.
that is of interest
community.
of this opportunity
articles, poetry or
Review, Box 152.

Professional typing
done in my home
call 235-7596
or 236-8100
after 4:30 and
ask for Cheryl

**SKIP
NOV.
19th.**

On November 19, we'd like you to stop smoking cigarettes for 24 hours. It's worth a try. Because if you can skip cigarettes for a day, you might discover you can skip 'em forever.

**THE GREAT AMERICAN
SMOKEOUT**
American Cancer Society