

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROGHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor

LISA PULLEN, University Editor

CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor

MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor

BILL RIEDY, News Editor

JOHN CONWAY, City Editor

KAREN FISHER, Features Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Time to leave

It's been a year since the U.S. Marines first entered Lebanon on a mission of peace and of unifying the strife-torn country. Last week was the anniversary of that goal, but the celebration could only be heard near the Beirut International Airport, where four marines were killed in artillery attacks. The peacekeeping mission begun by the Reagan administration had died at the hands of sectarian hatred within Lebanon.

The Marines' deaths showed for the first time how enmeshed the United States had become in the Lebanon conflict, and how inadequate current peacekeeping jargon was to handle it. U.S. citizens had been killed on foreign soil. No one could answer why.

President Reagan has maintained that the United States throughout the Lebanon conflict has been needed to provide a stabilizing force to the teetering government. It was a government that was battling an eight-year-old Syrian occupation and a one-year-old Israeli invasion. President Amin Gemayel was struggling with the reins of his slain brother's administration. Criticism of his rigid Christian Phalangist background soon sparked factional disputes; battles between Moslems and Christians became the rule. It was in this warfare last week that 10 United States and French peacekeeping officials were killed.

Against this history of conflict, Reagan at first seemed justified in bringing the United States to aid in stabilizing the Lebanese government. The Marines were first charged with smoothing the departure of the Palestine Liberation Organization from Beirut, anticipating that the nation's unification soon could follow. But the administration didn't count on then-President Bashir Gemayel being killed and the rampage by Israeli and Muslim forces that followed.

In response, the United States, along with France, Italy and Great Britain, formed a new peacekeeping force — this one 5,400 strong. The goal of the mission was to negotiate the departure of the Syrian and Israeli forces from Lebanon. But again, they didn't count on a rigid Soviet-backed Syria which refused to call back its 64,000 soldiers. Consequently, Israel decided it couldn't pull out either. The peacekeeping troops were now bound to their mission as mediators for a country struggling with two invaders.

Last week's brutal warfare changed the Lebanon scenario and the role of the United States in it. With the deaths of four U.S. Marines, the government could no longer rationalize that the Marines were not in danger. Their peacekeeping efforts were reduced to dodging bullets and defending themselves by returning machine gun and cannon fire.

Lebanon's war had become one immersed in civil conflict, a conflict that threatened the Gemayel government. Muslim factions criticized the regime for representing only the Christian Phalangist sect, a small minority of the Lebanese population. But Gemayel refused to acknowledge the Muslim complaints, announcing he would not negotiate with Lebanese factions until Syria and Israel had been removed. He refused to acknowledge that there was a civil war, though the Druze were bearing arms against the Christian forces and though mountain villages had become sites of civilian massacres.

It's this warfare and these massacres that point to the danger of the Reagan administration's allowing the Marines to remain as peacekeeping forces. Already the president has turned down Gemayel's request for additional aid. Now he must negotiate ways of bringing the U.S. forces out of the growing conflict.

Government officials can and have argued that withdrawing the troops will signify the demise of Lebanon, that warring factions will create a chaotic hell, ready for Syria to take over. However, it must be noted that the Lebanese battles have already transcended those of simple conflicts able to be resolved through peacekeeping missions.

Lebanon, as the administration has acknowledged, is in a civil war. And it is doubtful that the Gemayel regime will be able to regain a stable hold on the warring factions with or without the United States' aid. Reagan now must realize his obligation to bring the Marines out now, before more are killed while under the guise of peacekeeping.

Fed up

A recent downturn in the economy has put pressure on the Reagan administration to steer the Federal Reserve Board toward unstopping its plug on money-supply growth, a move which some economists and Reagan advisers hope will lead to a resurgence in the recovery.

By all accounts, the recovery has slowed dramatically, much in response to the Fed's tightening of money available for borrowing by raising interest rates. With business activity running unexpectedly strong only a few months ago, the money supply grew too quickly for the tastes of Fed Chairman Paul C. Volcker, who said he feared sustained high money growth would lead to high inflation. With low inflation the hallmark of the Volcker Fed, the board raised interest rates to squeeze some of the gushing funds out of the system. The result, as usual, has lowered productivity and increased unemployment slightly.

As the 1984 presidential election approaches, the economic performance of the Reagan administration will come under close scrutiny. Both Reagan and his advisers know that an economic slump during the campaign could kill his re-election bid. Treasury Secretary Donald Regan advised Reagan before the summer recess to pressure the Fed into easing its lending restrictions.

This, however, is faulty advice given the goals the Fed has laid down for itself. If the Fed were to ease interest rates now, inflation would likely rise. The Fed, acting independently and in character, would then raise interest rates to lower the inflation rate, causing unemployment to resurge, probably near election time, and leaving Reagan in economic disdain and political ruin.

So far, Reagan has wisely refrained from asking the Fed for lower interest rates to fuel the economy this summer. Recent money-supply growth figures show a dramatic decrease, leading some economists to believe Volcker will lower rates in the near future anyway, perhaps as early as next month. Other analysts say the Fed will be more cautious, waiting for more permanent signals.

Whatever the Fed's decision, it is important that the Reagan administration not play politics with the Federal Reserve Board by trying to manipulate it into acting against its better judgment. Reagan, by reappointing Volcker to a second term as chairman, has already reaffirmed his confidence in the Fed's ability to keep inflation low, while it slowly, if somewhat erratically, brings the country out of one of its worst recessions. Perhaps Reagan has found that a hands-off, pragmatic approach will be best for the American people. And what's good for the American people is definitely good for President Reagan.

Integration is no solution

By BENJAMIN MOREHEAD

It is said that the far left and the far right have convergent goals: both seek to infringe on the personal liberties of others. While examples of right-wing attacks on personal liberties come readily to mind (e.g. Jerry Falwell's diatribes against premarital sex, homosexuality and birth control), examples from the left are more insidious and require a keener eye to spot. The left-wing attacks on personal liberties are usually promulgated under the banner of "social equality," a vague goal at best, but one that is difficult to disagree with publicly. Nevertheless, the left-wing attacks are a manifestation of the same extremist desire: one group of people wants to tell another group what is good for it.

So it is with S.L. Price's article, "Old habits die hard," (DTH, Sept. 7). In it, Price proposes to "abolish any choice for freshman housing" and "randomize the process (by mixing) the incoming blacks and whites by number all over campus." This, Price says, will break down the racial and ethnic stereotypes now held by campus residents by promoting a racially diverse environment and by ending the *de facto* segregation that now exists at UNC. I agree with Price that a state of *de facto* segregation exists in the UNC dorms and that many students hold

racial stereotypes, but that is where my agreement ends. First, Price offers no evidence that the proposed solution will solve the problem. In my limited experience as a Craige Hall resident, I have seen neither significant racial co-mingling nor an absence of racial stereotypes.

Second, the proposed solution takes from freshmen a fundamental freedom of expression: namely, the right to choose where to live. Freshmen have always had the option of living in an "integrated" dorm, and most have chosen not to exercise it.

Do the alleged benefits to society resulting from increased diversity in the dormitories outweigh the measure of their personal liberty?

In deciding whether to take this choice away from freshmen, an economist would ask a simple question: Do the alleged benefits to society resulting from the increased diversity in the dormitories (e.g. a breakdown of stereotypes, mutual understanding, housing equality, etc.) outweigh the known aggregate cost to individuals of losing a measure of their personal liberty? The U.S. Supreme

Court has been faced with this sort of question many times in its history; the controlling precedent it uses was authored by Justice William Brennan in *Bantam Books Inc. v. Sullivan* (1963):

Any system of prior restraints of expression comes to this court bearing a heavy presumption against its constitutional validity.

The court undoubtedly would be disturbed by the generative nature of Price's proposal; that is, the likelihood that the rule would spawn other such rules which would further erode individual liberties. For instance, if it's desirable to force on-campus freshmen to live in racially diverse environments, then surely off-campus freshmen would benefit as well. (In fact, many would argue that it would be discriminatory to force on-campus residents to live in racially diverse atmospheres without also forcing the off-campus residents to do the same.)

Surely, then, some brilliant legislator would realize that all the residents of Chapel Hill could benefit from this policy, and he or she would propose that the racial composition of every neighborhood in the town be representative of the community as a whole. Before you know it, all the cities in the United States would be forced to integrate all their neighborhoods, and from there, it would be but a short hop to communism.

Benjamin Morehead is a first-year MBA student from Miami.

Let's not re-elect Helms

By HARRISON J. KAPLAN

We label politicians all the time. We call them Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, right-wing or left-wing. In isolation, these labels mean very little. You can call Jesse Helms a right-wing Republican, but what does that mean? Helms' slick public relations team at the Congressional Club always urges North Carolina voters to look beyond those Raleigh News and Observer labels.

Who does Jesse Helms represent? He does not represent the minority population of our state. Besides his 30-year record of opposition to even the most basic of all civil rights reforms, Jesse Helms has hired only one black staff member in his 12-year Senate career. He maintains a blissfully indifferent attitude to the problems and feelings of nearly a third of North Carolina's citizens.

He certainly does not represent women. He has opposed every effort to end discrimination against women, including the Equal Pay Act, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and, of course, the Equal Rights Amendment. Jesse Helms sets himself against the basic needs of working women — day care, child nutrition programs, equal pay for equal work, etc.

Helms does not represent the interests of anyone who is concerned about his or his family's economic future or the environment.

A quick look at Helms' record reveals that:

- He opposed the Emergency Farm Loan Program which provides emergency low-cost loans to farmers and rural home owners in case of natural disaster.
- He opposed passage of the Toxic Substance Control Act and nearly gutted the legislation to create the Environment Protection Agency Superfund, both designed to protect Americans from the dangers of hazardous wastes and clean up our treatment of industrial chemicals.
- He opposed establishing a tax credit program for the working poor and a bill to strengthen efforts to collect child support payments from fathers who had deserted their families.

In recent years, Helms has opposed legal aid to the poor, federal funds for highway and bridge repairs, educational funding — the list could go on forever.

These are not ideological issues. These are basic human life issues. Once could better respect Helms' opposition to abortion if he cared about people after they were born.

Jesse Helms gets his votes by appealing to hatred and intolerance. For the last five or six months he has placed thousands of advertisements in small N.C.



DTH/David Washburn

newspapers that are skillfully designed to appeal to bigotry. Nearly every advertisement has photographs of black union members or black political leaders like the Rev. Jesse Jackson and Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young. The purpose of the ads is to tie Gov. Jim Hunt to teacher unions and alleged radicals. Hunt is proud of his friendship with Jackson and Young and many other respected black political leaders. These malicious attacks will backfire.

North Carolina is a moderate, progressive state. It is moving forward fast. There is no longer time for race hatred or extremist screaming. What we need are leaders interested in balanced, fair economic growth, better public education, a safe environment and a more peaceful world.

Jesse Helms may believe that he stands for these values, but his record as a U.S. senator fails to prove it.

Harrison J. Kaplan, a third-year law student from Wilmington, is president of UNC College Young Democrats.

From inside the cockpit

By RYKE LONGEST

The sky was dark through the window of my cockpit. Sometimes, a glowing wisp would fly past as my light would illuminate part of the cloud formation I was flying through. I love flying at night, especially when the moon is low upon the water. It is then that I am one with my plane and the sky. Compared to this joy, my mission is always an afterthought.

That night the mission was pursuit of an enemy surveillance plane. I could see it, and the plane that was currently following it, as red dots on my radar. I was out of the clouds by this time and the stars were brilliant. The moon was bright enough that I shortly made visual contact with Capt. Borschkova's plane. I signalled him, and his plane veered off across a mountain of fleece.

"Huntsman 8 to Ground Control," I said. "Have made visual contact with Huntsman 7 who has broken off. Am continuing pursuit, situation normal."

I had pursued spy planes before, but never this far in. From what the radar blips indicated, this one had bravado. I wondered what her pilot was like and pushed the throttle forward. It was about time that I made a visual contact with the target.

The moon was lost beneath the clouds, but the starlight gave me enough to see the plane. It was huge and from appearances looked to be a passenger plane. But my teachers had taught me well as a boy and I was not fooled. The Americans are lazy and decadent and will go to any lengths to steal the fruits of the workers' labors from them.

"He's starting to climb," I said to ground control. He was hoping to avoid surface-to-air missiles that would open up the belly of his plane and send him and his cargo of cameras to the bottom of the sea. I remembered the wonderful celebration we had when I was young on the day that an American spy plane had been downed off of North Vietnam.

"Huntsman 8, this is Col. Les Sovar. Are you still within sight of the plane?"

"Yes," I said. "The target has made no attempt to evade pursuit."

"Take aim at the target."

"Aim taken," I said and smiled. I could smell promotion and hear the joyful laughter of my mother.

"Fire."

"Fired."

A missile is almost as splendid a thing as a plane. I've often wondered what the missile thinks. There was tension in me as I watched it, and joy when it hit and its fireball was glorious in the night sky. It is said that the missile never saw the fruits of his labor, but each has his duty to perform, even the missile.

Ryke Longest, a freshman business major from Raleigh, is a member of Doris Betts' creative writing class and a photographer for The Daily Tar Heel.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sick of 'DTH' anti-government propaganda

To the editor:

Enough is enough! From the first issue of the *Daily Tar Heel* I picked up to the most recent, there has been a consistent trend toward turning your editorials into blatant beatings on U.S. government decisions regarding policies in foreign countries.

The most recent example was in Friday's issue of the *DTH* ("Funeral for a forgotten friend," Sept. 9). Frank Bruni, through false insinuations, managed to place the blame of the assassination of Benigno Aquino on the U.S. government.

Much as a child would do while playing "pin the tail on the donkey," Bruni set himself spinning and then pinned blame for the murder on "Reagan and his

predecessors in the White House." As evidence, Bruni asks questions such as, "Why did Vice President Bush, upon his visit to Manila two years ago, toast President Marcos' adherence to democratic principles?" After asking a barrage of questions, Bruni commits a fundamental cardinal journalism error; he attempts to answer his own questions. This is where he flounders miserably. Instead of good journalism, Bruni spouts his own anti-Reagan anti-military propaganda.

Basically, Bruni presents a warped argument of "down with the U.S. government and military for the sake of human rights." Indeed, one wonders if Bruni could write anti-government propaganda if our country did not have a strong defen-

sive force. Another quotation in this column states: "Perhaps our government is willing to tolerate the rape of human rights just so long as our military investments remain safe." If the U.S. government allows Bruni to write garbage blaming the president for the assassination of a democratic hero who was welcomed into this country by its government, it is the reader who believes the trash Bruni has written who is being "raped."

And, finally, regarding the topic of the U.S. military installations in the Philippines, Bruni writes that 88,487 lives were lost defending the islands during World War II and later refers to this fact as "nostalgia." Who won the World Series in 1948 is nostalgia, not the deaths of brave

men and women. Bruni proceeds to claim that two strategic U.S. bases in the Philippines were viewed by our government as "more important than human rights." Millions of people in Asia and the Pacific Ocean have human rights simply because the United States defends them by maintaining the Clark Field and Subic Bay military installations.

One wonders whom Bruni blames for the shooting down of Korean flight 007. Blaming Reagan's policies for Aquino's death is just as stupid as blaming Reagan for the murder of those 269 people. Tass would love to print Bruni's opinions.

Thomas W. Morgan
Bynum

Castration is for the bulls

To the editor:

I'd like to take issue with Kelly Simmons' support of Depo Provera ("A suitable sentence," *DTH*, Sept. 8). If you take her argument all the way, you find a disturbing similarity to the treatment of farm animals. We castrate breeding horses and bulls to protect the breeding stock. It's the sexual instrument and not the drive that provokes us. And anyway, the castrated bull fattens up real nice for slaughter. Certainly Simmons doesn't think we should eat rapists or that human

beings should be treated like livestock.

No, we are superior to chattel. The real question for humans, or in this case, man, is not the instrument but the motivation. Shrivelled testicles may lead to a more benign outlook, but only indirectly. A more honest procedure would be lobotomy. I say snip out the lobe and snuff out the problem.

Sam Quick
Carrboro

Letters?

The *Daily Tar Heel* welcomes letters to the editor and contributions of columns for the editorial page.

Such contributions should be typed, triple spaced, on a 60-space line, and are subject to editing. Contributions must

be submitted by noon the day before publication.

Column writers should include their majors and hometown; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number.

