

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor

CHARLES ELLMAKER, Associate Editor FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor

MICHAEL TOOLE, City Editor

KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor

KAREN FISHER, Features Editor

MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor

JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor

MELISSA MOORE, News Editor

CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Chilly reception

If there were any doubts that the deployment of U.S. missiles into Western Europe would cause Soviet retaliation, they were quickly dispelled last week when Russian diplomats left the talk of arms reduction in Geneva bargaining rooms and began talking once again of escalation. It was an attempt by the Soviets to show they would stand behind their threats, yet it served only to further polarize East-West relations, worsening the chance of equitable solutions to the nuclear arms race. By their move, the Soviets departed from the realm of influence in Western Europe. Now, it is up to the United States to make sure they do not stay away from Geneva too long, or that the goal of reduction is not lost in the eagerness to deploy.

The U.S. deployment of cruise and Pershing II missiles was the first of a five-year deployment that would plant 572 new missiles in Western Europe. The deployment was part of a plan adopted by NATO in 1979 designed to meld deterrence as a strategy with reduction as a goal. It was called the two-track approach, a reaction to the Soviet 1977 deployment of SS-20s aimed at European targets. As Helmut Schmidt, then West German chancellor said, "We are all faced with the dilemma of having to meet the moral and political demand for arms limitations while at the same time maintaining a fully effective deterrent to war." The deployment was postponed until the latter part of 1983, in hopes that a reduction agreement would be signed.

Since then, however, it has become obvious that the "two-track" approach has failed in allowing for the reductions of arms. Its philosophy had rested on the remote possibility that the superpowers could pull away from the numbers game and develop the trust needed for an agreement. But the United States became caught in a race to achieve parity with the Soviet presence in Western Europe. And the Soviets, in turn, called a halt to all negotiations. Deterrence as a strategy, then, existed not with but to the exclusion of any hope of reductions.

It can be argued that the NATO alliance has been strengthened by the Soviets leaving Geneva, but the departure can in no way be called a victory. The U.S. deployment of nuclear missiles cannot be termed a success. It was a cold necessity that only highlighted the need for greater attempts at negotiation. Unless last week's efforts are backed by attempts to bring the Soviets back to Geneva, a greater loss will be suffered by all.

Don't eat the daisies

Motorists on the Cross Bronx Expressway may find themselves a bit perplexed about the new scenery they are enjoying. What are those shapes in the distance, covering the windows of crumbling, deserted buildings in the South Bronx? What are they made of? Who put them there? For what purpose? And, question of questions, what do they mean?

First, what they are — large decals in the shapes of flowers and flower pots and window curtains and venetian blinds and assorted other suburban send-ups. Vinyl is what they're made of, and each costs about \$6. The New York City commission of housing preservation and development, under the leadership of Anthony B. Gliedman, spent more than \$100,000 in pasting them up. Their purpose — to create the psychological impression among both nearby slum dwellers and expressway passersby that these buildings are neither forsaken nor forgotten.

Now, the hard part. What do these ludicrous vinyl decals tell us? Actually, it's the easiest answer of all. They tell us that the poor in America are in trouble, because those government officials who have some hand in the fate of the poor fail to grasp the reality of poverty. They tell us that government agencies do not have sufficient funds to tackle poverty in tangible ways, but have just enough funds to create an illusion of government action. They tell us that American society is increasingly becoming a place where the interests of the upper and middle classes, who flinch at the thought of tax increases or contact with "the other half," tend to take precedence over the plight of the indigent.

If anything, the vinyl decals will serve as bitter reminders to thousands of tenement dwellers that they do not enjoy the typical luxuries others do. They will remind families living in poverty of how little the government is presently doing to help their situations.

It's doubtful that the interests of the poor are really at the center of the commission's intentions. It seems more likely that the decal plan is really intended to make all those Westchester County, N.Y., commuters who must pass through the Bronx on their ways to and from the high rise office buildings on midtown Manhattan believe that government agencies are well-endowed enough to improve slum conditions.

That the decals will work as a balm for the consciences of the middle class is also unlikely. Even Anthony B. Gliedman, housing preservation and development commissioner, seems to realize that, below the surface of good intentions, his agency's newest program is ineffectual. As he told *The New York Times*, "We don't want anybody to think we're doing this instead of rebuilding. But that will take years and require hundreds of millions of dollars. And while we're waiting, we want people to know that we still care."

A daisy for your hunger, laced curtains for your hopelessness.

The Daily Tar Heel

Editorial Assistants: Bill Riedy and Gigi Sonner.

Assistant Managing Editors: Joel Broadway, Tracy Hilton and Amy Tanner

Assistant News Editor: Gary Meek

News Desk: Cynthia Brown and Pam Weber

News: Tracy Adams, Dick Anderson, Diana Bosniack, Keith Bradsher, Amy Brantley, Hope Buffington, Tom Conlon, Kathie Collins, Kate Cooper, Teresa Cox, Lynn Davis, Dennis Dowdy, Chris Edwards, Kathy Farley, Steve Ferguson, Genie French, Kim Gilley, Andy Hodges, Reggie Holley, Sue Kuhn, Thad Ogburn, Beth O'Kelley, Janet Olson, Rosemary Osborne, Heidi Owen, Beth Ownley, Cindy Parker, Donna Pazdan, Ben Perkowski, Frank Proctor, Linda Queen, Sarah Raper, Mary Alice Resch, Cindi Ross, Katherine Schultz, Sharon Sheridan, Deborah Simpkins, Jodi Smith, Sally Smith, Lisa Stewart, Mark Stinneford, Carrie Szymeczek, Liz Saylor, Amy Tanner, Doug Tate, Wayne Thompson, Vance Trefethen, Chuck Wallington, Melanie Wells, Scott Wharton, Lynda Wolf, Rebekah Wright, Jim Yardley and Jim Zook.

Sports: Frank Kennedy, Kurt Rosenberg and Eddie Wooten, assistant sports editors. Glenna Burrell, Kimball Crossley, Pete Fields, John Hackney, Lonnie McCullough, Robyn Norwood, Michael Persinger, Julie Peters, Glen Peterson, Lee Roberts, Mike Schoor, Scott Smith, Mike Waters, David Wells and Bob Young.

Features: Clarice Bickford, Tom Camacho, Toni Carter, Margaret Claiborne, Cindy Dunley, Charles Gibbs, Tom Grey, Marymela Hall, Kathy Hopper, Charles Karnes, Joel Katzenstein, Dianna Massie, Kathy Norcross, Jane Osment, Clinton Weaver and Mike Truell, assistant features editor.

Arts: J. Bonasia, Steve Carr, Ivy Hilliard, Jo Ellen Meekins, Sheryl Thomas and David Schmidt, assistant arts editor.

Photography: Lori Heeman, Bryan Lankard, Jeff Neuville, Susie Post and Zane Saunders

Business: Anne Fulcher, business manager; Angela Booze and Tammy Martin, accounts receivable clerks; Dawn Welch, circulation/distribution manager; William Austin, assistant circulation/distribution manager; Patti Pittman and Julie Jones, classified advertising staff; Yvette Moxin, receptionist; Debbie McCurdy, secretary.

Advertising: Paula Brewer, advertising manager; Mike Tabor, advertising coordinator; Laura Austin, Kevin Freidheim, Patricia Gorry, Terry Lee, Doug Robinson, Amy Schultz and Anneli Zeck, ad representatives.

Sandinista human rights violations

By PETER REINER

I was completely appalled when I read Loren Hintz's article on Nicaragua ("U.S. Wrong on Nicaragua," *DTH*, Nov. 9). All I could think when I read it was, where does she get her information? She says she's visited Nicaragua several times during the past few years, but where has she gone? And in what frame of mind? Unfortunately, important details are left out of her article and others like it, and many students come to accept what they read as indisputable fact, when in reality such articles express only the one-sided, day-dreamy bias that romantic would-be revolutionaries are infected by when they think they've found something to believe in. They want to believe so much that they block out certain facts, and refuse to accept them. Sofoza was a tyrant — there is no doubt about that — but to paint the Sandinista government in the messianic colors that Hintz uses is an utter outrage. Why does she leave so many holes in her article? Because if she were to look at the whole Nicaraguan picture, she would have to burst her bubble and open her mind. Admittedly, there have been improvements in some areas, for example, medical care and housing, since the Sandinistas took power, but consider the following as well:

- Complete Sandinista control of the media and

editorship of information. Although this is justified by the alleged "emergency war period" Nicaragua finds herself in, much of the information censored has nothing at all to do with Nicaragua. For example, articles about the fighting in Afghanistan are censored.

- The Sandinistas are conducting the systematic genocide of the Miskito Indians, because of their refusal to submit to communist rule. Many are sent to labor camps, many are found in prisons, and many have simply disappeared. (Reminiscent of Cambodia?)
- Indoctrination of children about Marxism-Leninism. School-children are taught to chant, "Americans are the worst evil." In their math classes, they are given sketches of automatic rifles to count.

- Basic necessities are rationed, and coupons to purchase them are only available to those who participate in government "re-education" meetings.

- The government ridicules religion. Pro-Sandinista demonstrators shouted down the pope when he visited there.

Hintz writes that because the United States is supplying anti-Sandinista rebels, Nicaragua is forced to spend its scarce resources on defense weaponry. She fails to mention two things. One, if these resources are really scarce, how do the Sandinistas dare to ship so many weapons and so much ammunition to the El Salvadoran Marxist guerrillas? If the Sandinistas are so concerned with the poor, why are they exporting their revolution to El Salvador? And secondly, those

anti-Sandinista "rebels" are Nicaraguans, too, who refuse to be dominated by the Sandinistas. If they had government representation there would be no fighting. But there are no free elections. The Sandinistas have promised them for 1985, but Castro promised them to Cuba in 1958, and he still hasn't delivered. Naturally, the Sandinistas justify this exactly as Castro did — free elections would destabilize the country. Besides, the Sandinistas have the popular support, right? (Convenient for them, only government opinion polls are allowed in Nicaragua.)

If Hintz thinks the Sandinistas are the solution, she could have stayed in Nicaragua to help them build their workers' paradise. But in reality, America committed a dreadful mistake by giving up Nicaragua to the Sandinistas. People like Hintz should be involved in pressuring the United States to bring true democratic reform to Central American nations, not to abandon them to Sandinistas and the like, who offer no solution to the problem of human rights. That involves developing the potential of true democracy in this nation as well — through education. It means overcoming racist, nationalist, sexist tendencies. Our politicians and businessmen have to develop the heart to serve others, not to take advantage of them.

Peter Reiner is a member of CARP living in Raleigh.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Know options before deciding

To the editor:

A baby boy or girl should have the right to be raised in an atmosphere of love by caring parents who will devote time to nurturing the infant. An unwanted child born into this world is a terrible thing.

Likewise, it is a terrible thing to be forced into giving up the possibility to bear a child if that's what one really wants to do. Unfortunately, Donna Turner ("A perspective on abortion," *DTH*, Nov. 17) wasn't given the choice!

Aside from her first pregnancy (in which she asserted herself and went against the wishes of the Navy), her course of action was determined by family and "friends" who decided that she

shouldn't carry her pregnancies to full term. They forced her to undergo abortions when she herself was not prepared to do so. What woman would not feel resentful placed in this same situation?

"Pro-choice" means that a woman is given the opportunity to select for herself in what way she wishes to conduct her life; she has the option to practice parenthood, give the child up for adoption, or terminate her pregnancy, if she so desires, but her choice is not limited to abortion alone!

Any woman who finds herself in the situation of being pregnant and not sure of what to do needs to talk with someone who can help her sort out her options and help her feel comfortable with the deci-

sion that she herself decides upon. No one should be forced into a situation that she doesn't feel is right for her.

I commend Turner for work in helping other women who have suffered from the psychological strain of inner conflict. But I would consider changing the name of her organization to WEBO (Women Exploited by Others), for it is not the act of abortion itself which is exploitive — many women who have chosen this route for themselves feel good about their deci-

sion. Rather, it is those individuals who pressure you into making a decision that you can't live with who are exploitive.

It is best to investigate all options before you act. Pregnancy Support Services, Student Health Service and the Sexuality Education and Counseling Service stand ready to help.

Brian Richmond
Sexuality Education and
Counseling Service

A clouded perspective

To the editor:

I, too, have a perspective on abortion, one based on five years of volunteer work at a birth control clinic. There are girls and women who have had abortions and are determined never to have one again; who are shocked to learn that they are pregnant even though they don't want to be; who become pregnant even though they don't want to be; who become pregnant despite using contraceptives. I've heard about 13-year-olds pregnant because of incest or ignorance, of women who couldn't cope with a child just now. I have been asked if it was normal not to have sex. I've seen how few boys and men care enough to come along with their girlfriends. I have a friend who had to have an abortion because the pregnancy seriously threatened her life.

We activists have to spend all our time and energy fighting to keep legal a woman's right to control her body. We would prefer to start people talking about the ethics of sex, abortion, pregnancy and child raising. And wouldn't it be nice if men would take their responsibility to prevent pregnancy?

Andi Weiss Bartzack
Craig

To the editor:

Must we really cloud this issue again? In the column "A perspective on abortion" (*DTH*, Nov. 17), Bill Riedy ends his tirade with a message: We must despise abortion as a form of exploitation. Let's talk about exploitation. This article is the very definition of that concept. The youthful confusion, and later, the idiocy of one woman and her apparently unscrupulous doctor are supposed to impress us (disgust us?) so that we condemn the tool they abused.

Condemn, instead, the lack of knowledge that causes a woman to have an abortion when she is seven months pregnant. Condemn the so-called doctor who allows such a thing. And condemn a "journalist" who is too narrow-minded to recognize that pro-abortion does not mean pro-death. Do people really believe, still, that an abortion is an option lightly chosen, as blithely undertaken as a trip to the dentist? It is a difficult decision, one that can be hard to live with, but it should be ours to make. The real exploitation we face comes from ignorance and, it seems, from the authoritarian figures who control without compassion or judgment.

Lori Kirstein
Chapel Hill

Bring it back

To the editor:

On Saturday, Nov. 12, the Carolina Union Film Committee presented a night of B-movies in the Great Hall. The fun with Batman, Bruce Lee, The Beatles, etc., was publicized in part by a contest conducted during that week. Students competed for prizes by identifying a collage of "B" pictures mounted on a poster.

Unfortunately, the poster was a bigger success than hoped for and during the midnight showing of *Let It Be* the B-movie collage went the way of the Talking Heads banner and other Carolina Union publicity: Someone stole it. A great deal of work (not to mention students' money) goes into such projects, and frustration and disappointment result when students find the

product of hours of work ripped off. The B-movie poster's disappearance also poses another problem in that the prizes (albums, movie posters and tickets) promised to contestants cannot be awarded until entry blanks are judged. And judging will be extremely difficult without the poster itself. The Film Committee is therefore asking that the person who removed the poster return it to the Union (in the auditorium lobby, at the desk, in Room 200, or wherever) as soon as possible so that the contest can be fairly concluded.

Daniel Streible
Union Film Committee

Don't squeeze the 'DTH'

To the editor:

I am happy to inform the *DTH* that the back page of the Nov. 7 and Nov. 16 issues was used for toilet paper. I felt that this was the most appropriate use for some of the garbage that was printed on these days.

In particular, I refer to articles by Bernardo Garcia ("U.S. no Messiah"), Balram Kakkar ("Longing no more") and Kerry DeRoche ("On Reagan and posse politics").

The United States seems to have become the Polish joke of the world. It appears that no nation can resist the chance to kick the United States in the teeth — they know that the next handout is forthcoming no matter what is said.

To the dissident international and American students I say that you must broaden your myopic outlook. America's economic and military strength has thrust it into the leadership of the free world. That all people will be granted freedom is a statement indigenous to the American spirit. Unfortunately, the myopic dissidents fail to realize that those with freedom must accept freedom's heavy responsibilities. The death of America's

sons in Lebanon and Grenada must bring tears to your eyes, but such a sacrifice must be weighed against the actions of those whose objectives include the usurpation of the freedom of nations.

As an Australian, I see the invasion of Grenada as something positive, where the United States was calling the tune, where the petulant outbursts of European nations did not water down American policy into uselessness, and where the objectives of the non-free world were stuffed back in their pants.

From Australia's standpoint, the United States is unequivocally the leader of the free world and we are honest enough to admit that fact. However, do not consider us America's puppet, for we are stubbornly independent. Could it be that this "unusual" stance is due to the fact that, as a young nation, we are unbiased by history — a history that tells us that the United States is the first dominant power not to attempt to usurp the rights of other nations?

Greg McLardie
Craig

Wrong definition

To the editor:

Robert Ragland's only purpose in offering a scholarship to an openly gay medical student was to stimulate "open discussion by both gay and non-gay people... so that gay people can be seen as human beings not much different from others."

It's too bad that the non-gay side of the discussion has been represented by the naive and hostile words of Kelly Walker in his letter "Animal lovers, unite!" to the *DTH* (Nov. 14).

Walker needs to be reminded that love and sex are deeply personal — and therefore private — aspects of human

A pleasant surprise

To the editor:

I was pleasantly surprised to see Donna Pleasants' reply ("U.S. not perfect, but...," *DTH*, Nov. 16) to Balram Kakkar's column "Longing no more" (*DTH*, Nov. 7). As another foreign student at UNC, I was disappointed with Kakkar's attitudes toward the United States and it was heartening to see an American stand up to this criticism.

To Kakkar I have only one thing to say: You are in this country as an unwelcome guest (on a foreign student's visa), and if you are so disillusioned by it you are free

life. To define people by their sexuality is wrong, just as it is wrong to do so based on age, race, sex or other differences that too often become barriers to human understanding.

As for Walker's hostility, perhaps he didn't realize that in the flippant attitude of his letter, he summarily invalidated the lifestyles of 10 percent of his fellow Americans, perhaps including friends, neighbors, co-workers, professors or even relatives.

Marc Eisendorfer
Carrboro

to leave to return to your Afghani paradise. No one will discourage you from departing. I think it says a lot for this country which allows foreigners to use its media to criticize its policies and actions. I am also surprised that as an ethnic Indian you conveniently ignored one of the basic axioms of our culture which (roughly translated) says that a guest has no business to spit in the plate after his host feeds him a meal.

Rahul J. Shah
Craig



MISS JONES, IT'S MARGARET THATCHER'S BIRTHDAY... SEND HER SOME MARINES WITH A NICE LITTLE NOTE...

On an emotional level

To the editor:

ABC's *The Day After* served one vital purpose: It brought home to an emotional level the consequences of nuclear war. Since the invention of the bow and arrow, man has been freed by distance from the emotional effect of killing his fellow man; he has avoided his opponent's anguish, the one thing that would hurt him, too, and cause him to reconsider his action. "The button" is housed in a brief-

case handcuffed to a man that is always near the president. A man in Washington once suggested another step in the protocol of pushing the button — that the president would have to cut the man's throat before setting off a strike that would kill hundreds of millions of others. Why doesn't this sound absurd?

Alex Washburn
East Franklin Street

Letters?

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

Contributions should be typed on a 60-space line and triple-spaced. They are subject to editing. Contributions

must be submitted by noon the day before publication.

Column writers should include their majors and hometowns; each letter should include the writer's name, address and telephone number. Letters that are not typed will not be printed.