

# The Daily Tar Heel

93rd year of editorial freedom

ARNE RICKERT AND DAVID SCHMIDT  
Editor

CATHERINE COWAN Associate Editor  
ANJETTA McQUEEN Production Editor  
JANET OLSON University Editor  
JAMI WHITE News Editor  
ANDY TRINCA State and National Editor

LORETTA GRANTHAM City Editor  
LORRY WILLIAMS Business Editor  
LEE ROBERTS Sports Editor  
ELIZABETH ELLEN Arts Editor  
SHARON SHERIDAN Features Editor

LARRY CHILDRESS Photography Editor

## A serious peek at the summit

By JIM TOWNSEND

With today's meeting between President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, we find ourselves already knowing a great deal about the web of arms control issues they will confront and the differences they must overcome in order to end five years of dangerous stagnation in arms control. The Soviet Union, for example, seeks a ban on all testing and deployment of strategic defense systems and attaches this precondition to any proposal it makes concerning offensive weapons. At the same time, the United States refuses to negotiate any facet of its proposed missile defense known as the Strategic Defense Initiative.

For anyone serious about arms control, observing the daily rounds of pre-summit posturing emanating from both sides can be more than a little disheartening. Each side advances its latest position always reminding the other of its readiness, in the words of Secretary of State George P. Shultz, "to get down to real business with the seriousness the subject deserves." Given the intransigence of both sides, particularly the United States, one wonders if either side is taking the subject of arms control as seriously as those of us sitting on the sidelines watching.

Any hope we entertain going into these talks rests on the assumption that both sides will work effectively toward a compromise, not so much on their differences concerning the reduction of offensive weapons, but primarily on their disagreement over the testing and deployment

of defensive weapons. Regardless of one's position on the future of strategic defense, the fact cannot be ignored that the more plausible any defense, the greater the pressure to counter it with greater offense. While both U.S. and Soviet positions on strategic defense are undesirable preconditions to which neither is entitled, the administration's refusal to negotiate SDI jeopardizes the future of arms control more because it is pre-emptive. It rules out the possibility of a mutually advantageous agreement on this all-important aspect of the nuclear build-up.

This does not suggest that we should succumb to Soviet demands simply because that may lead us to arms reduction. Quite the contrary, we should consider the legality of SDI testing and deployment in light of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty which explicitly prohibits such testing and deployment. By pursuing this type of testing and deployment we would be renouncing a treaty, the letter if not the spirit of which, both the United States and the Soviet Union have abided by for the past 13 years. What would be the effect of our subverting the meaning of this pact on future agreements? Killing the effectiveness of a treaty, whether by ignoring its existence or "re-interpreting" its provisions (as members of the Pentagon and State Department recently sought to do) throws into question our ability to stand by our agreements and casts doubt on the point of making arms control accords with the United States.

What then does the Reagan administration

believe we stand to lose by negotiating strategic defense? Nothing other than our very ability to negotiate. The president himself has said that SDI could someday be the "big bargaining chip" that will bring about nuclear disarmament. But this goal, he says, can only be achieved after years of research and testing bring us to the brink of deployment. Gorbachev, on the other hand, argues that the lure of billions spent on testing will make more advanced testing and finally deployment irresistible and thus preclude their negotiation. In other words, strategic defense should be negotiated now, because it will only become more difficult to negotiate as time passes and the money spent on developing it mounts.

In addition, the feasibility of the plan itself is still very much in question. Regardless of which expert on the subject one believes, one fact remains: The kind of scientific effort required to determine whether or not SDI is feasible will take many years. In pursuing its line of keeping SDI off the bargaining table in Geneva, the Reagan administration is assuring the failure of the summit to achieve substantial arms reductions. All the pre-summit maneuvering, verbal jousting, and any vestiges of optimism will have been for naught. The president, quite simply, has decided to subordinate arms control to his vision of a nuclear shield. It is a decision that may preclude the possibility of any new arms agreements and drive the nuclear arms race to an even more preposterous level.

Jim Townsend is a sophomore history major from Summit, N.J.

## Behind the scenes at Geneva

The world braces as its two most powerful men, Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev meet today to begin the super-power summit in Geneva, Switzerland. This meeting will define and gauge U.S.-Soviet relations for a long time to come. The fate of the world, and the balance of power, may be bargained away by either side of crack negotiators.

The summit will focus on the control of the nuclear arms race, both on earth and in space. However, much behind-the-scenes negotiating already has taken place that has been just as intense as what the world will see today, negotiating that will directly influence what Reagan and Gorbachev will discuss. For instance:

**Hotels:** Geneva, for all its neutrality, is really a very small place, and the summit occurs at peak skiing season. The two sides had to wrangle here, but when the smoke cleared, the United States had booked the Geneva Ramada Inn, while the Soviets were left with the Howard Johnson 10 miles outside of town on the Bern-Geneva turnpike.

**The opening-night banquet:** Score a propaganda success for Gorbachev here. President Reagan initially took a hard line on prime rib, which the Soviets took advantage of by requesting hamburgers, and only if it was no trouble. The United States immediately recognized its blunder and asked for pot roast, while accusing the Soviets of plans to smash the packets of ketchup on the floor and to unscrew the tops of SALT shakers. The final menu will be pot roast, with an ample serving of humble pie for the United States.

**The guest list:** This also was a major point of contention. Seating was at a premium because of the smallness of the Geneva VFW banquet hall (there aren't many veterans in Switzerland), and Mrs. Reagan created a stir by exceeding her guest list with a last-minute invitation

to something reputedly "warm and fuzzy." Gary Coleman was a rumored possibility.

The Soviets considered bringing their own bulky tables, as opposed to the multiple, card-table approach employed by the United States. The Soviets rejected the plan as a major breach of protocol, but the United States refused to fold.

The Soviets suffered their own epistolary embarrassment when Soviet news agency Tass accidentally printed a letter from chief Soviet negotiator Viktor Komplektov to Gorbachev urging Gorbachev not to seat him next to "that boring old goat Shultz" at the banquet. One official described the letter as "a serious detriment to talks." When asked which talks he meant, the official replied, "The talk around the pool."

**The wives:** The two first ladies are waging their own propaganda campaign. Gorbachev's wife, Edith, won the first round by rushing out to the Moscow Bloomingdale's when first informed of the trip and buying the entire Winter line. Mrs. Reagan, undaunted, asked Macy's to create a special look. Olive and "peace blue" are reputed to be her theme.

Mrs. Reagan will continue her worldwide quest to eliminate drugs by speaking at a Geneva kindergarten against them. Mrs. Gorbachev, supposedly a green thumb, will visit a Swiss husbandry clinic. But it will not be all work for the women, as Mrs. Gorbachev plans to tour a Swatch watch factory while Mrs. Reagan will take in the Aalgstadt Valley, where *The Sound of Music* was filmed.

As can be seen, much preparation has created the backdrop to the dramatic events that will unfold during the next several days. Which side will win? Jimmy the Greek was unavailable to *The Daily Tar Heel* for a prediction, but the key seems to lie in whichever side gets the camera on it the longest.

### board opinion

## READER FORUM

### Group and individual rights

To the editors:  
"Think globally, act locally" is this year's theme for the Campus Y. Also appropriate for Human Rights Week, the theme has been adopted as an answer to the question from participants of the Week who want to know "What should I do to get involved?"

In one sense, this theme relates to today's topic "Group and Individual Rights" because we all identify with others on a large scale but our actions are uniquely individual.

There are 15 programs today, in addition to another program, "Date and Acquaintance Rape," on Wednesday at 7 p.m. in Room 211 of the Student Union. (For specific information check the Campus Calendar.) This day is a "catch-all" that should consume programs which deal with individuals and/or groups in regard to race, gender, sexual preference and religion. These issues may overlap in many of today's programs, but each program has its own theme.

Three programs deal with economics: "Affirmative Action or Reverse Discrimination," "Capitalism, Socialism and Communism: Three Views," and "Is Unemployment a Human Rights Abuse?" Two programs which deal with gender

are "Women in Iran," sponsored by the UNC-CH Baha'i Club, and "Invisible Barriers: Being Female at UNC," sponsored by the Campus Y Executive Committee. "Affirmative Action or Reverse Discrimination" also deals with race and gender.

Programs which deal with race and civil rights issues are sponsored by the Carolina Indian Circle, the Union Human Relations Committee and the Campus Y Human Rights Week Committee. The Carolina Indian Circle is showing an excellent film, "Annie Mae: Brave Hearted Woman," which highlights an Indian civil rights leader during the '60s whose life was stifled by FBI cover-up. It gives the viewer a strong feeling for Indian philosophy and culture. "An Evening with Susan Harjo," director of the National Congress of American Indians and a citizen of both the Cheyenne and the Arapaho tribes, continues in the same vein. She will speak on "The Forgotten Americans: Indians and Human Rights." Certainly, if there is one race of people who have been shuffled, pushed aside, and "reserved," it is the American Indians. (By the way, North Carolina has the fifth largest Indian population in the country.)

Dean Renwick, the guest of a dinner discussion at 5 p.m. in the

North Banquet Room of Lenoir Hall, will discuss civil rights on campus. And with the participation of the UNC Baha'i Club and the UNC Chaplain's Association, the theme of religion has not been forgotten. The Baha'i Club gives specific illustrations of religious persecution of members of the Baha'i faith using two programs: "The Mona Video," and "A Cry from the Heart: Persecution of the Baha'is in Iran." The Chaplain's Association will sponsor an inter-denominational celebration, "Songs of Justice," a combination of dramatic readings, songs, and liturgical dance.

One program, "Pornography and Homophobia," deals with sexual preference and is sponsored by Carolina Gay and Lesbian Association. Other programs include "Forum on the Death Penalty," sponsored by Amnesty International, and "Chapel Hill/Carrboro: Response to Those in Need."

The day should offer something for everyone. We are hoping these programs will incite global thoughts and local action.

Addison Sweeney  
David Schnorenberg,  
Human Rights Week Committee

### Fast support

To the editors:  
The Hunger Responsibility Committee of the Campus Y has for 12 years been involved in organizing and sponsoring the Oxfam International Fast for World Harvest. Oxfam International is a non-sectarian grassroots organization concerned with world-wide hunger, and its programs are oriented toward technological and economic development to relieve hunger. The organization depends to a great extent on the financial support derived from the annual Fast for World Harvest.

Again this year the Hunger Responsibility Committee is involved in promoting the Fast. Participants are asked to donate to Oxfam the money saved by fasting. The Hunger Responsibility Committee will have tables set up in or around the Union to collect donations, or contributions may be sent to the Campus Y. In addition, the Committee will sponsor a breakfast meal in Room 210 of the Union after the fast is over.

The need for constructive action in the face of world hunger becomes greater with each passing day. Only with such continuous action can we ever hope to alleviate the problem; it is with this in mind that I bring the problem to your attention.

I encourage all to assist with this important effort, and I thank the Hunger Responsibility Committee of the Campus Y for the leadership which makes possible our participation in this international program.

Christopher C. Fordham III  
Chancellor

## Add some comment please, 'DTH'

To the editors:  
OK, so a paper supported by involuntary student fees is obliged to provide a forum for all sorts of student opinion, even ill-informed gibbering. But you don't have to run it without comment: somebody might think you agree with it. When you ran Sally Pont's "Zionism lives

in infamy" (Nov. 13), you really owed it to your readers to point out that judging Israeli policy by the ravings of the Jewish Defense League is roughly equivalent to judging the civil rights movement in the United States by the actions and rhetoric of the Symbionese Liberation Army. Someone who doesn't recognize that cannot really

be expected to distinguish between Zionism and racism — and should not be able to expect that her opinions will be treated seriously.

J.S. Reed  
Dept. of sociology

## Remember the fast times at Campus Y

To the editors:  
On Wednesday, the Campus Y Committee on Hunger Responsibility will sponsor the annual Oxfam Fast for World Harvest. The fast begins at 5 p.m. on Wednesday and will run until the same time on Thursday. At this time, there will be a break-fast dinner in the Union where fasters will assemble to formally break the fast and eat foods supplied by local restaurants. Donations are requested of fasters who should give the amount of money that they would normally

have spent on food during this 24-hour period. Interested others may also donate, (i.e., those who have a big heart, but an equally big appetite.) You're all encouraged to join in the fast in an effort to fight the continuous battle against world hunger.

A little information on Oxfam: Oxfam America is a non profit, Boston based, international organization that funds self-help development projects and disaster relief in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Oxfam is funded by private indi-

viduals and groups and neither seeks nor receives money from any government agency. During its 43 years of existence, Oxfam has achieved an international reputation for innovative yet realistic aid to some of the poorest people in the world.

Current projects include renovation and development of small-scale irrigation systems in rural African villages, collection and distribution of food, blankets, and other emergency supplies to Ethiopia, and getting rice seeds to peasants in

Kampuchea who were very affected by the severe flooding in 1984.

Of the 6 million in contributions received last year, only seven percent were used for administrative expenses, excluding fundraising expenses which were 17 percent. Your money will be well spent and your time spent fasting will be well worth it. Stop by the Hunger Responsibility table in the pit this week for additional information.

Martha Brady  
Campus Y

## Conclusion reached wasn't worth the tripe

By DAVID BROWN

It is hard to recall a more ill-informed, poorly argued, and biased editorial as that which graced this page on Nov. 13 ("Zionism lives in infamy"). Rarely have I seen such tripe masquerade as a student's thought on a major issue. Indeed, I am doubly surprised to read such a rambling from Sally Pont. She has achieved a considerable reputation as a writer and student in many classrooms and for various Carolina publications. I had expected more thought from one of the most able undergraduate students of this university. Nevertheless, I will endeavor to make sense of her arguments. It is difficult, however, to know where to start when analysing a diatribe.

First, she makes no attempt to define either Zionism or racism. Both are terms whose use is fraught with difficulty. They are used in many different ways by many different people, by people acting in good faith, and by those acting in bad faith.

Second, she claims Zionism is "entirely militaristic and imperialistic." Such a claim ignores the nation-building, the study, both secular and religious, and the land-reclamation that is going on in Israel at the moment. However I suspect the writer is loathe the accept such vague claims. She might care to consider that a 1982 demonstration in Tel Aviv against the war in Lebanon drew 10 percent of the population. I cannot imagine 24 million people descending upon Washington to protest anything. I cannot imagine 5 million people protesting in London, and I certainly cannot imagine a nation that is

"entirely militaristic and imperialistic" allowing 10 percent of its population to protest a war it is currently involved in.

Third, it is argued that the plight of those Palestinians outside Israel further proves Zionism's (Israel's?) inherent racism. Are we to assume Jordan's killing and expulsion of many Palestinians during "Black September" is the fault of Israel? An analysis of the role of the Palestinians in the Lebanese civil wars, both past and present, would also be worthwhile.

Fourth, the editorial stated that the Jewish Defense League, (an American Jewish organization) "provokes" the fear, anger, and retaliation that manifests itself in the "1972 kidnapping of Israeli athletes at the Summer Olympics in Munich." This nonsense is void on its face. Are we to assume that the "attributed" actions of the JDL in 1985 justify the actions of the terrorists in 1972? We have a substantial time jump here. Or alternatively, are we to assume that the JDL is part of the international Zionist conspiracy that exists irrespective of time and space? You might find the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* interesting reading, Miss Pont. When you are finished, you can extol its virtues in the *DTH*. The double speak continues for the article refers to the "kidnapping" of the Israeli athletes. They were not only kidnapped; they were murdered.

However, there is a more general point to be made here. The blame is laid upon the victims, the athletes, the Israelis (Zionists?). Are we to now blame the victim? You might consider this when thinking about crimes against women; or

more specifically, would the killing of the passengers of the TWA plane in Beirut have been semi-justified?

Fifth, the editorial states that "there needn't be so much fear at least (of) the moderate faction of the PLO." I wish you could say that to the children murdered in their cots in Kiryat Shemona, or to the three Israeli boaters in Cyprus, or perhaps you might try asking Mrs. Klinghoffer. She is one of the Zionists who lived to tell the tale.

Sixth, you claim that U.S. support for Israel drives the Arab nations into the hands of the Soviets. I suspect such an argument is peripheral to your central point, but nevertheless you might take the time to notice the new and growing strength of the U.S. relationships with Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and despite some tensions, Egypt.

Seventh and finally, you claim that "as the Jewish Defense League proves, Zionists have behaved and continue to behave in a maniacal, militaristic manner." I wonder whether the KKK proves that all white Americans are racist.

I have no doubt that some Israeli policies are gravely mistaken, if not reprehensible. I am equally certain that the views of some American Jews who support Israel are racist, but I am confident that Zionism does not equal racism. What is more, when I read such an editorial, and see so many internal flaws and factual deceptions, I wonder whether the writer has a hidden agenda.

David Brown is a senior history major from Birmingham, England.

### THE Daily Crossword by Virginia Hopewell

- ACROSS  
1 "Splendor in the —"  
6 Tilt  
10 Catches  
14 Hold the attention  
15 Indian servant  
16 Aid  
17 Idolize  
18 Vikki of song  
19 "— but the brave..."  
20 Drudge  
22 Condensed liquid  
24 Included with  
26 Rained ice  
27 Olympiad stars  
31 Gaelic sea god  
32 "I — if I could"  
33 Made bovine sounds  
35 Sch. gp.  
38 Ostentatious  
39 Protozoan  
40 Intuit  
41 Affirmative  
42 Postulate  
43 A Greene  
44 Beetle  
45 Pool additive  
47 Crickets' kin  
51 Father horse  
52 Reference  
54 An Allen  
58 Celebrity  
59 Time for lunch  
61 Signs of sorrow  
62 Endure  
63 Tell —  
64 Sweeney-telling card  
65 Experts  
66 Masticate  
67 Combat place

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
14					15				16				
17					18				19				
20				21				22					
			24		25			26					
27	28	29			30			31					
32					33			34			35	36	37
38					39						40		
41					42						43		
					44						45		
47	48	49						50			51		
52								53			54		
58					59			60			61		
62					63						64		
65					66						67		

© 1985 Tribune Media Services, Inc. All Rights Reserved. 11/19/85

Yesterday's Puzzle Solved:

L	O	P	E	F	A	R	A	D	A	R	A	B		
O	R	L	O	A	L	O	N	E	P	O	L	E		
S	A	I	N	T	L	O	U	I	S	B	L	O	E	
E	N	E	I	L	E	X	L	O	E	S	S			
A	M	I	S	L	A	M								
S	E	R	E	N	A	D	E	I	N	B	L	O	E	
B	A	N	G	N	O	M	A	D	E	N	D			
A	L	T	O	T	I	M	E	R	M	A	I	D		
A	M	O	C	A	M	E	L	A	S	T	O			
L	I	M	E	H	O	U	S	E	B	L	O	E	S	
N	E	S	S	E	E	L								
T	A	R	N	S	A	S	T	A	O	C	A			
B	L	U	E	S	I	N	T	H	E	N	I	G	H	T
A	I	D	A	M	O	T	E	L	F	E	E			
R	E	E	D	P	L	U	M	S	A	F	E	R		

11/19/85

- DOWN  
1 Metric unit  
2 Astronaut  
3 Stratford-on—  
4 In install-ments

- 5 Cooked with little water  
6 Fond du —  
7 Moslem holy man  
8 Aegean gulf  
9 Ticked pink  
10 Rallery  
11 Concerning  
12 Category  
13 Horse  
21 Ignited  
23 Plant embryo  
25 Common people  
27 Out of sight  
28 Raced  
29 Novels  
30 — boom  
34 Swear words  
35 Lovely girl  
36 Nashville's state: abbr.  
37 Mariner's word  
39 Of a glacial ridge  
40 Grandfather was one

- 42 Seed shells  
43 A Lynn  
44 Disheartens  
46 Operculum  
47 Lily type  
48 Concerning a hip bone  
49 Shut

- 50 True, old style  
53 Memo  
55 Expose to the public  
56 Press  
57 This: Sp.  
60 Immediately